

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

30 JUNE AT 1:30PM

- 1 Procedure for Speaking
2. List of Persons Wishing to Speak
3. Briefing Update

UPDATE REPORT & ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC SPEAKING SCHEME - PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Procedural Notes

1. Planning Officer to introduce application.
2. Chairman to invite Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives to present their case.
3. Members' questions to Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives.
4. Chairman to invite objector(s) to present their case.
5. Members' questions to objectors.
6. Chairman to invite applicants, agent or any supporters to present their case.
7. Members' questions to applicants, agent or any supporters.
8. Officers to comment, if necessary, on any matters raised during stages 2 to 7 above.
9. Members to debate application and seek advice from Officers where appropriate.
10. Members to reach decision.

The total time for speeches from Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives shall not exceed ten minutes or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.

MPs will be permitted to address Committee when they have been asked to represent their constituents. The total time allowed for speeches for MPs will not be more than five minutes unless the Committee decide on the day of the meeting to extend the time allowed due to unusual or exceptional circumstances.

The total time for speeches in respect of each of the following groups of speakers shall not exceed five minutes or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.

1. Objectors.
2. Applicant or agent or supporters.

LIST OF PERSONS WISHING TO SPEAK

Agenda Item	Application	Name	Ward Councillor / Parish Councillor / Objector / Applicant
4.1	19/01752/FUL - Land Adjacent To 15 Apsley Way Longthorpe Peterborough PE3 9NE	Cllr Fitzgerald Pauline Smith	Ward Councillor Objector
4.2	20/00128/FUL - 58 Warwick Road Walton Peterborough PE4 6DB	Cllr Nick Sandford Mr Banhire	Ward Councillor Applicant
4.3	20/00266/FUL - 20 Broadway Gardens Peterborough PE1 4DU	James Barber Naidre Werner/Sue Hessom	Objector Applicant
4.4	20/00206/FUL - 24 Park Road Peterborough PE1 2TD		

BRIEFING UPDATE

P & EP Committee 30 June 2020

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1.	19/01752/FUL	Land Adjacent To 15 Apsley Way Longthorpe Peterborough PE3 9NE , Proposed one and half storey 2 bed dwelling

Additional representations

Two additional written objections have been received from local residents as set out below. Both objectors have previously submitted written comments for consideration within the main Committee Report.

1) Giles Richardson of No. 13 Apsley Way, received 24 June 2020:

"I know that although he was in his eighties my father objected strongly to the planning application and the impact it would have on his home and the amenity of the area. I can confirm that I share these objections and whilst I could not be physically present in Peterborough to sign the document along with the other residents (my father signed the original March copy), I have read the updated paper that they are presenting to you tomorrow and it has the full support of me and my family."

2) Mr Leedham of No.22 Apsley Way, on 25th June 2020 submitted a document on behalf of local residents at Nos. 13, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24 and 25 Apsley Way setting out their objections. This document is a revision to one previously submitted on 9th March and already considered within the main Committee Report. Owing to the substantial nature of this document, it is attached in its entirety at Appendix 2 of this Update Report and has already been provided to Members.

Written Statement

Mrs Pauline Smith has registered to speak in opposition of the application. In the event that the technology fails during her speaking period, a written statement has been prepared. This is attached at Appendix 1.

2.	20/00128/FUL	58 Warwick Road Walton Peterborough PE4 6DB , Change of use from dwelling to children's home and erection of 2m boundary fence
----	--------------	---

Additional representations

An additional written objection has been received from **Caroline Friskey on received 26 June 2020** as follows:

"Please consider my late response regarding the above address and subsequent application to convert it to a children's home. I will not be able to attend the meeting due to my job at Peterborough City Hospital; and also the fact that I have been trying to get round to my elderly neighbours for their input into the matter as many do not know what a zoom meeting is and some do not have the Internet and trying to explain this to them has had in itself been a challenge.

Most of the residents around 58 Warwick Road are in their 70's and 80's one of them not being far off his 90th and I must say on their behalf that they are all quite upset and worried about the impact the residence would have on their peaceful enjoyment of the Road and surrounding area.

