

Comments Form

Name..... Minam Madar

Address..... 28 Nehemiah Gardens (flat 1 & flat 2)



Planning application number..... 2014/6224/P

Planning application address..... 26 Nehemiah Gardens

I support the application (please state reasons below)
I object to the application (please state reasons below) strongly object

Your comments

see attached comments

Please continue on extra sheets if you wish

From: Miriam Saidi [REDACTED]
Subject: re 26 Netherhall plans.
Date: 22 December 2014 09:11
To: Madar Miriam [REDACTED]



Dear Angela

revised

I have consulted with my architect again on the proposal for 26 netherhall gardens and strongly object to proposed plans and the demolition of the building. There are major overlooking issues and the developers drawings are also incorrect and misleading.

1. The rear extension to No.26 netherhall side is still at least two meters over/longer than No.28. As No.26 is at the due south side of No.28, it will cast shadow to all the windows of No.28. Significant direct sunlight will be lost in all habitable rooms of No.28. All the rear extension of proposed No.26 which are on or above first floor should be cut back and lined up with No.28 rear facade.
2. First floor rear terrace of 26 is overlooking into No.28 garden; the roof terrace need to be removed completely.
3. First and second Floor rear extension at No.24A side are still blocking No.24A - 45 degree window of the habitable room. Need to be cut back.
4. Second floor L-shape rear terrace is overlooking into No.28 garden
5. Both rear balconies at the third floor are overlooking into the garden of No.28 and the first floor bedroom of No.24A. Both balconies need to be removed.
6. All rear terraces and balconies should be removed to avoid any overlooking into the neighboring private amenities spaces.
7. The creation of sub-basement has no reasonable usage; and will only create significant risk to all the surrounding buildings and environments, such as destabilize the existing soil where is at the nearby mature tree and destabilize the untreated slopes of No.24A, proposed site and No.28 rear garden; and long term affect to the flow of below ground water.
8. The rear garden level of No.28 on the drawing of revised rear (east) elevation is wrong and misleading!! The revised drawing make it looks like a raised platform, In fact the proposed terrace is around 3 meters + 2 meter fence above the level of No.28 rear garden!! Not like the one they show on the drawing at all!!
9. Poor quality outlook and daylight to all the proposed basement habitable bedrooms.
10. Over-development to basement level
11. No consideration on the design to make use natural daylight to all internal circulation at the basement level. No energy saving consideration!!

Angela, I would welcome you to come and visit my house so I can show you around -
regards Miriam