

Bailey , Georgia

From: Derbyshire Stephen [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 June 2016 20:01
To: DevelopmentControl & DevelopmentManagement
Cc: Williams , Kevin Councillor; Green , Donna Councillor; BSCP
Subject: Planning Application - 2016/0623 (132 Park Grove Cellar Conversion)

Categories: Printed by Rachael

Sir, madam

I have been made aware of the above application and must say I am concerned about the proposed application.

My concerns follow the same lines as my previous ones expressed about a similar application so I will find myself repeating the same issues here. To reiterate them, these are:

The application is misleading as it is not 'just' for the conversion of a downstairs cellar but for ALL levels of the property to be converted to permit it to be used as a house of multiple occupation (HMO). As I am not an expert on planning applications so I cannot say whether the application has been done correctly but if it has the system is wrong as it is being used in such a way as to mislead its true intent.

This is not the first property to be proposed for conversion for such use. Several properties in the vicinity have already been converted and another property in the vicinity was recently converted despite a number of objections raised, although I am pleased to say a more recent application has been declined.

The area in total is slowly degenerating into one dominated by rental and multiple occupancy with all the inherent problems that it brings along with it, as have been demonstrated by those existing. The streets are becoming more littered and traffic congestion increasing as more and more of these properties are being converted. This one will only exacerbate the problems.

General litter is increasing all the time as the new residents, and their landlords, are less concerned about the appearance and state of the surroundings. Cigarette litter is out of control as often these places restrict smoking inside so the smokers are pushed outside onto the street where their cigarettes and packages are discarded. Those attending the two doctors' surgeries are certainly responsible for some of the smoking litter, as can be seen by the amount of waste in those two locations, but I have taken notice of a number of persons standing outside as well, casually walking up and down the street on an evening smoking and then discarding their litter. A canned or bottled drink of some sort often accompanies them and this adds to the overall state of the streets.

The residents in these properties are also more inclined to discard unwanted items outside in the alleyways and streets as they have no real concerns for the area and assume someone will ultimately deal with their waste - old televisions, boxes, and other appliances being the most recent.

Traffic is also another major problem here. I accept that these are victorian houses and were not designed for cars but as in any location that should also be considered when any further developments are considered. On a previous HMO application the highways department raised no objections as they stated there were no traffic issues in the area, a statement that is quite laughable coming from them. There are parking restriction in this area imposed by them because of the traffic concerns.

Current restrictions are regularly ignored with limited enforcement. I have also noticed more vehicles from other locations being left in this area because congestion in the surrounding areas is causing drivers to seek

parking spaces further afield. More recently I have noticed a significant increase in second hand vehicles, some in not very good condition being traded in the area. Just recently traffic enforcement were on the street requesting a tenant remove a vehicle parked in a restricted zone with the person claiming it had broken down and this was the only reason it was there.

The application states that there will be no off-street parking provided as there is ample local transport. I am amazed if the proposed landlord really believes that tenants will not bother with their own transport as there is local transport. I would suggest this comment is only to justify not providing off-street parking in the application as it would not be feasible to cater for the number of vehicles that are likely to be introduced and an attempt to insinuate that the already difficult problem will not be aggravated.

I wonder if they are working on the assumption that any new residents will not own cars. A very bold, and most certainly, wrong assumption from past experience.

I notice that your website does now have a link that permits comments on the application to be registered. However I have grave concerns about using this. I know there is a need to be open and clear about such items but I am not comfortable leaving my personal details on the web site for others to scrutinise. My wife has already had a number of unkind comments made to her by tenants in the area because she has requested them not to drop litter and other items on the street. I believe a posting on your portal will only invite more unsavoury remarks.

I trust that this objection will be appropriately be administered even though it has not been submitted in the formal way for the reason stated above.

S Derbyshire

