

10 Hans Avenue
WANTAGE
Oxfordshire
OX12 7DB

1 September 2022

Reference: Application No. [P22/V1088/FUL](#)

Dear Sirs

I write regarding the Recommendation of the Officer regarding this Application to which I strongly object.

The Officer seems to have taken no notice of the local residents' objections and I would like to refute the observations and summaries in this report.

1. Introduction and Proposal

- 1.2 The single vehicle space is understood to be used by delivery vehicles
This is incorrect. Customers also use this and not all delivery vehicles use it – they use the road. Customers also block this entrance with their cars not taking any notice of the parking alongside the building. The delivery vehicles also have to reverse into the road and if someone is parked too near the junction then this is a hazard.
- 1.4 I would query the five parking spaces and the opening hours and note that the County Highways Officer has stated that this is subject to conditions being met with regard to this. Who is going to enforce this.

5. Main Issues

- 5.1 Impact on Highway Safety
The report states that the size of the spaces and the manoeuvring space between them will allow the vehicles to turn and leave in forward gear – NO! All customers that I have seen use this space drive in forwards and reverse out. I have never seen anyone try to turn in this space. If all spaces are taken up there would be a lot of manoeuvring needed and therefore more noise. When vehicles do reverse out of here if there are vehicles parked either side of the entrance it becomes a hazard.

This may meet the standard but how many drivers know about the standard?

- 5.2 There is a gradient but it is not gentle. Low slung vehicles have scraped the bottoms of their vehicles and coming out would cause problems too. There is not adequate visibility if vehicles are parked either side of the entrance to the parking area.

The Officers do not live in the road so how can they consider that the manoeuvring space in the proposal minimises the likelihood of the concerns being raised.

Nobody has mentioned that there is a Fire Hydrant opposite the parking area for deliveries and the front door. When people parked on the road nearby they are breaking the law. Also parking too close to the junction is also an offence.

5.5 Impact on Residential Amenity

- 5.6 Regarding the maintenance schedule included in the flue specification and regular cleaning of filters I note that this can be the subject of a condition. I believe this to be an absolute must and not conditional.
- 5.8 How can making earlier closing times on Sundays to Thursdays and on Friday and Saturday protect residents from noise at unsociable hours. The majority of the residents in these roads affected by this Application are over 75 years old and as you get older sleep is even more important as a full night's sleep is very difficult to get. These hours would be totally unacceptable as at the moment there is very little noise after 8.30pm. Deliveries would also cause disturbance to the near neighbours of this property as these do create noise.
- 5.9 I do not accept this paragraph at all. Residents should be treated like human beings and not cattle. This is a quiet residential street with elderly residents who do not expect to have a fast food take-away outlet with extended opening hours causing more noise and fume pollution and inconvenience of extra vehicles parking on an already narrow road. When cars are parked lorries etc very often have to mount the pavement to get by.
- 5.10 The 'seven-eleven' shops are generally for groceries and not just for fast food. Why should the recent trends and extended opening hours be applied to this application? The existing shop has fewer hours and also the outlets on the other side of the road do not have the hours which this application proposes.
- 5.11 The report states that this proposal is for the local, neighbourhood facility whose appeal will be to the nearby residents. In my view people will go to the food places they have a long-standing relationship with not a new establishment especially with the resistance against it.

Human Rights Act 1998

The report states that harm to individuals has been balanced against the public interest. I would argue this point as it seems that the Officer has completely ignored the residents' rights or feelings on this and the lack of public interest.

Further, in the light of the extra burden on Gas/Electric bills and businesses already struggling will this proposed business actually be viable or will the hours be extended non-conditionally?

Yours faithfully
Margaret Wadsworth (Mrs)