

Date 30/11/19

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for your kind correspondence dated 28/11/19 to the above-mentioned Application Reference APP/19/00767.

Introduction

1. Firstly, can I ask please that the council take into consideration my previous representation of 12/08/19, thank you.
2. I feel there has been a great disparity of the time line in the way of communication? On this matter to explain, No5 was given an extension from the 02/10/19 to prepare paperwork which gives a total time of 58 days. I and any other third party that may be involved have received a letter dated 28/11/19 giving us six days to respond to a deadline of 05/12/19. This I feel is a great difference in the communication time line process. I hope you will take my point in the way it is intended, not all parties may be in a position to respond in 6 days but possibly could if allocated more time.

Detailed Objection to Main Concern

- 1 The design may have changed but we feel that the roof height is still too high and ask that consideration is made to reduce it further please. Although applicant doesn't intend to live in it as a granny annexe type arrangement themselves, we are concerned that future residents may decide to do this. With the new design of roof layout windows could be very easily fitted in the future on the north elevation giving access to our bedroom windows which would impact on our privacy.
- 2 As previously pointed out in my representation of 12/08/19, that Ms Denise Sheath pointed out Concern was expressed over the height would create an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property to the north. And we feel strongly this was a right and proper observation and comment to make.

Conclusion

- 1 As a member of the public I feel very strongly in that we should raise concerns on matters of safety we have when identified to our council or other interested parties rather than just ignore them, please see paragraph 2 below.
- 2 Fire safety has been well communicated by the media over many recent months due to some very serious breaches and resulting in death. I therefore would like to raise a point of concern outside of my representation which is fire safety. Documents presented by No5 states the Ground floor: will be used primarily for storing cars but also for garden equipment including a potting bench, gas barbecue, garden furniture and power tools such as a lawnmower and hedge cutter, 'I see nothing wrong with this' however it has all the possible ingredients for fire i.e. oxygen, fuel, heat and ignition. On the First Floor: Material and equipment currently stored in the loft will be transferred to this area as well as Other items currently stored in the existing garage. It is intended that there would be sufficient free space to allow for hobby pursuits such as railway modelling, leisure equipment and occasional play space for visiting grandchildren.

- 3 My concern would be about people being trapped on first floor? The plans do not show an external fire escape route if a fire incident should occur or there may be a good reason that one is not required or may be covered in other paperwork which I am not privy to. In all the houses I have lived in or visited I have never seen children's play area in such close proximity to a garage where there is a possible risk of fire.
- 4 We do feel very strongly to the points we have laid before you as laid out above and my previous representation of 12/08/19, with all the right and proper intensions to maintain the "Schedule of restrictive Covenants dated 11 January 1928", thank you.