

This document aims to provide feedback on Planning Application 20/0021 (Phase 2) from Residents of Phase 1 of the Rowland Homes development located off Preston New Road.

Residents have significant concerns regarding the proposed plans for Phase 2 and issues experienced with the developer during Phase 1 which is nearing completion; for planning purposes this document is classed as an objection however residents do not object to a residential development but they do object to the current plans provided by the developer.

To make this document manageable each area of concern has been titled and key points have been made. We appreciate planning time is limited however the points raised in this document are important and should not be overlooked or simply dismissed.

Layout

1. Phase 2 proposes to use driveways with tandem parking. Based on how this works with Phase 1 these should be changed. Tandem parking is not practical, if you consider a property with residents who have different work patterns (night shift, day shift) or other commitments (school drop off / pickup) trying to organise 2+ vehicles so they can be accessed when needed is next to impossible and ultimately results in vehicles being parked on pavements (usually >70% of the vehicle obstructing the pavement) or on the grass service strips and various other areas which cause access issues. Side by side spaces should be used for all properties not just those that are accessed directly from Marples Drive.
2. Phase 2 contains a high density of 3-4 bed properties with a lack of parking. Off street parking needs to be increased to one space per bedroom to stop the roads and pavements being obstructed. If you look at the population of Phase 1 there are a significant number of young children, as they grow older probably in the next 10-15 years the number of vehicles on the estate will increase by 2-3x; if planning looks at the ONS data, more young adults (20-34) live with their parents than ever before, in 2019 this figure was at 27%, with Covid-19 and any economic down turns in the future this will increase. Residents are not purchasing 3-4 bedroom properties to have 2-3 bedrooms empty; they will ultimately be used for either children growing up or visitors. Neither internal or external garages should be considered as off-street spaces for a vehicle. There are three core reasons for this, the first they are not very large which means some modern vehicles do not fit (you cannot get in and out of the vehicle once its parked in the garage), secondly it creates a tandem parking issue (a vehicle will be blocking the garage door), thirdly the properties have limited storage space, as with most new builds the loft space is not usable by design therefore garages are used for storage.
3. Following on from point 2, plots 147-150 and 184-187 have no guest parking and due to the design if a single vehicle parks on the unadopted section cars will not be able to access their parking spaces. The same applies to 158-159 again cars will park on the road, due to the restricted road width this will cause access issues to a number of properties.
4. Plot 140 requires the driver of the vehicle to mount the pavement on the corner, this will not work unfortunately. As planning will be aware of, there is a similar plot on Phase 1 (Plot 20) if a vehicle parks next to or on the pavement the driveway becomes inaccessible. This is not acceptable and should not be permitted. The Plot 20 issue was missed by planning under the Phase 1 application, the developer was made aware of this issue however they appear to have ignored the problem and created the same situation for Phase 2.
5. Plot 134 driveway does not appear to be accessible, based on the width of the mouth of the driveway and the limited width of the road you will not be able to get two vehicles on this driveway. The design for access to this property is not practical.

