

Statement on 39 Broadwater Road

I apologise I cannot be with you as I have a clashing prior engagement.

Whilst I support the application in general, I have several concerns which I hope can be addressed

1. Parking

I believe the lack of visitor parking in the application must be addressed. We dealt with this issue at DMC in a recent application on Bridge Road East where the plan before us did not provide for this. Clearly there will be visitors and they should not be forced to use the spaces reserved for residents.

I actually would support provision of visitor parking becoming a requirement set out in our policies. I assume we would not allow no visitor parking in an office development, so why is it allowable in a residential application?

2. Tenure of homes

The applicant appears to want to provide all social housing of various types. But the conditions recommended only provide for 30%. We cannot rely on the fact the applicant is a Housing Association for the remainder, as para 9.54 of the officer report appears to; as I read it, the site could be sold as soon as consent is granted and a new owner might abandon this approach. I believe we need a mechanism to guarantee the remaining units as social.

3. SPD

There is no SPD governing all the windfall applications in the WGC industrial area. So there is no 'guiding hand' on density, height, materials, amenity space or any of the other aspects that would be included in a new planned suburb. The number of homes that have emerged in the industrial area over the last few years is many thousand, yet each has little relation to each other, many are deficient in amenities. This is a town built on design and logical planning.

I believe it is high time an SPD is brought forward.