## Good Afternoon Mr Denbury,

Thank you for meeting with us again on $18^{\text {th }}$ October.

We are writing to you to give our formal objection to the proposed footpath diversion that went out to consultation on Friday $11^{\text {th }}$ October 2019. The reasons for the objection are as follows;

- The point marked A on the plan is land in our ownership, this section has been illegally filled by Taylor Wimpey. There should be a retaining wall at this location as shown on the attached layout. Taylor Wimpey have previously acknowledged the fact that this area has been filled and issued a plan with instructions to remove the fill which has not happened. This plan is also attached for your reference. The land is being reinstated to its original topography which does not lend itself to a footpath due to the steep gradients.
- The section of footpath which uses the pavement to Rhiw'r Coetir is utilising a narrow shared surface pavement which is 1 m in width. Our understanding is the standard for path width is approx. 1.8 m . When we met onsite again on the $18^{\text {th }}$ you explained that the intention is to use the entire width of carriageway and pavement as it's a shared surface. However now that a full kerb has been added to the one pavement can this still be classed as a shared surface?
- The proposed footpath not only passes over allocated parking for plot 136 it also runs down the shared driveway of plots $134,135 \& 136$. This is obviously a safety concern with the added hazard of a blind 90 degree corner from behind the garage of 136.
- The original objection for the first footpath diversion came from the Ramblers who wanted a countryside path on grass not tarmac. We have tirelessly worked towards producing that at great cost.

I the above is clear. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

Mike Wells<br>Contracts Manager

Bond Demolition Ltd
Unit 3B Ocean Park,
Pant Glas Industrial Estate,
Caerphilly
CF83 8DR

Tel No:
Mob No:
www: bonddemolition.co.uk

