

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planning; Raymond Lee](#)
Subject: Campus West Planning application 6/2021/2207/MAJ
Date: 30 November 2021 11:45:03

** WARNING: This email originated outside the WHBC Network. Please be extra vigilant when opening attachments or clicking links **

Dear Mr Lee

I write in response to the various documents regarding lighting that have only recently been added to the above planning application. I also write in response to your email of 23 November.

Firstly, the planning portal states that the application will come before the DMC on 9 December but there is no Officer's report. Please forward by return or delay the hearing to next year. Secondly, if the time for response to the latest documents doesn't expire until 7 December, how can the officer consider those comments in his report?

I suggest that the hearing should be re-scheduled for the new year.

Turning now to the lighting reports, it is abundantly clear that cheap street lamps have been suggested presumably to go with the cheap design of the car park. Bollard lights and perimeter lighting would be acceptable but not tall street lamps. Your email states that the building would have a "lightweight, open design to allow it to be relatively low in height" and that "vertical slatted cladding panels are aimed at breaking down the perceived horizontal mass of the structure". Having a lightweight open design has absolutely nothing to do with its height. It is not necessary to be lightweight or open to have a low height. The two are not related and therefore your response holds no weight in this regard. Adding vertical slats only adds to the perceived mass of the building, not detracts from it. Again, your response holds no weight.

I note that Maria Kitts, Principal Built Heritage Consultant has stated in her letter of 17 November that the measures employed to reduce light spillage don't go far enough in that there remains a "low level of 'less than substantial' harm to the significance of the Conservation Area." How are you going to change the design to take account of her comments?

If the north elevation was a solid red brick wall, it would look so much better than ridiculous fins and an open design. It would also contain the lower carpark lighting as well as the noise and fumes.

Despite the cheap design, the car park is ridiculously expensive coming in at £20,000 per additional car parking space. It is not needed. The Council have not justified the need for the car park which is crucial and should be the starting point for any council project.

Please, please reconsider the need for a new deck on the car park. It really isn't needed. If it is built, please do not put street lamps on the top deck and also please build a solid wall on the northern elevation.

I look forward to hearing from you with confirmation that the application will be heard in the new year and not on 9 December.

Regards
[REDACTED]