Whilst they all understand that such homes are necessary it is just not the right environment to place one right in the midst of a mainly elderly community. They are frightened that these children would have a detrimental affect on their life as there is no space for them to enjoy outdoor activities; there is no garden area just a very small patch of grass at the side of the property with about a third of it being

taken up with a tree and flowerbed and a block paved drive that once 4 cars are parked would leave little or no space at the front. If staff parked on the road there is also a risk factor due to the blind bends that Warwick Road has at both ends and the middle where the property is situated. Such a lack of space is a potential for leading the children/teenagers to congregating on the street with their peers and could potentially make it frightening for the older residents after dark; the managers of this facility could make assurances that this would not be tolerated but in reality there would be very little they or anyone else would be able to do to prevent this from happening.

Children need space to play and run about they certainly wouldn't get it there and although there is a park and field at the bottom of Hastings Road I doubt very much that it would be a good idea to send them out to play there as during lockdown this has become a congregating point for youths to meet, drink alcohol and leave discarded food wrappers and worse still those little silver canisters that are used to get a "legal high". Around the corner there are people who supply drugs and I have witnessed one raid on a property myself, this could be verified, it could potentially lead to all sorts of issues.

One person who has been a foster parent for many years is quite horrified at the prospect, reminding me about the amount of times she had the police out to just one child on literally a daily basis as there was not an awful lot they could do and this young person knew this, this is going to be a home for up to 7. I know we can't predict that this would be the case with these children it does mean that the odds for this to happen is all to realistic.

The residents feel that they have been misled by the owner of the property as he originally stated it was to be a family home for a couple with a disabled child this has most certainly deviated away from that, they don't understand how he has been allowed permission for the overdevelopment of the property and also why he has gone ahead with furnishing and decorating before he is supposed too; many of them feel that it is a forgone conclusion and he knows that his plans have been agreed with already as it has all been dealt with very quietly, it only came to light what was happening when he applied for change of use and the fence erection. They feel that their feelings and opinions are not going to be taken into consideration as they are old and that the amount of money that must have been spent on remodelling the property indicates that the owner must have already been given the green light as it is to greater risk to undertake such a project without having some assurances.

It has nothing to do with property values as a house is only worth what someone is willing to pay, but it is about them being able to live out their lives in peace in the place they retired to because it was an elderly community, the last thing these people need or want is the risk that all this will be taken away from them.

Why could the unused community centre not have been a better proposal it has everything right on its doorstep. Why not use this as a residential care facility for the elderly as not all the ageing population need nursing homes this would be much more in keeping with the area.

I ask you to please consider the feelings of these elderly residents and reject the proposal.

Many thanks

Caroline Friskey

On behalf of the surrounding residents of number 58"

Written Statements

Councillor Sandford and **Mr Nyasha Banhire** have registered to speak in (the former in opposition and the latter in support) in respect of the application. In the event that the technology fails during their speaking periods, written statements have been prepared. These are attached at Appendix 1.

3.	20/00266/FUL	20 Broadway Gardens Peterborough PE1 4DU , Permanent change of use from dwelling (C3) to residential institution (children's home) (C2)
----	--------------	--

Additional representations

Councillor Joseph submitted the following on **23 June 2020**:

“I have received an email from a resident who wishes for the applicants to repair the fences around the property, as the lack of secure fencing means that the occupants of the house are smoking close to the garden of the resident and also it is not a safe environment for their young children.

Is this something that can be brought before the committee, as the security and impact upon local residents was raised as a possible objection to the property being used as a children's home in the first instance?”

Officer response: The matter on boundary fencing has been dealt with in the main Committee report. Whilst Officers appreciate the neighbour’s concerns, this matter is a private civil matter between the care provider and the neighbours. The alteration, or maintenance, of existing fencing does not require planning permission. The Local Planning Authority cannot impose conditions that are not directly related to the application, or which are not necessary to make the development acceptable. As such, a condition requiring this fence to be repaired could not be imposed.

Written Statement

James Barber and **Naidre Werner** have registered to speak (the former in opposition and the latter in support) in respect of the application. In the event that the technology fails during their speaking period, written statements have been prepared. These are attached at Appendix 1.

