
Sent: 23/09/2022 5:46:16 PM

Subject: DA2022/1320 Proposed additions to existing restaurant at 20 Albert Street, Freshwater

Dear Sirs

I wish to object to the above listed Development Application.

This proposal for an outdoor eating area shows a level of indifference to the reasons for this being rejected when first included under a previous DA.

The use of this outdoor area for additional patronage would result in the loss of this space being used currently for parking both for staff and some vehicle deliveries. The applicant appears to have decided that he can rely upon using his neighbours's parking provisions rather than using his existing on-site parking, and has totally ignored his responsibility to provide some level of on-site parking.

The applicant's Plan of Management suggests that deliveries should instead use local loading zones (where currently available) for the 6 days per week of vehicle arrivals. This is totally unacceptable impingement upon the general commercial deliveries of properties within the Freshwater business area.

The new works as proposed extend to the property boundary line and as a result totally cover access to a number of existing inspection pits, including a manhole access panel and drainage service pits, within the concrete hard standing. This will severely impact access in the event of issues with underground services. In addition there is an upstanding ventilation duct in the area of the outswinging door from the bin store. Surely this ventilation duct needs to be maintained and be kept clear from any obstruction?

It should also be noted that the existing area is also currently used for storage of beer kegs (6no), some building materials (paint tins etc), unused furniture (broken?), alongside car parking and waste bins. Where are all these to be relocated under the proposal before us?

Waste management. The existing waste storage on site consists of three mobile bins each of plan dimensions of 1220mm in length by 770mm width. These are proposed to be stored within a new bin area until collection days. The PoM proposes that on Tuesday and Thursday mornings after 8:00am these bins will then be moved from this bin store and placed "on the outdoor area within our tenancy" for collection. Under the proposed development and the building in of the existing hard standing there will be no such available outdoor area remaining under the applicant's tenancy and the bins will therefore be left blocking either footpath or communal parking spaces.

The applicant proposes a retractable awning over the outdoor area and claims that this will prevent noise from disrupting the environment of the adjoining neighbourhood properties. However, the plans appear to show this awning only extending to finish in line with the eastern end of the bin store, resulting in a triangular area of the courtyard still being open to the sky. Even if the awning would to extend over the full area the eastern enclosing wall to the courtyard shows an unprotected area above the new low height brick wall of two to two and a half metres in height by the full length of the low wall. This opening will continue to allow substantial noise to disrupt the quite enjoyment of the neighbouring residential properties.

Another disruptive aspect of this proposal is the likelihood of air pollution to the neighbouring properties from smokers and vape users who may well locate themselves in this outdoor courtyard.

As there is no direct access to the street from the proposed courtyard area I raise the question of whether there is sufficient minimum distance for patrons to escape safely in the event of emergency when the only exit appears to be the main entry door further along Albert Street?

I query the strange allocation of a bike rack in the courtyard when for any such bicycles to be brought to this location they would have to be brought through the indoor restaurant passing alongside tables of patrons. Hardly a 'fine dining experience' the applicant is claiming this development will provide?

Finally I wish to object to the proposed changes to the opening hours which ask for the neighbourhood to put up with patron disturbance up to a closing time of midnight for six days a week, and until 10:00 pm on Sunday. Remembering that no matter what time a premises closes the patrons inevitably linger outside talking well after closing time. This extension of hours should be rejected completely.

Regards

Chris Thomas