6. In phase 1 significant access issues have occurred when residents have had deliveries of furniture or materials, Lorry's have to reverse down the narrow roads and all it takes is for a single vehicle to cause an obstruction. This has resulted in a number of near misses with both pedestrians and vehicles. We would suggest the width of the roads be equal throughout Phase 2 rather than reducing in width in certain sections.
7. Plots 152-156 will again have parking issues this is a small group of 4x 4 Beds and 1x 3 Bed on an unadoptable road
8. Rear access to 179 is not practical and reduces the length of 178's garden. Please note these properties will usually be priced the same
9. Grass service strips are heavily used on Phase 1, on the original Phase 2 plans they existed near to Plots 125, 134 and 157. The developer has adjusted the Phase 2 plans based on initial feedback from planning. For both the developer and council's future reference a pedestrian should never be forced to walk along an adoptable road especially when it comes to corners, shared spaces/surface schemes put lives at risk. A separate case is currently being raised with planning/highways on how they will be dealing with the grass service strips in Phase 1 after legal adoption. They should not have been approved by planning for Phase 1 and ultimately action will need to be taken by the council at significant cost to the tax payer to stop a member of the public being seriously injured or killed.
10. The attenuation basin at the front of the estate is in poor condition. In all marketing material and coloured plans, the basin contains blue water, unfortunately this has never been the case, it's a rather disgusting brown mess that during summer emits a stomach churning smell. Attenuation basin/ponds are used on many new developments normally they are turned into a feature and are well maintained. The developer in this case has carried out no works to improve the attenuation basin. Plots 116-119 will look directly over this pond and the view/smell will not be appealing. Planning needs to look at forcing through improvements to the attenuation basin. The residents would also like to seek clarity on why United Utilities are not adopting the attenuation basins on this site, residents have to pay a management fee each year which goes towards the maintenance of both the basins; residents pay United Utilities for Wastewater which includes 'Rainwater removal' the basins are part of that system so therefore residents at the moment are technically paying twice (storage and removal). A photo of the basin can found on [Page 12](#) of this document.
11. The developer appears to prefer to set the fencing for properties a fixed distance away from the legal boundary, this reduces the garden space available to the property owner. The property owner should have full usage of their land; some examples of this for Phase 2 are 125, 135, 134, 160, 173. In Phase 1 this was done we believe so the residents will maintain the grass service strips as there is no separation between the resident's land and the service strip.
12. Phase 1 has issues with bin collections and it appears Phase 2 will have similar issues.
 - There appears to be no collection point for 126 and 127, surely this should be on the corner to allow easy access for collections.
 - Based on what occurs in Phase 1 the bin collection truck will have to reverse down past Plot 123 to get to the 12 properties on this section, the road width is not suitable for this. On Phase 1 it has been observed on a number of occasions that the truck will either struggle or not be able to get past if a single car is parked on the road side. If they are able to get past its usually at a very slow speed which is not efficient. On a couple of occasions this has involved mounting the curb. A similar issue would occur with collections for 159 to 150. The layout needs to be efficient for bin collections.
13. Gardens for 143, 144 and 179 are very small in comparison to the rest of Phase 2, this needs to be looked at.

14. On a number of properties in Phase 1 the access paths to the rear of the properties are not wide enough to accommodate the standard council bins without dragging them through the gravel drainage strips along the side of the properties. We would suggest Planning specify a minimum width for the paths (including getting through the gate to the rear of the property) to make sure bins can be moved/stored safely.
15. The lack of public open space has been brought up by residents on many occasions, Phase 1 includes 'so called' public open spaces unfortunately these are not usable. The areas simply cannot be built on for technical reasons so the developer labels them as public open spaces. These can have a steep incline, drain easement or boundary features (hedges, bushes, trees etc). Phase 2 plans originally included no real open space except for a very small area next to plot 191. With the number of families with young children and the lack of public open space outside the development the residents would support an area being created on Phase 2 however there is one key issue that the council needs to understand and factor in to any decision they make. The residents pay a site management fee each year, this covers various elements (more info will be provided towards the end of this document) if a public open space is created residents will be responsible to pay for it to be maintained. Residents pay a significant amount of council tax, the vast majority of properties are band D with a handful of C and E's; for Phase 2 this will be D and C's based on current sale prices; residents believe the council should adopt any public open space created as anyone from outside the estate can use it. The residents would actually prefer the council to adopt the entire estate, the developer has not provided an answer on why this is not possible. The developer has updated the plans to include a very small Local Area of Play, there are no details on the drawings published by planning that this area is actually usable e.g. is the area on an incline.
16. We would request Planning add a restriction requiring the developer to install street lights and street signs prior to properties being occupied on each street. One of the problems with Phase 1 is properties have been occupied for 3-6 months before lighting is installed. Street signs on Phase 1 did not go in for over 12 months. Lights are required for safety purposes especially over winter months and street signs are necessary on new developments as maps are not immediately updated. The lack of signage became a serious problem during the Covid-19 lockdown as deliveries were being made to the wrong properties or the properties could not be found.

Quality & Construction

Phase 1 of the development has experienced a large number of quality issues which continue to this day, the developer has a track record of issues that are persistently repeated across all their developments. Residents are aware planning cannot force the developer to improve the quality of the homes they construct but we believe some of these issues should be highlighted for public record purposes.