4.	20/00206/FUL	24 Park Road Peterborough PE1 2TD , Construction of timber-framed outbuilding to rear for use as Shisha lounge, single storey side extension, increase height of rear wall to 2.5m and relocation of external staircase - resubmission
----	--------------	---

Altered recommendation

Owing to a failure with the postal system, the Agent/Applicant did not receive notification of this Committee meeting. As such, neither they nor Councillor Bashir (who referred the application) have been able to register to speak in support of the proposal. Accordingly, in the interests of fairness, Officers are seeking that the application be deferred for consideration by Members at the next Committee meeting and the recommendation is altered as follows:

‘The Executive Director of Place and Economy recommends that the application be **DEFERRED** for consideration at the next available meeting of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee.’

Page Break

APPENDIX 1 – Written Statements for speakers registered

1.	19/01752/FUL	Land Adjacent To 15 Apsley Way Longthorpe Peterborough PE3 9NE , Proposed one and half storey 2 bed dwelling
----	--------------	---

Mrs Pauline Smith, 18 Apsley Way on behalf of residents

NOTE: This statement is provided as a backup in case the Zoom meeting system connection fails. It is presented by Mrs Pauline Smith of 18 Apsley Way, on behalf of immediately affected residents from properties no’s 13, 23 adjoining no 15 and 16,18, 20, 22 and 24 Apsley Way opposite the proposed development. Full names and their agreement that I represent them have been provided to Daniel Kalley, Senior Governance Officer.

I’d like to start by emphasizing that the overwhelming reaction of everyone to this application, residents of Apsley Way and beyond has been disbelief that it is a serious proposal accepted for consideration by

the Council. This view stems from the impact of the proposal on the streetscape and character of Apsley Way, the limited accommodation it provides, out of keeping with the rest of its surrounding area, the highway risks it creates and the fact that it is on garden.

I want to highlight some of the most significant points raised by residents that have not been answered by the Committee Report. These concern Policies LP16 design and the public realm, LP3 spatial strategy, LP13 road safety and LP17 amenity.

Firstly. The proposal is contrary to LP16 in terms of the impact it would have on local character and distinctiveness. This Character Area has houses sitting on large gardens with open frontages giving a sense of space and airiness. This distinctive character is much valued both by local residents and visitors and is generally known of in Peterborough; it is a key part of the attraction to home buyers, particularly families. This type of housing character is relatively scarce in the city. The addition of a property that will actually be 0.4 metres higher than its neighbours, located on the apex of the bend, will intrude massively on this streetscape. Its position following the curvature of the bend, rather than a straight line between the existing properties of no. 15 and no. 23 will worsen this impact. The Committee Report's stance is considered to be unreasoned and fails to objectively apply LP16's requirements.

Secondly. The Committee Report is mistaken on the objective interpretation of LP3 as including development of residential gardens. LP3 focuses on 'previously developed land'. The National Planning Policy Framework and the Court of Appeal confirm that this phrase excludes private residential gardens in built-up areas. And LP3's subsequent reference to windfall sites is clearly constrained by the first paragraph of LP3 and so does not include gardens. The exclusion of gardens from the Local Plan's spatial strategy is consistent with the NPPF and national policy as they discourage development of gardens. The application site is a garden outside the focus of the Local Plan's spatial strategy and so should be discouraged.

Thirdly. Road safety in relation to LP13 is still a concern that as local residents we don't believe has been addressed. The location is on the first bend carrying traffic into all the rest of the large housing area beyond. Indeed it is worrying to read on page 4 of the Report to Committee that the Highway Services consultation states that 'it is appreciated that local residents have the knowledge and experience of local highway conditions, but comments can only be based upon on-site observations and the information put before LHA Officers during the consultation period.' We remind you that at least 50 local residents (those aware of the application) think that the proposed parking will create highway safety issues on a bend that local residents already find dangerous. The point we've made about the existing driveway being a secondary drive to no 15, and in practice barely used at all in the last two decades, compared to it becoming the main driveway for a new property is also overlooked or dismissed.

