Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 27/01/2023 09:10:24 Response:
2022/5320/P	Richard Ault	25/01/2023 12:53:34	INT	I am the captain of the Kenlyn Lawn Tennis Club. Following a recent Kenlyn committee meeting, we like and agree with the recommendations for a community tennis club, containing within the SLC report document that forms part of the planning application. We look forward to discussing the final LTA approved specification of the the 3 courts (levelling the land and court surface, foundations and fencing), Club Pavilion access, and community garden maintenance adjacent to the proposed courts. I expect this is going to be set out in a Section 32 document? I am happy to meet or discuss when relevant.
2022/5320/P	Oliver Butt	24/01/2023 12:07:52	OBJ	I have lived in York Rise since 1987 and back onto the former bowling club. I strongly object to the proposed plans, for the following reasons:
				<ol> <li>The development is being moved from the site of the original bowling club in the direction of my house/ garden. York Rise is nearest the original footprint of the bowling site and there is much more space between neighbouring housing and the development site on the other side. Therefore, it seems particularly unfair that if the building is to be moved off the existing footprint, it is to be moved fowards us and not in another direction where the effect on neighbours would be much less. It is difficult to make out from the very confusing and huge numbers of drawings, but it looks as though the distance from my back garden to the development will halve.</li> <li>The height of the building will be considerably higher than the height of the bowling club. The developers argue the height is the same as the highest point of the club, but they are using what was a rickety shed filled with some plant that perched on top of the highest point! It is absurd to claim they have kept to the original height.</li> <li>an very concerned about the anticipated increase in volume of the building compared the bowling club as was. I wrote to the developers and asked what was the volume of the the bowling club and what is the volume of the proposed development. They did not reply. Could the Council please give me the figures?</li> <li>Harrison Varma want to turn the site into a 78 room care home. With visitors, care staff, gardeners, ambulances etc etc, this will involve well over 100 people and puts a huge burden on the local traffic system where the roads are narrow. Beyond the question of traffic flow, there will be very few parking spaces (none for staff) and therefore cars are likely to spill into the neighbourhood can support the size (in terms of the number of people) of the development envisaged.</li> <li>I spend a great deal of time from Spring to Autumn sitting in my garden, reading or gardening (everyday). The proposed plan will mean I will be overlooked. There is a balcony opposite as well as w</li></ol>

Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	Received:	Comment:
2022/5320/P	Mariachiara Corazza	24/01/2023 18:51:06	OBJ

Response:

I strongly object to this planning application as it is a greedy design that shows no regard for the neighbours in York Rise (who will be enormously and negatively impacted by it) and the overall architectural history of the neighbourhood and the site.

## GREEDY:

1. HEIGHT: vastly increased, in order to maximise profit the building has been made taller and wider than the original footprint of the clubhouse (now demolished) on which the planning approval/consent had been originally granted back in 2017. (Planning Inspectorate APP/X5210/W/16/3153454 of 27/01/2017) The developer thinks he can get away with this by using as a point of reference for the height of the new building the height of the top of a tiny prefab plant shed that was originally plonked on top of the clubhouse roof. This little prefab shed represented only about 5% of the original building roof area yet this height has been extended to the whole of the new building. It is an insult to everyone 's intelligence that the developer thinks that the height of the original little shed can be used as the parameter on which to base the final height of the whole building ( a dishonest expedient used by unscrupulous developers when they think they can get away with it and no one is watching.... This is surely unlawful). Thus the volume of the building is a lot greater than the original clubhouse volume, upon which the developer is pretending it is based as per original approved planning application - Planning Inspectorate APP/X5210/W/16/3153454 of 27/01/2017.

2. LIGHT: As one of the neighbours in York rise points out, all our gardens in York rise are in a dip, at a lower level from the proposed building, so the height of the new building will greatly affect sun light (sun rises behind the building and the taller the building the later it will rise for the residents of York rise) and reduce her (and mine) number of hours of enjoyment of such light at the detriment of our wellbeing and our mental health.
3. PRIVACY: The fact that our York rise properties are in a dip also contribute to the total loss of privacy, both in our gardens and our homes as the new building will be towering over us in a most intrusive way, with windows and balconies looking straight onto our gardens and into our windows.

Moreover: the new building has been moved out of the footprint of the original clubhouse (going against the existing planning permission currently granted) and closer to the York rise residents' tiny gardens, thus towering over us in a most menacing and intrusive way.

This will greatly affect our quality of life, our enjoyment of our properties, our wellbeing and our mental health. Why should one group of people (the developer and his profit) have their amenity at the cost of others!

Setting aside that moving out of the footprint of the clubhouse had been ruled out in the previous planning application that the council granted in 2017 (Planning Inspectorate APP/X5210/W/16/3153454 of 27/01/2017) (that must count for something right?) and that the new developer bought the land with that planning application in place (let us not re-invent the wheel, shall we?) if, and I stress IF, the building was ever in need to be moved out of the above mentioned footprint of the original Mansfield clubhouse, surely it should be moved towards the tennis courts and the greater open spaces of Dartmouth pk Avenue where the gardens are so large that such move would be of negligible effect and hardly noticed.

## 4. Total disregard for Transport Strategy:

with 78 people in care (plus staff!) there will be hundreds of visitors during the week and every weekend, equalling to a potential hundred+ cars every weekend, marginally fewer during the week ...with almost no parking facilities on site they will all spill onto Croftdown rd and York Rise (already chock-a-block at weekends because of the Farmers' Markets and events at the local schools). Where are the current residents going to

## Comment: Response:

park their cars? Perhaps we will go and park on the lawn of the Tranquillity garden.... The neighbourhood has narrow roads that are ill suited for heavy lorry traffic- there will be a lot of this traffic

with service companies providing catering and equipment deliveries, laundry services etc. not to mention ambulances moving at speed.

There are 4 schools in the area and a vast number of school children use the roads that lead to the site, namely Croftdown road and York rise- they spill onto these streets without paying much attention and will be at greater danger of being run over or incurring in a dangerous accident because of this increased traffic. This constant traffic will change the soul of this tranquil neighbourhood for the worse and for ever.

5. One ambulance bay has been plonked along the fence of one neighbours' back garden with total disregard for the impact of noise and a blue flashing light that will become the constant in her visual at the detriment of her well-being and mental health. At the very least the ambulance bay should be moved to the entrance side of the proposed building where it is not attached to the back fence of a neighbour's garden.