

Appendix 3 – Correspondence from Objector

Initial communication was received from this resident following informal consultation sent on 29th May 2024 – the letter was dated forward (4th June) to allow for printing and postage. Communication / site visits and discussions were held throughout June / July and as they remained unresolved as the formal advertising process was undertaken, it was agreed that it would be considered as a formal objection to the formal TRO process.

“I was shocked to receive a letter from you, dated 4th June. I am a resident XXXXX, and this is the first I have heard about the development scheme. We purchased the property in 2022 and moved in a few months ago. This proposal has never once been highlighted to us, or discussed with us, despite it having a major impact on our property.

According to the map you have given, the keep clear in the lay-by directly in front of our house will be removed. How is this fair? Please can you tell me where we are meant to park our car? You have also clearly identified we have a drive, however it is not wide enough for us to be able to take our car into it safely. This leaves us with no other option but to park the car directly in front of our gates.

Regardless of the size of the drive, even if we were to park the car inside, we would still require the keep clear in order for us to freely get in and out of the drive.

We highly object to this proposal, and are very disappointed that no one has informed us, or come to discuss this matter with us, before all the plans have been passed. The proposal has not taken into account the people living directly next to the development, which goes to show that you don't actually care about the residents.

I look forward to hearing a positive response from yourself very soon, and will be taking legal advice if you can not come up with a solution that is favourable to us. “

Objectors further response to the TRO proposal following site visit.

“Thank you for taking the time out to come and do a site visit and the time taken to come up with the proposal. We highly appreciate it.

However, we are not totally happy with the proposal, as our strong preference would be work that allows us to turn the car around in the drive. Widening of the gated part would mean easier entry, however the problem of not being able to open our doors once in the drive still remain, and also the safety element of reversing into the main road also remains.

I appreciate that you said other houses along the road have drives similar, but they are firstly not on such a slope, secondly they would not be reversing out into a two lane road, and they also have clear vision of the road. Because of our wall, and the weather station as well as the extended footpath, it is very unsafe to even see if a pedestrian is crossing the road, let alone the oncoming traffic.

I would highly appreciate it, if you could reconsider your proposal, and id also like to make you aware that we have taken our concerns to the local MP Paul Davies, who has taken on our case.

Thank you once again “