Fourthly. In relation to LP17 it appears that amenity impacts on the streetscape and immediately affected residents of the homes adjoining and opposite continue to be misunderstood and have not been explained by the application despite the requirements of LP17. In particular we point out that the tree officer requires the existing two trees to be retained – which we agree are in keeping with the streetscene – and yet the location of the development following the curvature of the road bend, will mean that certainly one (the cherry tree) and possibly both will have to be removed in order to construct the property. In relation to individual properties, the judgment of the Officer that the distancing is sufficient to mean the impact is acceptable ignores the distinctive character of the area, of relatively generous distancing between properties. And for No 23 in particular, the impact on amenity in the rear garden is substantial and the Report to Committee does not accurately reflect the benefits and usage of that garden by its occupants.

Lastly, given the weight of objections and concerns and the precedent that this application could set for the future of Apsley Way, please can all members of the planning committee confirm that they have read and had time to digest the document submitted on 25 June 2020 and entitled 'Residents' Objections revised as at 25 June 2020 to address the June Committee Report. And please can all responses be minuted.

2.	20/00128/FUL	58 Warwick Road Walton Peterborough PE4 6DB , Change of use from dwelling to children's home and erection of 2m boundary fence
----	--------------	---

Councillor Sandford

Mr Chairman,

I would like to raise objections to this planning application and in doing so I am speaking on behalf of a significant number of local residents in the Warwick Road, Richmond Avenue and Hastings Road area. I have myself received 8 emails raising detailed objections and I know my two ward colleagues have also been contacted by people objecting to the planning application. In the report it states that of 25 people submitting comments, 23 were opposed to the planning application. I think this reflects the strength of local feeling that I have found in the area.

Most local residents that I have spoken to do not object to the Council giving permission for the setting up of a children's home. They do, however, feel that this is not an appropriate location for it and, although a number of detailed points have been raised, I think the key objection concerns the character of the local area and the type of people living there.

Warwick Road in particular, in the immediate vicinity of the development site, is populated largely by a fairly settled population of predominantly elderly and retired people. It is stated by planning officers that they "note this point" but in the report they do not really respond to it.

So the character of the area is a key point. Basically residents feel that putting a children's home in this location is not an appropriate development. You will see from the comments raised that there are also concerns about the possibility of young people with behavioural difficulties being placed in the home. Even a small number of such children could have the potential to cause considerable disturbance to the residents of nearby homes.

One of the objectors quoted in the report mentions that the house at 58 Warwick Road has been significantly expanded previously so as to remove most of the garden space at the rear. Given that the space at the front is to be given over to car parking, the resident makes a good point that the children in the home will have nowhere onsite to play. I think the potential for disturbance of nearby residents is given away by the fact that the operators of the home originally intended to surround it with a two metre high fence. It is good that this is no longer proposed but the question remains as to why they felt it was necessary in the first place?

The Police objected originally because of the potential for crime or anti social behaviour. They are no longer objecting because they are reassured that Ofsted is regulating the development. But Ofsted can only respond to problems after they have happened..... they will not be on site 24 hours a day to respond to situations as they arise.

There is a section in the officer report that states this would not require planning permission if it were a facility for adults. But that argument is irrelevant as it is not an adult care facility but one for children.

I now want to refer to some national and local planning policies that are relevant to this case. It is concerning that there is no reference to the National Planning Policy Framework in the officers' report.... Surprising because this is the key statement of Government planning policy and it forms part of our local development plan.

Para 110. applications for development should:

c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which respond to local character and design standards;

Is the committee convinced that this development truly responds to the character of this quiet residential area?

122. Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:

d) the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens)

This development conflicts with the character of the area and does not provide any outdoor amenity space for children who may have learning or behavioural difficulties and need somewhere to "let off steam".

127. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, ...

This paragraph makes similar points to the others. The policies together, I submit, are highly relevant and should form part of the committee's consideration of the merits of this planning application.

Turning to the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Policy LP16: Design and the Public Realm

All development proposals are expected to positively contribute to the character and local distinctiveness of the area and create a sense of place. As such, and where applicable, proposals will be required to demonstrate to a degree proportionate to the proposal, that they:

a. Respect the context of the site and surrounding area and respond appropriately to: the local patterns of development, including street plots and blocks, spaces between buildings and boundary treatments;

h. Are safe and designed to minimise crime and antisocial behaviour, taking into account secure by design principles; and

You might ask does this development in this location minimise the danger of crime and anti-social behaviour and respect the character of the site and patterns of development?

