

Having carefully read all of the objections relating to our proposed extension we have identified 4 main areas of concern:

- The proposed front hard standing for cars and related issues
- The overall impact of the development on the area
- Concerns over our integrity and our intentions for the property (renting etc) with related resultant issues
- Concerns over effects on number 62 Brisbane Grove (our immediate neighbours)

HARD STANDING FOR CARS AND RELATED ISSUES

It appears that objectors are under the impression that the proposals will result in an increase in car numbers on and around the property. This is inaccurate as there will be no more drivers living in the property. We simply wish to have off street parking for our own family cars.

Objectors are concerned about safety in relation to accessing the hard standing. This will be no worse than at present as only 1 car at a time will be able to cross the footway (nb not footpath as mistakenly represented in one objection).

Reference is made to the potential visual impact of a “small car park”. We intend to create an aesthetically pleasing driveway and the “small car park” comment is a gross overstatement of a domestic drive. We believe we are entitled to have friends and family to visit (especially as many of our close family live over 200 miles away) and allowing them to park off-street will reduce potential ‘parking problems’ on a busy street.

Moving our drive from the side to the front of our home will not cause an increase in on-street parking in the area.

Like some of the objectors, we are also concerned about the safety of local children and believe that responsible conduct by the individual driver is the best way to avoid creating a hazard. Having worked in a professional capacity for 3 years as a safer routes to school specialist Lucy (Mr. Qureshi’s partner) is both well versed and passionate about school journeys and child safety.

The ‘suspicions’ about increased car numbers due to a change in use of the property are wholly inaccurate and are based on hearsay and misinformed pre-judgements about our family. We will keep this property as a family home.

An objector notes an increase in on-street parking since we have moved in – parking is obviously an issue with substantial history in this area – an issue in which we have played no part. We have on occasion had reasonable cause to park one car legally and considerately alongside (not in front of) a nearby house; causing them no inconvenience and raising no complaint from the residents of that house. This in no way relates to the proposed extension.

An objector notes concern for the trees outside of numbers 62 and 64 which are subject to preservation orders. This is based on the assumption that we do not care about the trees. We in fact do (Lucy's degree in environmental studies and extensive environmental charity work is testament to this). Our architect spent many hours on site surveying the land in question including a study of the trees – his plans are designed to minimise impact on the trees and allow for the root systems, we have taken his advice on this issue and believe him to be a competent professional.

OVERALL IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON AREA

The main concerns in this category are that the extension won't be in-keeping with the area and will have an adverse visual impact. We have specifically included features such as matching bay windows and a pitched rather than flat roof to keep the development in-keeping with the area and aesthetically pleasing – at additional cost to ourselves.

We believe that part of the charm of the area is that the houses are individual – many having been extended. We do not think that our proposals will impose on the area as the side extension borders a school car park and open land, and the rear extension will not be visible from the street.

We do not believe that our extended family home would be 'unsightly' – we wish to create a family home that we will be proud of and that will fit in with the local area, be visually in-keeping with the existing house, and will be a good quality build.

We do not believe this to be an 'over-development'. We are ambitious people who seek to create a spacious, luxurious and beautiful home for our growing family. We feel that a 4 bedroom house is not excessive for a family with 2 adults and 3 offspring, and potentially future additions in the form of **related dependants** (we hope to have more children).

Much of the bias of the objections results from a lack of knowledge of our situation. We are not new to Hartburn and have lived here for over 2 years (at Kenton Close) – having decided to settle here to bring up our family we have committed to live at number 64 Brisbane Grove at least until our 2 year old daughter leaves primary school. Mr. Qureshi also has 2 teenage daughters from a previous marriage who visit frequently, often staying during school holidays. We also hope to have more children in the future. A large family home is therefore not an unreasonable ambition.

CONCERNS OVER OUR INTENTIONS FOR THE PROPERTY

Several objectors have developed (or been given by 'a third party') the misguided impression that we intend to rent out portions of the property or somehow have several unrelated adults living with us. There are concerns over parking, social impacts, and house prices. The main reason for this impression seems to be that the house will be large.

Mr. Qureshi's substantial business portfolio does not include a little cottage industry from home nor is this a future ambition as suggested by one specific objector.

In addition, Mr. Qureshi has been subject to false and unsubstantiated accusations resulting in an inaccurate perception of our family's lifestyle and of our intentions. As a result Mr. Qureshi has forwarded the details of this perceived deformation of character to his legal advisors.

As there will be no extra adults living with us, there will be no extra cars.

CONCERNS OVER EFFECTS ON NUMBER 62 BRISBANE GROVE

These proposals have been developed by a professional architect who has visited and studied the site; and in conjunction with Stockton Borough Council planning department has revised the original plan to accommodate the objections raised by 62 Brisbane Grove. We believe he has adhered to all relevant guidelines and regulations in relation to proximity to neighbouring properties, size of proposed development, and vehicular access. We have taken advice from the local authority in relation to the proposals.

Our proposed side extension does not border any residential property as it is next to a school car park.

Our proposed rear extension is similar to others on the street and has features designed to allow extra light to neighbouring properties. The proposed rear extension aligns with number 62's current rear extension and the angle is in-keeping with the existing property.

Our current rear room overlooks number 62's garden and we do not believe that this will significantly increase with the proposals.

The proposed bay windows are intended to be in-keeping with the current property, maintaining the character and style of properties of this era.