

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3008/P	Nigel Birdsall	10/08/2020 11:42:46	OBJ	<p>As a property owner in the area I strongly object to this application on the basis that it is adjacent to a conservation area and will be an unsightly addition to this residential neighbourhood. I would like to draw your attention to a quote from the developers who state they have rejected other possible sites on the grounds that</p> <p>“The site is adjacent to a conservation area and is considered to have a greater impact on visual amenity than the proposed site.”</p> <p>I completely disagree that Monmouth House is a better alternative to another site in a conservation area. Monmouth House itself is adjacent to and already towers above the Inkerman Conservation Area so the impact on visual amenity by the addition of radio masts will be immense. I hope you will reject this application on the grounds of respect for our conservation area.</p>
2020/3008/P	Inkerman Area Residents Association	11/08/2020 13:37:25	COMMT	<p>We are the Inkerman Area Residents Association - which includes and is largely made up of streets within the Inkerman Conservation Area. One side of Raglan Street is in the CA and Monmouth House is therefore just on the edge of it. This 12 storey tower is the highest building in the area and is visible across many of our streets. It particularly dominates Raglan Street, Inkerman Road and Alma Street. The proposed installation is extraordinarily large and would be extremely oppressive for the school, for all residents and for the thousands of people passing through the area every day.</p> <p>We note that the applicant has rejected 5 other sites on the grounds that:</p> <p>"The site is adjacent to a conservation area and is considered to have a greater impact on visual amenity than the proposed site."</p> <p>As Monmouth House is immediately adjacent to a conservation area it is hard to see why the applicant thinks it should not also have been rejected as a potential site.</p> <p>We had previously suggested to the applicant that they should instead be considering a non residential area, such as Regis Road, and certainly not a site adjacent to the CA.</p> <p>Our area also includes St. Patrick's school, just opposite Monmouth House and some of our residents have expressed considerable anxiety about the possibility of having this installation so close to the school.</p> <p>Please reject this inappropriate application.</p>
2020/3008/P	Charles Collett	11/08/2020 22:42:54	WREP	<p>I would like to object to the Planning Application for the following reasons:</p> <p>&gt; The issue regarding exposure to electromagnetic radiation from 5G , which has potential hazards for human health - Monmouth House residents; for those, like me, living in a surrounding street; and the adjoining Saint Patrick's Primary School.</p> <p>Look forward to the application being turned down again.</p> <p>Regards Charles</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3008/P	Martina Doherty	10/08/2020 10:14:10	OBJ	<p>As a property owner in the area I strongly object to this application on the basis that it is adjacent to a conservation area and will be an unsightly addition to this residential neighbourhood. I would like to draw your attention to a quote from the developers who state they have rejected other possible sites on the grounds that 'The site is adjacent to a conservation area and is considered to have a greater impact on visual amenity than the proposed site'. I completely disagree that Monmouth House is a better alternative to another site in a conservation area. Monmouth House itself is adjacent to and already towers above the Inkerman Conservation Area so the impact on visual amenity by the addition of radio masts will be immense. I hope you will reject this application on the grounds of respect for our conservation area.</p>

---