

Applicant response to neighbours' comments.

p/2022/0006

I am concerned there has been some misunderstanding amongst the residents which focuses on the fact that the application does not provide the necessary infrastructure for a communal cabling solution for the Mews properties and that any future installations in that area would require further disruption and groundwork. I set out below my response in the hope of bringing some clarity to the situation.

All comments at some point reference the communal charging scheme and concerns that this application is individual.

The groundworks proposed in the application satisfy the requirements for the communal scheme that has been proposed and discussed with residents (infrastructure to bin store for 9 cables, where 6 cables could be clipped to the existing wall as and when required then laid in surface mounted cable trays under the hedge, the remaining 3 cables would be in ducting under the path behind the Yew hedge and can be installed as part of this proposal)

Once these groundworks are complete, no other groundworks along the gravel path will be required to install future chargers on this side of the car park. The suggestion that all 9 Mews properties need to run cable behind the Yew hedge is incorrect as cable cannot then be run under the hedge to each parking space as this will damage the roots of the Yew hedge. Cable will need to be run in front of the hedge to each parking space.

The only individual part of the planning application is the siting and design of the charging points themselves, and I am happy to work with the conservation officer to provide the most sympathetic and appropriate charger.

There is no other solution to charging a car than to installing a charger in a private parking space- a charger cannot and should not be located in a hedge or behind a hedge.

There is a second part of the communal scheme which will need to be completed in a separate area of the development and permission for this can be sought as and when the remaining 4 apartment owners wish to do that.

Similarly, the remaining 7 out of 9 Mews properties as a result of this application being successful would only need to seek listed building consent for their individual charger as and when required.

The communal scheme proposed to owners was always to put in the infrastructure to allow cabling in the future. To install electric cables now for properties that may not require a charger for another 5 years would be ridiculous. Similarly, as the majority of the Mews property owners do not currently have an EV they have no requirement for a charger currently nor would they be entitled to claim the government grant for one.

Comment 3 specifically references trunking in the "moat" area of the houses. Installation of cable tray in this area could be provisioned at a later stage as more Mews properties wish to add cabling and is unlikely to require listed building consent. It is not required now. My property is the last one, nearest to the conduit, and therefore most affected by multiple cable runs in the moat. I have no issue with cabling on my wall.

Comment 4 point 1 re: accident and damage to the hedge. I do not believe installation of chargers will affect either access to the car park, or increase likelihood of damage to the hedge as the proposal is to install it in front of the hedge. Indeed, previous damage to the hedge may have been prevented by an EV charger in the case of the accident referenced. The council vehicles that access the car park do not go anywhere near individual parking spaces but merely reverse in and drive out of the car park.

Comment 4 point 3 re: appearance. EV chargers are designed to be mounted outdoors in high weathering environments. The choice of the ProjectEV charger is specifically due to its quality and long guarantee/warranty. Many of this make of charger have been installed locally by Rawsons and they are currently working on an installation for Chester Cathedral. The covenants in the property lease are a separate issue, can be challenged/revised and are not a matter of concern for the planners.

Comment 5 point 1 : With regards to the long term communal charging infrastructure at Trevalyn Manor this proposal should come as no surprise to anyone as discussion around what the ideal infrastructure should look like has been ongoing since 2018. The proposal that was put to owners on 18 October was the culmination of rigorous work with Rawson EV power who have significant expertise in this area and was clearly explained in a Youtube presentation which could be viewed online as many times as owners wished to, in order for them to fully understand what would be involved.

Finally, I am happy to assist other residents in gaining consent in the future based on my experience in the process and technical understanding, but the planning application as it stands is because there is a pressing need for both myself and James Comrie to have chargers. Calling out in the comments that I have had no problem charging for the last 5 months has no bearing on the matter. It has in fact been an inconvenience, as often I am making special trips to chargers because of a lack of the ability to charge at home. However, I have tolerated this in the hope of achieving a sensible and reasonable agreement to a communal infrastructure scheme.

I have however received many emails from residents saying that the time is not right for them, they do not see what the rush is for and therefore they are not prepared to contribute at the moment – I have therefore, as part of my application, said I will install part of the communal infrastructure at my expense.

Angela Russell
28 January 2022.