Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4199/P	S Blackett	24/11/2021 14:59:58	OBJ	Completely unnecessary, overbearing and out-of-scale and will harm the character of the building which has been the same for decades. Will cause more rubbish being left on the streets since the rubbish bins will no longer be easily accessible to residents as well as less recycling.

				Printed on: 25/11/2021
Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4199/P	Suzi Raopport	24/11/2021 13:52:30	OBJ	I wholeheartedly object to this planning application. I am a resident of 18-26 Buckland Crescent. I object on the following points.
				This is a conservation area and any planning application should take into consideration the impact on aesthetics of the local area. The proposed design does not do this. The aesthetics are not in keeping with the look and feel of the local area and are incongruous. The height of 2.5m is unnecessarily high and the overall effect is that of an industrial estate not an upmarket residential area. A height of 1.2m would be more appropriate if indeed the gates are required.
				It is also not clear what the impact on the green area to the right as you enter the car park will be. It is still show in minor detail on the plan but it does look like the green area has been reduced. Green areas are really important from an aesthetic point of view as they soften the impact of a built up area and they also support the local wildlife. I have a concern that, despite, the showing of a green area on the plan that once construction starts this would be damaged during construction and then not replaced. It is clear from the design submitted that the architects do not hold aesthetics in high regard.
				The design statement states that the application has been made at the behest of the residents. This is not correct, not all of the residents agree that the gates have to be changed. This is for a select few residents who have expensive cars.
				The design statement also states that there have been a number of break-ins to garages and vehicles and thefts reported. It also mentions 'unsavoury' ' anti-social behaviour' The height of the gates and their overall appearance would not deter any criminal activity or non resident access , in fact it highlights the fact that there is something worth protecting behind them. It will invite unnecessary attention and more expensive criminal damage as anyone determined to steal a car or its contents will not let a gate get in the way, they will simply do whatever is necessary to get in and out.
				The statement does not specify what this 'unsavoury ' behaviour is. There have always been scattered episodes when its clear that people have smoked in the car park ( discarded cigarette butts etc) but this isn't really unsavoury and usually it's one or two times a year at most. It speaks volumes that the applicants would not specify exactly what has been happening. Notwithstanding this, the gates will not stop this activity as anyone wanting to access the car park to smoke or whatever will simply be able to follow a car or pedestrian in whilst the gates are open. So after all this expenditure to all residents ,irrespective as to whether they require it or not, there will be no real gain.
				It is my view that in order to prevent the alleged damage to vehicles and non- residents gathering in the car park it would be far more effective if car owners upgraded their garages with alarms, better doors and locks, fitted their cars with phone activated alarms, immobilisers, trackers and cameras. The car park would be better served with increased lighting and strategically placed PIR lighting in the dark areas which would come on when pedestrians passed into the area where they carry out this alleged anti social unsavoury behaviour along with CCTV with large visible notices that recordings are being made and people will be prosecuted if they break the law.

In this way the measures taken will not impact adversely on the wider community which this proposed planning application does, by being more sympathetic to the aesthetics of the area. The gates proposed are expensive

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	
-----------------	------------------	-----------	--

## Comment: Response:

and there is no guarantee that they will give the protection claimed and there are other, less impactful, less heavy handed, more effective and considered ways to solve the problems as detailed above.