

Dear Charlie,

Further to my below objection submitted during the consultation period, I note that a new document has been uploaded to the public register: “Planting plan (286–101)” dated April 2026 and added on 01/05/2026, which is after the consultation period ended on 06/03/2026.

As this planting plan was not available to me when I made my original representation, and given that the planting plan introduces new assertions and baseline information relevant to material planning considerations (trees/landscape constraints and the relationship to parking/servicing space), please treat this email as a supplementary representation and place it on the application file.

I would also be grateful if you could confirm whether the Council will re-consult (or otherwise ensure that relevant stakeholders are not disadvantaged in responding to material information uploaded after the consultation deadline), and ensure these supplementary points will be taken into account prior to determination.

I attach Exhibit S, which illustrates the discrepancies between the planting plan / layout drawings and the site’s key material features (tree line, maple location, and the relationship to the parking/servicing area).

Key supplementary points arising from the late-upload Planting Plan (286–101) and Exhibit S:

1. Not-to-scale and lack of reliable verification

The planting plan is labelled “Scale: N.T.S.” and does not provide clear, dimensioned verification of the location of existing trees relative to the proposed bin store footprint. Where precise relationships and tree protection are material to the decision, I respectfully request that a scaled, dimensioned constraints plan (ideally survey-based) is required. For instance, Exhibit S shows that the location of the young maple tree is misrepresented on the plan, and that the woodland edge/tree line is also misrepresented. These inaccuracies materially affect the assessment of tree constraints, potential root disturbance, and the acceptability of the proposed bin store siting.

2. Parking/operational space not properly depicted

The planting plan labels “Existing parking” and “Existing drive” but does not clearly show marked bays/constraints in a way that allows the Council (or affected stakeholders) to assess actual manoeuvring space for eurobins/refuse collection. This gives an impression of a more open/unconstrained service area than exists in practice. Also, as raised in my original objection, on-site measurement indicates the drive/road width at the relevant point is approximately 4.25–4.30m (not 5m). This materially affects the feasibility and safety of bin manoeuvring and refuse vehicle stopping/collection operations.

3. Repeat inaccuracies despite earlier representations - confidence in submitted information and deliverability

Importantly, this is the second time factual inaccuracies have been highlighted. In my original objection I raised concerns about misrepresentation/missing constraints in the submitted drawings. Despite that, the planting plan dated April 2026 (prepared after the consultation period ended) does not correct those issues and introduces further inconsistencies. This raises a significant concern about the reliability of the submitted information and, by extension, how the Council (and affected stakeholders) can have confidence that the impacts have been properly assessed and that the development would ultimately be delivered in accordance with what is shown.

Given the above, I respectfully request that the application is not determined until the applicant submits a corrected, survey-based and dimensioned plan set , and that relevant stakeholders are given a fair opportunity to comment on any corrected information.

For completeness, I maintain my original objection and submit these additional points solely because the planting plan and associated landscape information were uploaded after the consultation deadline.

Kind regards,

Owner of Flat 11 Boston Court