1. Plumbing, not a single property on the estate will have plumbing that is up to an acceptable standard, the contractor G&M Heating Utilities Ltd (based in Wigan) appears to lack the basic skills required
 - On completing on a property, its not unusual to find they have failed to bleed the heating system correctly; this results in radiators not operating efficiently if at all
 - Kinked pipework has been found in walls resulting in non-functional radiators. The plumbing contractor always blames other trades rather than the fact they failed to test the system.
 - Missing TRV's for radiators, in some cases this has occurred in bathrooms, towel radiators get exceptionally hot which could have resulted in burns being incurred
 - Signing off of boilers when its not possible to remove the boiler cover, this is usually down to the kitchen fitters (KAM Design, Preston) installing a cupboard around the boiler. The boilers should not be signed off until the kitchen is complete, at that point they can confirm the boiler is accessible and is compliant with gas safe regulations
 - In one case a fused spur had been installed in the wrong place again this stopped the boiler cover from being removed without disconnecting the socket

- Issues have occurred with boilers losing pressure, the developer has never identified the true cause. In some cases, the manufacture (Baxi) has had to replace parts within the boilers in other cases weeping pipe joints have been found in the airing cupboards. A number of properties still have this issue outstanding and residents have given up with trying to get the developer to identify the cause.
 - In one case a property had a defective gas meter that cut off supply, had the installation been tested correctly this issue would have been identified prior to legal completion.
 - Leaks from pipework are common; this can be from baths, radiators, taps, toilets essentially anywhere the plumbers have failed to tighten/check connections correctly
 - In one case the waste pipe from a kitchen sink was found to be damaged (during installation), the waste water had been leaking into the wall cavity resulting in quite a bit of damage and a build-up of mould.
 - The plumbing contractor is the designated emergency contact for out of hours plumbing issues, on one occasion during the winter a resident called them with a non-functional boiler (persistent over heating eventually identified as being caused by a leak in the airing cupboard pipework), the on-call engineer who answered the phone stated he was not on call and refused to attend. The developer did not investigate why the plumbing contractor failed to comply with their contractual obligations.
 - In a number of properties, the thermostats for the upstairs and downstairs heating zones have been installed the wrong way around, this results in upstairs thermostats controlling downstairs radiators, this is a very basic issue and is simply down to the system not being tested
2. Electrical, as far as residents are aware there have only been a couple of serious issues with the electrical work on this development.
3. Drainage
- The developer has opted for a complex design for removal of foul waste, pipes cross multiple properties creating an extensive network of shared sewers. The developer has refused to hand over drawings showing where foul waste pipes are located ultimately denying the residents their right to identify pipes located under their land. When it comes to dealing with blockages being able to trace where the waste goes is critical, residents only get to see the drawing for the foul waste layout during the reserve process, the sales executive will only highlight inspection chamber positions on their property and will not go over the full layout; this process takes <5mins therefore residents do not get the time to review the drawing fully. We would recommend planning instruct the developer to provide drawings showing the external pipework layout for each plot.
 - Blockages have occurred on a frequent basis; on a number of occasions these blockages have stopped foul waste from flowing for the entire development. As United Utilities have not adopted the estates pipe network residents have to rely on the developer to deal with the issues.
 - The developer will only deal with the first couple of blockages reported by an individual resident after that point they will refuse to attend even when blockages exist in shared runs. United Utilities (UU) have made their position very clear on this, they expect the developer to meet their standards this means where a blockage occurs in a shared run which will be eventually adopted by UU the developer is responsible for clearing the blockage, just as UU would be responsible.
 - When the developer has refused to deal with blockages residents have had to pay for private contractors to attend and deal with the issues. In all occurrence's where a private contractor has come on-site, they have identified defects; these defects include pipework not having the correct fall, pipework being clogged with rubble and cement.
 - The developer does not carry out camera inspections prior to the legal completion on each property which in reality should be done to identify any defects. When they send out their chosen contractor to clear blockages they rely on the word of the contractor and not video evidence. On at least one occasion the contractor stated a blockage was due to baby wipes, the two properties on the shared run did not have any children and did not use any form of wipes; when a private contractor was brought on site, they identified within 5mins that the fall of the pipe was incorrect which meant waste was being held under another plots land. They made it quite clear that if the contractor was competent, they would have identified the problem.

