

[REDACTED]

From: Carolyn Pannell [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 November 2014 17:11
To: Anita Gardner [REDACTED]
Subject: RE:EP/149/14/PL rep Letter from Mrs Gilliam, 29 Orchard Road

Dear Mrs Gardner,

Once again this resident has not looked at the plans correctly, as there is a CLEAR divide line on the Plans. That of the old dwelling whose boundary is marked in BLUE and the new proposed dwelling's marked in RED. Therefore, making Mrs Gillam's comments INVALID about density.

The size of the plot has been verified by the Inspectorate - Point 12. ***"I am satisfied that there would be enough private garden space for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling."*** Showing Mrs Gillam's comments to be INVALID. We have already held a consultation with yourselves re sufficient space provided to both properties.

The site is NO WHERE NEAR the school - see attached photographs approaching from Lashmar Road and away from front garden, no school can be seen. As previously pointed out we are only losing two car parking spaces and will be gaining two or more. So this point about space to park our vehicles is INVALID too. In fact a Police **CCTV** - see attached photograph of the vehicle which has just parked directly outside my property approx 16.30pm on 10/11/14 which would clearly show the vehicles parked on the grass verge **DO NOT** belong to that of No.37 and **ALL** our vehicles **WERE PARKED ON OUR DRIVEWAY**. Should you need verification.



No windows to the new build will be effected by any divide of the properties. The living area window and stair window are placed **HIGHER** than any fence boundary height would be placed, if they were to be eventually divided in the future. The entrance of no. 37 **faces a long BRICK WALL with NO WINDOWS, so would not be affected in ANY WAY**. Great care has been taken with all the design feature's so as not to affect either dwelling.

The window in the direction of Mrs Gilliam's garden on the first floor is **Obscured not affecting her privacy**. Other windows are a Fire building regulation escape to the rear/ **South**, but privacy is not affected as per photographs provided. The plans are **VERY** clear where all windows are to be located.

For all of the above reasons and incorrect assumptions this objection letter should be dismissed as containing INVALID comments.

Yours sincerely,

CAROLYN PANNELL