

Major Casework, Temple Quay House
2 The Square, BRISTOL, BS1 6PN

Dear Sirs,

Churchill Retirement Living – 23/01700/FULLS

APP/C1760/W/24/3342514

The most important issue is the architectural impact this new building will have on the delightful historic town of Romsey, which welcomes so many visitors to its Abbey and unspoilt town. This is an opportunity to produce a building we could all be proud of now and into the future, and surely should not be missed by short term thinking and profit for an individual company based elsewhere.

This planning application seems so flawed I do not know where to start. It is a virtual living plan to fit in with what is wanted, not a real life living space. I am an 85 year old woman who has actual experience of living in a 55+ dwelling complex so have first hand experience of what it is like in actuality. Believe me, over 55s and the retired elderly who are less mobile like myself, need cars probably more than the younger more mobile population.

It is stated the elderly inhabitants of this proposed new development can catch buses so cars are not required. Obviously a proposal stated by a “non elderly”! Old people cannot stand for long periods awaiting the arrival of public transport and they cannot carry shopping or heavy loads. You have to be old to know the practicalities.

Where I lived, parking was always a problem even though we had one allocated space. Parking at Wakeford Court and Love lane care homes in Romsey have similar problems. Wakeford use the Comrades club next door for extra parking and Love lane have taken part of the garden to create more parking space.

Point 1. This is the reality. 47 apartments with 16 parking spaces is quite ridiculous in this modern day. There is apparently:-

- 1 **No provision** for Electric car charger spaces.
- 2 **No provision** for visitor, family, friends, helpers.
- 3 **No provision** for carer parking (sometimes needed 3-4 times per day)
- 4 **No provision** for general maintenance of apartment parking e.g. boilers, plumbing, decorators, lighting etc.
- 5 **No provision** for furniture, household deliveries (large vehicles)

- 6 **No** provision for larger vehicles delivering internet shopping for 47 apartments.
- 7 **No** provision for cleaners and staff parking, both individual apartments and complex
- 8 **No** provision for gardeners vehicles or place for garden/tree waste.
- 9 **No** provision for window cleaning, taxis etc. Larger vehicles will need access other than refuse. E.g. fire engines (from experience!)
- 10 **No** provision for disabled parking.
- 11 **There appears to be only** one small lift. If this is out of order or being serviced, I for instance would be unable to get out of the building and it needs to be big enough for a motor scooter.
- 12 **Outside space.** For people such as myself who cannot get about easily, a space to escape your home and sit soaking up some sun is a life saver; a place to relax outside, easily accessible, is a must. How is this provided in this scheme? This would seem more necessary in this development as so many of the apartments will get little or no sun and the internal corridors need fresh air.
- 13 **Buggies.** If the elderly in this development are not expected to own cars the older and more infirm occupants will need mobility scooters to stay mobile (to the shops, the park etc. Broadlands is mentioned as an open space but is a private estate and not open to the public except for events). The buggy parking room shown is ridiculous; most buggies would get hemmed in. Seven spaces for potentially 94 residents is not enough. Also most immobile users would need to take their buggies to their apartments. There does not seem to be room to do this. Will one lift be adequate or big enough?

Point 2.

- a) Paragraph 8.2 in the application states that the future needs for elderly is a 72% increase in the number of elderly with dementia and 59% increase in the number with mobility problems. Is the money that Churchill is going to pay towards these items going to be ring fenced and transparent to the public? This replaces care for the elderly homes; where is the Churchill care for the elderly to come from?
- b) £342K is being paid in exchange for 18 existing properties. This seems a ridiculously low amount. 18 x say £300K per property amounts to about £5

million. The developer must be very pleased with this deal; not so good for the elderly needing care.

- c) From my experience of over 55 living accommodation, and also of a friend living in McCarthy and Stone 55+ apartment, the above needs are not fanciful, but give a much required quality of life. Has there been a study of these needs?

Conclusion.

Maybe I am cynical, but my overall impression of this development as presented seems to be mostly about concerns about the money implications for the developers and TVBC, with on the face of it Churchills doing well out of it. This development is not about improving Romsey or life for the elderly but a long term financially rewarding business for Churchill. As I know from experience, ever increasing ground rents and maintenance costs are a nightmare when on a fixed income. An opportunity for architectural improvement at the entrance to Romsey next door to a conservation area seems to be missed due to short term greed. This is a 55+ development that does not care/protect the elderly and should not be approved.

Yours faithfully,

Margaret Lamb

Margaret Lamb

1 Barling Mews, Love lane, Romsey, SO51 8TB