

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0207/P	mimi belilty	15/03/2023 14:59:55	OBJ	<p>there is nearly a 10 year history of planning applications for the site at no 26 netherhall gardens.this application has its merits compared to the 2019 application - notably the absence of a deeper basement. this has previously caused considerable worry for neighbours especially those at adjoining properties.therefore this application is preferable.however there are concerns that need rectifying. I ask the council to carefully consider these details and request amendments made to the planning application before granting permission</p> <p>the heat pumps are of concern. there is no acoustic report. what are the sound implications for the surrounds? will we sit in the garden or have a window open and hear noise / buzzing / humming? the council must have concrete evidence there will be no such noise. will these units be enclosed? will they be on and working 24/7? will they work more in the winter than the summer? all this information is absent. the council needs this information to make a sound judgement. there is also an echo on our street - sound carries more than in other streets. I don't know why but its common to hear sound that is far from us quite loud. therefore this is a big consideration.we live in a city with a lot of sounds but here in our homes and in a conservation area I would like to think we will have a level of peacefulness.</p> <p>the gap has been narrowed between no 24a and no 26.the new building will sit too close next to 24a. 24a will subsequently loose more light as a result from key windows in the daylight and sunlight report.because of building closer, notably the downstairs area deemed a " habitable space" by 2 planning inspectors during 2 previous appeals.</p> <p>the bedroom window at the back of the house will be subject to a sense of enclosure.it will look out on a wall quite long extending out to the garden. it will feel like you are looking down an alleyway not looking out into the conservation area. its set too close to the back of no 24a. there is one small window that feeds light into this bedroom - I believe the light feeding in will be compromised.there will also be overlooking from the balconies. all this needs to be closely looked at and amendments made before planning approval is given.</p> <p>the building should sit further back away from no 24a to the 2m distance which was approved in the 2021 application. there are no published measurements about the foundations for no 24a - therefore by building further away it is much safer for the structural stability of no 24a and no 24.</p> <p>I understand plans to remove tree on the boundary. this is not a good idea. these trees offer public amenity - they are listed as 12 metres but look higher. much wildlife uses these trees - notably birds nesting and around. you can easily see these trees from the street.the trees also offer screening for all the surrounding neighbours. we are in a conservation area the trees should be retained. the recent netherhall conservation appraisal document I believe highlights this. we will sit in the garden of no 24a and be subject to overlooking from the people on the balconies. I don't think this is fair. the development plans should respect what is already in situ when designing their building, notably the adjoining neighbours. I understand a hedge has been offered for screening but this will not be high enough to screen overlooking from the 2nd floor balconies.the trees should be retained and as a condition of giving planning approval</p>