

I am writing to object to this application to modify the existing section 106 agreement. This new application changes the wording of the sections dealing with the phasing in quite a confusing way but the main changes appear to be:-

Construction of phase 6 (the 2nd residential block) can start before phase 5 (construction of the main racing training establishment apart from the smaller stable block built under phase 2) is practically completed. The developers only have to reach first floor level of the Main Yard and there is no confirmation as to what other works have to be done so in reality it can just be a "shell" AND Construction of phase 8 (the third residential block) can start before phase 7 (the stable staff accommodation) is practically completed. Again only the first floor level of the staff accommodation has to be reached and there is no confirmation as to what other works have to be done so in reality it can just be a "shell".

The main consequences of these proposed changes are as follows:

1. Speeding up the construction could lead to a more intense and noisy construction period, traffic disruption and adversely affect the eco-system in one full swoop.
2. The "affordable housing" part of this development namely the stable staff accommodation has fallen even further behind.
3. With the economy as it is, as a result of the coronavirus, it would be no great surprise if some developers have issues finishing big projects which may have been sustainable in "normal" times. These modifications would allow more development work to be done at once so if this development is halted for whatever reason you could be left with a large part of Green Belt land destroyed without the racing training establishment having been completed which was after all the main purpose of allowing the enabling development on Green Belt land in the first place. It would certainly be a blight on the landscape with the eyesore of a lot of unfinished buildings and the potential for another planning application being submitted to the Council to discard the racing elements of the site and instead put in for more housing which after all is more profitable to "get rid" of the eyesore. After all similar practices have been done in the past on other land which had been Green Belt.

I note that the applicant quotes in this application S106a(6)(C) of the Town and Country Planning 1990 Act which basically provides that any modifications should serve their purpose equally well as the existing obligations. Therefore the purpose of the current obligation has to be considered and this is to ensure that the new Racing Training Establishment (RTE) gets built and totally finished before work on the later phases of the residential development which will take up more Green Belt land commences. After all permission for this sizeable residential development on this Green Belt site would not have been approved without the new RTE so it was seen to be vital that this was given priority. This was an important consideration when the planning committee approved the application and was not an issue disputed by the applicant at the time. After all the existing S106 agreement does allow the first part of the residential development to be built and occupied after building the smaller stable block to assist with funding of the further development.

The current obligations clearly serve a useful planning purpose so the question that has to be asked is would the obligations serve that purpose equally well if they had

effect subject to the modifications that are now proposed. I hope that for the reasons stated above you will agree that the new modifications would not serve the purpose equally well and that this application should be rejected by the Council.

Can you please arrange for this letter to be uploaded on your website as an objection to this planning application as soon as possible.

Many thanks,

Clare **Kyrou**