Policy LP17: Amenity Provision

6.12 Amenity Provision

6.12.1 Standards of amenity influence people's health and quality of life. Through policy LP17, the council will seek to ensure that standards of amenity, which all existing and future occupants of neighbouring land and buildings may reasonably expect to enjoy, are provided for in new development. This includes preventing unacceptable harm to existing occupiers arising from new development. This policy applies as much to extensions and conversions as it does to new development.

Amenity of existing occupiers

New development should not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing occupiers

of any nearby properties. These impacts may include:

c. noise and/or vibration levels resulting in disturbance for the occupiers or users of any nearby property or land; or

Amenity of future occupiers

Development proposals should be designed and located to ensure that the needs of future occupiers are provided for and should include:

j. well designed and located private amenity space, and/or communal amenity space in the case of apartments/flats;

Is there not at least a possibility that the occupants of the childrens home might cause adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring properties occupied by elderly people and where is the amenity space that may be required by the occupants of the home?

LP4. Employment

Other Employment Proposals

Other employment proposals not within GEAs, BPs or allocated sites will be supported, provided:

there is no significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, and/or the amenity of neighbouring occupiers;

the proposals maximise opportunities for modal shift away from the private car.

In the report officers state that this is not a business development. It is though clearly an employment use, in that it employs a number of people to staff the childrens home and given that the company running it is a limited company, presumably they are intending to run it profitably and so they are, to all intents and purposes, a business venture. Therefore LP4 is relevant and you need to consider whether it may possibly have some adverse impacts on the amenity of nearby residents.

One final point, some local people have said to me they would have liked to have attended the committee meeting but they do not have the skills or equipment needed to use Zoom. I know of at least one couple who would have been here if the meeting had been in person.

Peiople have also said to me that the company has been moving furniture and equipment into the building as though they thought they already had got planning permission. Whilst this may not be strictly illegal, it has given some people the impression that the application is a foregone conclusion. I hope members of the committee will take account of local people's objections and choose to reject the planning application.

Nick Sandford

Mr Nyasha Banhire

I am a qualified Social Worker and have worked in traditional institutional children homes for over 10 years before qualifying as a social worker. Modern society should shift away from the traditional institutional children homes. This has also been also a recommendation from Ofsted who are the regulators of children homes .I strongly believe that every child despite their presenting needs or disability has the right to be loved, natured and live in an all-inclusive community environment like every other child who is not in care. All children are born equals, does not matter if a child is born and brought up in, care, stately home or council estate.

Reading comments from some residents, I have been left shocked that the same adults who are supposed to show empathy and protect vulnerable children are more concerned of themselves.

It's adults/parents like this who this day and age do not believe in equality and children rights. They will paint an unnecessary bad picture of children in care and the system trying not to let them down and to keep them safe.

Our company's approach is to create the environment of a typical family house. The home will cater for between 3 and 4 children on long term care from the ages of 8 - 16 years of age. As a company we are open to accepting any child where we can meet their needs in community which could be special needs, learning difficulties or physical disabilities hence the bungalow and environment is perfect will not discriminate.

We would want children we care for to be part of the community and be entitled to a chance to thrive. In today's world there should not be such thing as a "bad child". It is family, environment and society that shapes a child's behaviour, not something ingrown in a child.

I pray and hope the residents and council find it necessary to grant permission for this house.

Many thanks

3.	20/00266/FUL	20 Broadway Gardens Peterborough PE1 4DU , Permanent change of use from dwelling (C3) to residential institution (children's home) (C2)
----	--------------	--

James Barber

As long as the change of use for 20 Broadway Gardens does not adversely affect the residential amenity of its neighbours including ourselves, in principle we are in support of the planning application.

However, as the property stands, we believe if the application is approved, there is a substantial risk for disturbance and loss of privacy for ourselves being next door to 20 Broadway Gardens, which we believe are grounds to review this planning application and any conditions attached to planning consent that may be given.