- If a blockage occurs out of office hours its down to the residents to deal with the issues, the developer does not provide an out of hours emergency contact for blockages. United Utilities cannot deal with blockages until adoption due to liability issues. This situation needs to be addressed; we would recommend Planning look at adding some form of restriction to deal with this issue to protect future residents of Phase 2
4. Windows & Doors, in every property on the development issues have been identified with the windows and doors
- Window beading (plastic strip used to hold the glass in place), these are usually cracked/damaged on the corners and mostly do not line up correctly (not flush to the frame). The developer has been aware of these issues for nearly two years but still allows the window supplier/fitter to complete the works to a poor standard
 - Handles on windows have been found to be very difficult to use, the developer has opted for a low-quality window frame and unfortunately the parts used during assembly are not of a high standard. A number of residents have ended up snapping the handles.
 - Sealant around the windows is not usually up to a high standard, gaps are often found and the finish is poor
 - A number of patio doors have been damaged due to being caught by the wind and swinging back resulting in damage to the door and frame. The developer on multiple occasions has blamed residents for this stating they should claim on their own insurance. The cause of these issues is usually down to the patio doors not being fitted with Stay's which stop the doors from swinging back. Residents have to provide evidence to show the issue was caused by a defect.
 - The quality of the windows and patio doors are poor, its quite embarrassing for Blackpool as they are made by Direct Windows Co. There is no resident on this development who would use Direct Windows Co in the future based on the quality of the windows/patio doors they have supplied.
 - A number of properties have experienced leaks through their front and back doors, this can be anything from missing sealant, damaged rubber seals and missing rain deflectors. Again, this is ultimately down to a lack of attention to detail.
 - One resident unfortunately had a window installed in the wrong place (not to the plans approved by the council), this was not spotted by the developer, building control or the NHBC. The window was installed in the middle of the stairs rather than on the turn at the top of the stairs. This meant it was not possible to open the window. This issue was raised prior to the 2020 lockdown however the developer did not deal with the issue prior to lockdown or after the site was opened post lockdown. The only method the resident had to get the issue resolved was by raising a case with planning enforcement, as soon as the developer was notified this had occurred, they arranged for the window to be moved to the correct location. The issue should have been found in 2018 when the property was built
5. Brickwork
- The standard of brickwork on the estate can only be described as shoddy. Walls are rarely plumb or level the developer appears to accept any bricklayer that is available, going as far as to leave a sign outside the development for 12 months stating they are looking for bricklayers.
 - Properties will have pointing missing as the developer does not check the walls properly prior to removing the scaffold. This is one of the reasons why its important to have the properties professionally snagged so any missing or damaged pointing can be identified.
6. Landscaping / Gardens, the developer has provided planning with documentation related to how they carry out landscaping, we would like to highlight most if not all of what the developer has stated is not what happens in reality.
- Soil depths are below the required depths of the NHBC
 - Soil is clay based and of a very low grade, tests performed at a certified Laboratory confirmed pH levels of 7.7 (alkaline due to the clay contents) this should be at around 6.5, the soil lacks basic nutrients like Manganese, Phosphorus

- Soil has been found to contain rubble and various other building materials, in one case broken glass was discovered
- The gardens created by the developer are often referred to as being 'hard as concrete'
- Due to the high concentrations of clay during the summer dry weather the gardens will shrink creating channels and ultimately dropping well below paving, foul waste/land drain inspection chamber height.
- During the winter the gardens become heavily saturated, due to the clay-based soil the water is not able to drain away efficiently
- The developer will not deal with garden issues, a large number of residents have already had to have their gardens completely dug up and replaced by professional landscapers at significant cost.
- Planting at the front of the properties is poor, the developer is using the wrong type of plants and is excessively overcrowding the beds. They do not use any membrane to stop weeds growing, they then place bark on top of the beds to provide nutrients to the soil this unfortunately ends up feeding the weeds. A number of residents have given up trying to maintain the planting provided by the developer and have replaced them with proper beds.
- The developer clearly needs to find a professional landscaper to not only design but carry out the required works.

Most of the quality issues would be avoided if the developer used higher quality materials and experienced professional contractors, unfortunately to maximise profits the developer uses neither.

The developer refuses to allow professional inspection of properties prior to legal completion (this is known as professional snagging), professional snagging is usually conducted by a qualified (RICS accredited) surveyor that specialises in new builds, they are able to identify non-compliance with building regulations, NHBC technical requirements and general issues that would not normally be expected to occur in a 'New Property'.

Residents who have purchased a property during the build phase only get to see the property once during the 'home demo' prior to legal completion. After legal completion the resident will need to provide their initial snagging list to site management, this is usually around 7 days after completion. After the snags have been fixed the property is signed off with site management. The resident then has to deal with head office, unfortunately this is where the larger issues occur. Issues reported to head office can take anywhere from a couple of days to several months to get resolved, as the developer already has the money for the property there is no incentive to carry out repairs in a reasonable time frame.

