

Dear Lissa,

I refer to the above Notice of Review and wish to make the following further representation.

The objections raised in my letter dated 5 October 2017 still stand and I will use this representation to address the points raised in the Applicant's Notice of Review and Grounds for Review.

The Applicant makes a number of references to what they believe has happened elsewhere and requests that the Local Review Body compare the proposal in comparison with other takeaways however each application must be judged on its own individual merits.

Referring to the pictures provided within the Grounds for Review, the Applicant notes that the pictures were taken at approximately 3pm in the afternoon and states that "this is the street when its busy". At this time of the day, most people are at work or collecting children from school, and neither the Chinese nor the proposed takeaway are or would be open. Therefore, I am unsure how the Applicant can claim that this is a busy time. Attached are some photographs taken at approximately 6:30pm on Saturday 2 December 2017. This shows the street with resident's cars and as well as cars belonging to staff and customers of the Chinese takeaway which is open at the time of the photograph. As can be seen, this shows the high level of parked vehicles at an actual busy time and this is when only one takeaway is open.

The Applicant refers to the area of greenspace to the North as a roundabout and states that this opens the road up. The definition of a roundabout is "a road junction at which traffic moves in one direction round a central island to reach on of the roads converging it." As traffic is able to move in both directions on all sides of island, it is not a roundabout. The road only opens up at the junction to the west of the island. Due to the extended pavement, the road actually narrows outside the Chinese takeaway to approximately 5.38m. The average width of a car is 1.8m which means that if cars are parked on either side at this point of the road, which happens frequently and in particular during peak hours, then that would leave approximately 1.78m for cars to pass through.

When discussing the "roundabout", the Applicant also states that there are no residential properties here – whilst there are none on the island itself, there are a number of properties surrounding the island. There are two residential properties to the south, including our own, four to the north and three (one being a building with two flats) to the east.

The Applicant makes a number of references to the length of time that vehicles will stop at this site, stretching from 3 minutes to 10 minutes. These waiting times, in particular at peak times, appear ambitious and no evidence has been provided that these times are accurate and achievable. They also do not take into account the unpredictable footfall of customers ('walk-in' or phone orders), which the Applicant has no control over. Whilst the Applicant expects most of their patrons to walk to the unit, in my experience with the Chinese takeaway, a majority of customers actually travel by car to this area to collect their meals.

Stating that there is no change of use as the property is still a commercial property, I reiterate that the proposed site has lain derelict for over 10 years, since the death of the barber who occupied the building previously. This means that there will definitely be an increase in traffic movements as there have been no customers, relating to the previous use of the site, parking in the vicinity for over a decade.

The Applicant, in their conclusion, states that the site is not big enough for a house and suggests that the building will go to ruin and fall down unless the building is brought back into commercial use. This statement is speculative and should be disregarded from consideration.

In conclusion, the addition of a takeaway, which proposes later opening hours than the adjacent Chinese takeaway, will give rise to a loss of residential amenity and security, whilst also creating a new source of disturbance (noise, parking and pollution) as the building has lay empty for over 10 years and I urge the Local Review Body to uphold the Appointed Officer's decision to refuse planning permission.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]