The fence owned by 20 Broadway Gardens has partially collapsed into our garden, and as the fence further deteriorates, access can then be gained into our property leading to a lack of privacy, with the potential for noise and disturbance to ourselves.

This fact appears to have been dismissed as a civil dispute, but there is no dispute between ourselves and 20 Broadway Gardens, about responsibility for the fence. We just want the owners of 20 Broadway Gardens to secure the boundary to preserve our residential amenity.

If this does not form part of the planning approval if given, we fear that we will lose our privacy, and the risk for noise and disturbance is quite great.

There is a simple solution to remove this risk and the future stresses this could bring, with 20 Broadway Gardens replacing the fence as they have pointed towards doing in the past, but not acted on even after chasing them.'

I thank the committee for seriously taking into consideration our views with regard to our privacy as an adjoining neighbour.

Naidre Werner

Two years ago, Sue Hessom and I, Naidre Werner as Directors of Florinee Homes Ltd applied for planning permission to change the use of 20 Broadway Gardens from a domestic dwelling to an unregulated children's home, ages 16 to 18. We were granted temporary permission with a view to revisiting permanent planning changes in two years.

Whilst there were no planning objections two years ago, there were considerable concerns from the community that having this type of provision within their neighbourhood would increase anti-social behaviour, criminal activity and pose a threat to their own children and household environment.

Over the last two years, the police presence on Broadway Gardens is perceived to have increased at times. This is not due to criminal activity at the address, or for increased criminal activity on the street – it has been down to young people missing from the property and our duty to report them missing in order to safeguard them. You have a copy of the corrected reporting numbers from PC Carol Aston.

Crime statistics show that there has been no increase in the area since the presence of the children's home on Broadway Gardens – comparing April 2018 (around the time that temporary planning permission was granted) to April 2020 (latest figures available) figures, there is in fact a decrease in the amount of crime committed in the area with a reduction from 713 crimes reported in April 2018 to 487 crimes reported in April 2020. Source www.crime-statistics.co.uk

Two years ago, and in support of this current application, consultee reports from the Highways Agency and the Conservation Officer concluded that there was ample space for parking vehicles and there were no concerns over traffic generation. Furthermore, the domestic use of the property was to be maintained as a family home looking after young people in care - and therefore the proposed change of use did not impact upon the setting nor undermine the significance of the Conservation Area. This has not changed.

With respect to any impacts affecting neighbours, we continue to enforce firm, sensible house rules and adopt strict curfew times. Noise is contained and the home does not generate any further light pollution than any other regular family home in the street. We do not permit loitering outside on the street, and the young people's licence agreement clearly states the consequences of any unacceptable behaviour. We have honoured our promises to the community and therefore any young person who has continued to disrespect their licence agreement has been transferred to a different home. Over the last two years, this has only happened twice.

Our development plan for this home is to now become Ofsted registered and regulated with a smaller number of residents i.e. 5. We will continue to have a duty of care to thoroughly plan, match and risk assess every young person who might want to live at Broadway Gardens against those who are already living at the property and with due consideration for the community.

As far as integration with the community is concerned, we have stood by our pledge to work with residents and within local community groups. Sue and I sit on the Committee of the Friends of Central Park and have initiated new activities for young people in the park and helped raise funds for local causes in the area. Our local councillors can vouch for our community integration as we regularly see Councillor Aasiyah Joseph and ex councillor John Peach at meetings.

The statement from the Broadway residents Association confirms that we have upheld our commitment to keeping channels of communication open, with all neighbours having our personal mobile numbers and through meeting the Chair and the Secretary on a regular basis to catch up on how our young people are doing and have the opportunity to raise any community/neighbourhood concerns that have been raised in resident meetings.

Many of our young people have benefitted significantly from living at 20 Broadway Gardens. They have gone onto study at college, get gainful employment, pass their driving test, and successfully become independent, living in their own flats.

Florinee Homes has achieved what we promised that we would do - repair young people's lives through guidance, care, stability, and emotional support. We have enabled young people to develop trust, a sense of self-worth, responsibility, and citizenship in order that they become young adults who successfully integrate into society and their local community. Please allow us to continue this good work and allow this home to remain vitally important for our current residents and any future young person's life. Hopefully, this will be reflected in your vote today.