

Despite the smile on my face I do take issue with what the report does not say.

It says that the railings are not part of the Conservation area. It does not say when the Park was added to the Conservation area the report said "There are some fine trees in the park, and it has a good boundary of iron railings, walls and trees. It is recommended that the conservation area boundary is extended to include these." The intention in this recommendation is clear.

The report references the "*poor state of repair in places*" but fails to mention that this is due to neglect by the owner. It references the fact that Historic England failed to list the railings as they were not of national interest but does not say that Historic England recognised that they may be considered of local interest.

Whilst the report says "*The railings do not form part of this planning application*" It goes on to say. "*The removal of the railings would have to be resolved by the Council's Asset Management and Operations teams with the Developer as appropriate.*" It does not say why this is necessary or why it should involve the developer. The developer hasn't applied for the railings to be removed. As the railings, which are owned by the council, are outside the red line area this would involve the sale of open space land and the agreement of the National Playing Fields Association who have a restrictive covenant.

The report states that the removal of the railings is a "*small matter of detail*". This is just not so. What it does not say, in full, are the Police comments from February 2019 "We do have concerns with this development with regards to its **permeability** and potential for **crime and Anti Social Behaviour**, we require the finer detail such as the proposed lighting, **boundary treatments** and **physical** security measures.

As you can imagine this aroused public opinion & a petition to preserve and renovate the railings gathered pace. The report alludes to this but does not say what the content is. This petition was sent to Governance over four months ago, on 9th June. Governance advised that they consider that the petition applied to the current application and passed the petition to Planning. Planning have never acknowledged receipt of the petition signed by 1,138 residents & only now acknowledge it in the current report. It gives me no pleasure to say this but this failure is discourteous to the electorate & the delay shows contempt for the petitioners and reflects badly on both the Planning Department and on the Council and its officers. You cannot but share my doubts about the future of the railings. The fact that this issue has still not been addressed is of concern. It is for this reason that I recommend that within Condition 26 that the first mention of the words "prior to first occupation." be deleted and replaced with **No development shall commence (including site clearance and demolition)** until details of the proposed means of boundary treatments to the extent of the above mentioned boundaries shall be submitted to and approved etc.

It does concern me that this application offers no protection for the railings.

If the Highway Authority have confirmed that the access road can be adopted, why does their confirmation not form part of this report?