

I write in reference to the application for 'Caffe Grey', 26 Felpham Road to partly object to the planning application which has been submitted, specifically in regards to day dining. I firstly refer to planning application managed by the same officer, Amber Willard (FP/202/19/PL) for a café in the site where Home and Dry now occupies (3 grassmere parade) which was strongly opposed by the community. I would argue that the only thing that has changed in our community since this application was criticised by our residents is that there has been a global pandemic which has knocked all small businesses to their knees, especially in the hospitality industry. Placing an establishment which mirrors one opposite, and two more on the same road after they have survived the outbreak would be immoral and risks setting a precedent to other premises for COU applications during such a time of uncertainty for office rental spaces, which would undoubtedly lead to a loss of ambiance in our quaint historical village.

The application states that there are no 'brunch style or tapas style eatery in Felpham', which is incorrect. Whilst we agree that there are no tapas restaurants, and with the closure of The Old Barn welcome a late afternoon/evening tapas wine bar, there are no less than three brunch style eateries currently in Felpham Village, our own named 'Deligo Eatery', 'Carlyles Café' opposite the proposed site, and The Bondwood in the heart of the village. In addition to this, The George, The Thatch, The Fox, The Lobster Pot, and during summer months The Boat House, all serve brunch and therefore this will not bring anything to our village as a carbon copy of the already existing eight premises, all serving brunch style food. I believe this also nullifies the argument at the conclusion stage of the application that it would provide 'much needed' local dining. This aspect of the application should therefore be edited so that it is factually accurate, so that the case officer can make a decision on the actuality of this.

In addition, I object to this application from a Highways aspect, that there is not ample daytime parking to satisfy residents and patrons for the businesses which are already in situ, including Felpham Bazaar, Carlyles Café, The Felpham Dog Groomer, The Felpham Physio, Allbright, VRV, Golden Grill, Everything Bathrooms, 5 Star, and Noggins, as well as all residential properties surrounding the proposed site which utilise parking, and those who are employed in the village who use the free carpark whilst they are at work. This will therefore lead to additional street parking down Links Avenue, and Admiralty Road which are already very narrow. The increase of traffic through this part of the village would therefore undoubtedly call for more pedestrian assistance, and should not be permitted until the correct safe crossing systems can be implemented, especially given the current location of bus stops opposite the proposed site, and secluded turnings just after (Admiralty).

To conclude, from a moral stance point, this application in our opinion should be approved only with the conditions of later opening times to support the village in which it is situated. When the application for an alcohol licence was submitted, the applicant for this premises put a sign in the window which stated 'I have no intention of stepping on anyone's toes in terms of menu and types of food I would like to serve', and therefore we would hope she will stand by this statement by listening and taking on board the opinions of those she would be very much stamping on the toes of in this community. The proposed later opening of this establishment would more notably negate many of the highways issues, as most of the businesses currently utilising the parking in this area would be closed by the time Caffe Grey opened (suggested time of 3pm), and at a time that less than 50% of the current daily

use of parking in this area would be being utilised which therefore allows for the safe introduction of another businesses traffic additions to the village.