

I am reading a note on behalf of Mr East who could not be here today.

This application is at committee because of considerable local public and press interest in this case. The result of both a Judicial Review and a Call-In.

Mr East has four points in his statement:

The first is **Air Quality**.

It has come to light since approval, from multiple very credible, official sources that this site has air quality exceeding W.H.O. standards. In fact the reason Mr East is not here is because (after a lifetime living by the site) he is self-isolating whilst his wife continues to receive treatment for her air quality related lung cancer.

The second is the **density of development**.

This now exceeds that of the adjacent housing estate. The high density has been partly achieved by hedgerow & tree loss, negotiated *after* the Call In Inspectors Decision Report.

Third.

Our 'made' Neighbourhood Development Plan specifies a development of this size has to provide **10 wheelchair units**. The scheme before you does not comply with this as it is only providing **2** units at the point of completion. The intent was to make accommodation available for our disabled residents which was fit for purpose.

Fouth.

Is the policy non-compliance of the **external lighting** scheme, which your Officers have determined are "unresolvable". This despite the *years* of planning that have gone in to date. We particularly regret that NDP policy HO4 with regard to designing out crime, is not even acknowledged in the officers review.

I suggest on the basis of these concerns, the reserved matters cannot be approved today and the scheme should be sent back and re-reviewed.