

The following is my response to the latest letter received from the Transportation Dept. concerning application 17/00590/APP.

I feel totally shocked at the Response by the Dept. concerning the content of their letter. All of a sudden there is going to be a cycle way on the existing pathway at the area I had hoped to get the access for the proposed new build. This is to enable Academy pupils to have safe access to their school. For the 34 years I have stayed in this house there is definitely not a stream of pupils coming along westwards on South Street. Their route is more likely to cross from Hay Street to North Street at the corner of the Mansefield Hotel down towards Tesco then through Morriston. If there is to be a new controlled crossing at Dr Grays Roundabout then that will service pupils coming from the West end. What kind of numbers does the Dept. think are travelling West on South Street. If they are coming from the New Elgin area then surely the numbers must be very small as those pupils will be more likely to attend the brand new New Elgin High School.

I am being asked to change the exit/entrance to the degree that 8 car parking spaces would be lost. The Pavement is 11 1/2 feet wide at the proposed exit which gives a clear sight of traffic and cyclists coming from both directions. If the Dept. is so keen to have parking on South Street then they should mark out the spaces to allow for 8 cars to park rather than the normal 5 or 6.

I have spoken to people who do park there mostly Postal Staff and they have said if parking is restricted they will find elsewhere and are not concerned as they are away by 2 or 3 o'clock. To think that parking would be lost altogether and be replaced with double yellow lines and a cycle path then I think this would simply add to any possible danger to pedestrians and cyclists as the dept. states that South Street is not "traffic calmed" Well I would like to suggest that it should be traffic calmed as the amount of commercial vehicles using South Street is a total menace to its residents. The speed large lorries approach the mini roundabout coming from the west is ridiculous.

There is a condition that our garden wall be reduced to 0.6 metres. I am sorry but the garden ground height is slightly above that already and I would not be prepared to do this. We have already lost our privacy with the Springfield Flats and am not prepared to lose any more. I have also been hit with massive costs such as £3950 per parking space which is out of the question. I maintain that 8 parking spaces would not be lost and this is a threat which I do not appreciate.

The Det. has raised a point about looking West a part of our wall does not belong to us. Any spaces lost could be found at the Council owned car park just round the corner. The Flats do not require spaces because I am sure when that application was put to the Council they would have insisted on private spaces on site. If not I would be keen to find out why.

The Dept. raised a point that a wall on the West boundary between the Accountants and myself did not belong to us. I can confirm that the wall is owned by Rosemount.

I am aware that Road charges will fall to me and also agree to have the entrance finished with inside parking before any building work commences.

Overall I feel the Dept. is being a bit too cautious about any traffic problems parking etc. This house is a bungalow suitable for two people to enjoy what's left of life and I hope that the Committee can see also my point of view. If all fails I may reconsider an entrance from Mayne Road as long as another application does not take so long as we are both getting on a bit !!

Ken Asher  
Rosemount  
5 Mayne Road  
Elgin