

I understand the desire to reduce carbon emissions but without adequate provision of good quality cycle routes, a decent public transport system around the local area it's not encouraging for people to leave their cars behind. Inevitably neighbouring roads will become more clogged with people seeking parking spaces. I also find this to be an interesting decision that whilst there is a garden city 'ethos' of not building over 5 stories high unless in exceptional circumstances this is now being proposed. You seem happy to create intensive housing but not provide adequate space to match the increased numbers of dwellings. This appears to be at odds with the 'meeting of town and country' and certainly doesn't reflect what would be permissible on the west side of town. Are you intent on creating a two tier town? Plentiful space and green areas on the West, over crowding and a population dense East side?

Local Authority policy states a requirement of 30% affordable on new builds, the Biopark development contravenes that with only 10%. During a national housing crisis and the impact of the covid pandemic on people's livelihoods it's not ethical to allow a developer to put their profits ahead of your duty to provide housing for those on low incomes and those in need. It does not encourage diverse communities and it pushes out locals further afield in the search of affordable homes.

I'm concerned about local infrastructure and the demand placed on schools and GP surgeries. It's already extremely difficult to obtain a GP appointment in the local area within a reasonable amount of time. What is really going to be put in place and improved upon with the high levels of new homes being built?

Finally I do not recall receiving written notification on the changes to the planning application.