There is growing frustration among residents that the NHBC and Building Control are signing off properties that do not comply with NHBC technical requirements or Building Regulations. The excuse from building control is that they cannot be there all the time this is not acceptable; if a developer is not able to construct properties to the required standards additional supervision should be provided, the developer can then be billed for this supervision. Building Control take a strict approach to dealing with DIY based construction and compliance with building regulations, they do not take the same approach when it comes to dealing with large developers, simply because the properties have a warranty attached does not mean they should be inspected to a lower standard than DIY based construction. The head of building control needs to start making sure inspections are carried out correctly.

There have been a large number of instances of antisocial behaviour committed by individuals who do not live on the estate. This happens frequently over the summer months; they gain entry to the areas of the development that are under construction, they cause damage to the properties being built including accessing scaffold. In one incident bricks were thrown off scaffold into the road. The police have been called on many occasions to the above incidents, in addition various items have been stolen from outside properties (plants, milk etc). The developer does not have any security on-site in the evening or at weekends.

Management Fees

All though the properties on the development are sold as 'Freehold' they all carry a management fee charge. This management fee covers a wide range of items. This fee is estimated to be £178.36/year per property on Phase 1 generating a total revenue of over £20,000 per year to cover what the developer claims to be Maintenance. There is

no indication yet on how Phase 2 will affect on-going costs. With an additional 90 properties the charge per property should decrease.

During legal completion property owners are required to pay the first year's management fee up front, this is either for the entire year or pro-rata. Some residents have not been charged any fee for the first year. To add to the confusion the developer has not charged any fees after the first year e.g. if the resident completed on a property in 2018 they were charged for 2018 but not issued a bill for 2019. There is no explanation from the developer as to why a fee is applicable when the development is not complete.

The estimated management cost breakdown is shown below, these figures have been provided by the developer. We believe its extremely important for planning to understand the on-going costs to residents on what are claimed to be 'Freehold' properties.

Item	Maintenance Costs		Notes
1	Grounds Maintenance (Inc. open spaces, hard landscaped areas)	£7,200.00	Grounds maintenance to be carried out fortnightly in the growing season and monthly in the winter. To include the incidental open space areas.
2	General Repairs	£1,000.00	General allowance for repairs, to hard landscaping, knee rail fencing and high railings around attenuation basin and other managed items.
3	Drainage / Gutters	£0.00	No provision made as It is understood that the foul water drainage will be adopted.
4	Street lighting and road maintenance	£300.00	Cost to maintain the stretch of road and street lighting by the entrance.
5	Pond maintenance	£800.00	Cost of maintaining the balancing pond.
6	Water attenuation basin	£550.00	Cost to maintain depth, shape and growth of plants and wildlife
7	Tree Maintenance	£600.00	Tree Maintenance and Inspections, noting that there may be TPO's on the development and appropriate tree surgery works as may be required.
Utilities			
8	Landlord's Electricity	£500.00	Cost to run street lighting to the road by the entrance
9	Landlord's Water	£0.00	No provision made as it is understood that the supply and drainage throughout will be adopted
Insurances			
10	Professional Insurance (D&O insurance)	£430.00	Cost of Directors & Officers liability Insurance once resident directors are appointed
11	Public Liability Insurance	£840.00	Cost of public liability insurance for the communal areas and facilities at the development
Professional Services & Fees			
12	Management Fees	£6,900.00	Calculated against the quantity of units - £50+VAT per unit per annum.
13	Accountancy Fees	£660.00	Cost of preparing the annual accounts and financial statements in accordance with the legal documentation and current legislation
14	Other Professional Fees (Company Business)	£300.00	Fee for acting as Company Secretary and registered office, administration costs
15	Health & Safety Risk Assessment	£356.00	Provision for the cost of carrying out a Health & Safety Annual inspection to comply with current legislation
16	Contingencies and Disbursements	£0.00	To commence in second year after consultation with owners
17	Bank Charges	£75.00	Bank charges for the current account

18	Reserve Fund	£0.00	Reserve fund contribution to commence in second year after consultation with owners
----	--------------	-------	---

Total Estimate	£20,511.00
----------------	------------

Cost per unit per annum based on 115 contributing units	£178.36
Cost per unit pcm based on 115 contributing units	£14.86

V1 27/02/2018
 All prices are based on information provided and are subject to change. The budget is based on an assumption of the below from reviewing the initial plans

From our understanding the street lighting and road maintenance costs listed above apply to the unadoptable section of access road that leads to the NS&I building, this is of concern to residents as this is the access road to a private business and its maintenance should not create a financial burden for residents. As the land the development is constructed on was sold by NS&I (UK Gov) its not acceptable for residents to have to pay for their access road, this should have formed part of the agreement of sale of the land. Based on the number of employees working for NS&I at this building we believe the council should adopt the remaining access road or the NS&I should be responsible for its ongoing maintenance.

