

Hannah Galpin, ■ Adonia, SO19 9XE. Please note this statement corresponds to application **22/00588/REM** however accounts for **22/01331/DIS**.

Re. planning application **22/00588/REM** and the amended parking plan **22/01331/DIS** for Phase 6 of Centenary Quay; the plan proposes 218 car parking spaces, including 29 allocated to Phase 5 (**17/02514/REM**). Phase 5 comprises 87 apartments in buildings named Adonia and Arcadia.

Specific residents of Adonia and Arcadia (shared ownership residents in 'affordable' units, including myself) have been forced to park in multi-storey car parking at the northern end of the development (Keel Road) since Phase 5 completed. This is over 5 minutes of walking door to door. The other residents in Adonia and Arcadia, 'private' owners (who purchased their apartments from Crest) have however had their parking accommodated with a mix of on-road parking outside the apartments and underground parking nearby (Denyer Walk, much closer than Keel Road).

The shared-owner residents have been repeatedly seeking a concrete update for 18 months and yet have received no reply from Crest NOR clarification as to the planned location of our permanent parking; this planning application has therefore added to residents confusion and concern. As noted in the planning statement for **22/00588/REM**, attendees to a public viewing event on Tuesday 22 February sought clarification upon seeing the plans as to the permanent provision for Phase 5 residents parking.

It would appear that ground located behind and to the side of Adonia (currently being used as a compound for materials or is bare ground) was previously approved for 'temporary' parking for Phase 5, with a provision of 68 spaces. Phase 5 residents even have diagrams showing this parking in their lease documents. However, this area remains a building site and was never converted to temporary parking.

In profound frustration, we again raise the question of our permanent parking. Please can it be demonstrated clearly and concretely by the applicant, how the 29 spaces are being allocated to Phase 5 residents, when it appears to be not nearly enough in quantity to meet the need. How are the shared ownership residents being accounted for? If they are not being accounted for, how would such a gross oversight be permitted by planning. The implications are far reaching for residents who are then committed permanently to a 5+ minute walk to their parking (this would confirm that false promises were made to residents previously and shared ownership residents will undoubtedly and disproportionately face unfair disadvantage at the time of trying to re-sell their properties).