

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2648/P	Mark Amery	Flat 1 27 Netherhall Gardens	06/07/2016 01:54:45	OBJEMAIL	<p>I object to this proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>The excavation of a large basement outside the footprint of the original building that sits on the slope of a hill, in a subsidence prone area, is likely to pose a significant and serious threat to the structural integrity of the neighbouring structures either side of No. 23. and perhaps to No. 23 itself. I note, for good reason, there are no other basements in the immediate area. Moreover No. 23 saw fit to object to the recent proposed development at No. 26 Netherhall Gardens (Ref:2015/3314/P). They said of the proposed basement at No. 26 - "It fails to assess the risks of damage to and demonstrate the measures for protection of the adjacent buildings as a result of the deep excavations" How can they possibly claim there is no risk from their own proposed development when they quite rightly voiced serious concerns about the basement proposed at No. 26?</p> <p>The proposed extension juts out a considerable distance beyond the rear of the original building. The addition of this new structure, with it's floor to ceiling windows, will significantly impinge on the privacy of both No. 21 and No. 25 The structure itself is incongruous with the character of the area both in terms of it's "modern" form and materials used.</p> <p>The proposed development should not be viewed in isolation but in the wider context of the proposed development at No. 26 and the proposed development at No. 20 Frognaal. There is currently the potential for three major construction sites within several feet of us. The proposed development at No, 26 (2015/3314/P) is the subject of an appeal to be heard on 12 July 2016. The Council should not allow these three large proposed developments to take place simultaneously. The construction noise would at times breach allowable decibel levels and adversely affect the health and well-being of local residents during the months/years(?) of construction activity. Many residents in the area work from home and/or have young families so have no choice but to be at home for large parts of the day when the noise and disruption will be at its most severe and disturbing. .</p> <p>I noticed there were some typos in the comments I submitted a few minutes ago. Please use this corrected version instead. Thank you</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/2648/P	Mark Amery	Flat 1 27 Netherhall Gardens	06/07/2016 01:43:13	OBJEMAIL	<p>I object to this proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>The excavation of a large basement outside the footprint of the original building that sits on the slope of a hill, in a subsidence prone area, is likely to pose a significant and serious threat to the structural integrity of the neighbouring structures either side of No. 23. and perhaps to No. 23 itself. I note, for good reason, there are no other basements in the immediate area. Moreover No. 23 saw fit to object to the recent proposed development at No. 26 Netherhall Gardens (Ref:2015/3314/P). They said of the proposed basement at No. 26 - "It fails to assess the risks of damage to and demonstrate the measures for protection of the adjacent buildings as a result of the deep excavations" How can they now possibly claim there is no risk from their own proposed development when they quite rightly voiced serious concerns about the basement proposed at No. 26?</p> <p>The proposed extension juts out a considerable distance beyond the rear of the original building. The addition of this new structure, with it's floor to ceiling windows, will significantly impinge on the privacy of both No. 21 and No. 23 The structure itself is incongruous with the character of the area both in terms of it's "modern" form and materials used.</p> <p>The proposed development should not be viewed in isolation but in the wider context of the proposed development at No. 26 and the proposed development at No. 20 Frognaal. There is currently the potential for three major construction sites within several feet of us. The proposed development at No, 26 (2015/3314/P) is currently the subject of an appeal that will be heard on 12 July 2016. The Council should not allow these three large proposed developments to take place simultaneously. The construction noise would at times breach allowable decibel levels and adversely affect the health and well-being of local residents during the months/years(?) of construction activity. Many residents in the area work from home and/or have young families so have no choice but to be at home for large parts of the day when the noise and disruption will be at its most severe and disturbing. .</p>