At the moment nearly 50% of the management costs are going towards maintaining the land surrounding the estate, we can't see how this is justifiable, the developer so far has carried out no maintenance other than to the area of land in front of the show homes. Again, we can't see why the council cannot adopt the estate as a whole, considering the amount of council tax income generated. Any maintenance costs to the council would be far less than the amounts being charged by the developer.

Nearly 50% of the on-going management fee relates to 'Admin' charges. There is no method for residents to establish how the money is being spent, copies of the books/receipts are not provided. As residents have no control of how the money is spent costs could quickly increase, residents are legally required to pay the management fee requested by the management company in other words the management company and ultimately the developer are in control of on-going management fees.

The on-going management fee also raises an issue over affordability, a Band C property currently incurs £1,689.51 per year in council tax, the management fee represents just over 10.5% of the council tax paid, this is not good value for money considering how little is being provided.

Residential vs Commercial

The original Phase 1 application included outline planning permission for office units (referred to as commercial in this document) located on the land that Phase 2 is going to be using. Residents have a number of concerns over how this has been handled

1. During the reserve process for a property the customer is shown the plans for the estate, the sales executive focuses on the area surrounding the customers plot. The sale executive does not point out the proposed commercial side of the development. If customers ask what is happening with this section of the development the executive will say they do not know. The development is currently on its fourth long term

sales executive, the response is always the same. If customers question further, they receive answers along the lines of 'Rowland Homes do not build commercial property'

2. A number of customers have expressed they did not know about the original commercial proposals, the reserve process is quite complex and requires customers to process a significant amount of information in a very short time, its easy to miss the details when you are focused on dealing with elements specific to your property.
3. The development has significant signage, two large signs exist at the entrance on Preston New Road, a number of smaller signs are displayed on the grass verge when you approach the development from the Paddock Drive junction, there is a further large sign where the old security cabin was located close to the turning for Kentmere Drive. The only sign advertising the commercial development was hidden behind the boundary fence at the furthest point away from the active development, the sign was pointing in one direction which means it was only visible to traffic on the opposite side of the dual carriageway assuming no vehicles were obstructing it.

Google street view images showing these signs are below



The commercial sign is shown circled in red in the above image, this is clearly not visible to traffic



This is the only position the commercial sign was visible



The above is the contents of the commercial sign



The above are the signs shown at the entrance from Preston New Road



These are the small signs outside the development, clearly not hidden behind any fencing



This is the sign close to the junction of Kentmere Drive

The point to the above is to highlight what appears to be a complete lack of effort by the developer to market the commercial side of the development at its physical location. If their intentions were to promote the commercial side and attract businesses why would they not use signs of the same size, the sign at the junction of Kentmere Drive is on the area where the commercial development would have occurred.

The developers own website does not show anything to do with the commercial part of the development.

The signs above were in place at the end of 2018, this is not a case of the developer simply moving the commercial signage, the size and position has remained the same.

4. A number of the drawings submitted for the Phase 2 application show document dates going back to August 2019. The developer did not inform residents legally completing on properties that they intended to submit a 'change of use' application for what was the commercial side of the development.
5. The developer has not engaged with residents of Phase 1 regarding their Phase 2 application. As Phase 2 has a significant impact on Phase 1 all residents should have been notified. Residents are surprised that Planning did not require the developer to notify all residents of Phase 1.
6. Residents primary concern with a commercial development was the lack of parking for the office units, Marples Drive would end up being used as a car park and ultimately this would have an impact on residents of Phase 1.
7. We would request that planning seek evidence from the developer to show what efforts they made to market the commercial side of the development. Simply rubber-stamping change of use to meet government house building targets is not acceptable.



The photo above is of the 'Attenuation Basin (Pond)' at the front of the development