

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/0928/P	stewart abel	12/03/2020 12:06:33	INT	<p>generally the site boundary is different as shown on location and existing floor plans versus the proposed site and floor plans and site survey, so which are correct and has this been agreed with the management of kings gardens?</p> <p>arising from this, what fills the space between the proposed building lines and the boundary and is there a fence as existing as nothing is shown on elevations or boundary treatment drawings?</p> <p>the south elevation shows just a depressing prison like series of blank walls affronting kings gardens, without showing features that would be visible at ground floor to protect the basement drop or the roof over living/dining and entertainment rooms at basement level, and a wall indicated on the g.f. plan. this is the most "in your face" elevation to neighbours and needs comparable treatment to the other elevations to mitigate this overpowering and boring view. simply inserting break lines of "white" brick as other elevations would help, plus small amounts of modelling such as false window recesses etc..</p> <p>on the subject of materials, the "white" stucco features on all the adjacent buildings are painted matt white or similar, so a ceramic faced porcelain "shiny" brick will jar and look cheap against all these. even a white/yellow gault brick would be more appropriate.</p> <p>turning to the daylight report, in appendix 2, where are the locations of rooms R1 to R9 on all floors in kings gardens so i can assess what the readings imply for the ones i am associated with.</p> <p>i see in the construction management plan that noise and dust proposals for both demolition and construction are to be consulted on after selection of the main contractor, but can we be assured now that this will not impinge on our everyday life and access to ventilation through our windows for the whole period from december 2020 to june 2022.</p>
