

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2325/P	Maurice Sheridan	02/09/2021 16:31:04	INT	<p>My name is Maurice Sheridan, and I live at 109 Arlington Rd, next-door to 111 Arlington Rd, the subject of the Planning Application. Please note my interest. I trust I have clicked the appropriate box below for "Comment Type".</p> <p>Please also note that my contact email address indicated on this Comments Form is from a work email address which I use solely for convenience here. This is not a work-related matter.</p> <p>I point out that I came across this Application by chance, not having been notified of it by the Council, despite its obvious concern to me as a next door terraced property neighbour. I do not know if, for example, 113 Arlington Rd has had this Application brought to their attention by the Council, which if not, seems unfair on 113 who may not have had the opportunity to present their comments, if any, on it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am not in principle opposed to the Application, which seems intended to restore much of the existing 111 to good repair and protect it for future generations, and enhance its utility and amenity benefit, but this is subject to the following comments/concerns which I ask the Council to take into account insofar as duly relevant to their planning etc decision on the Application. 2. The previous owner seems to have stripped out a layer of noise insulation between 111 and 109 on each floor. It is possible to hear people speaking through the walls, and the proposals for example for living/TV rooms sound systems and use of a piano for 113 risks the Council, if approving the Application, allowing a noise nuisance from 113 to at least 109: Should a suitable condition be imposed please to ensure appropriate sound insulation is installed against the 111/109 Party Wall as part of the proposed works to protect the amenity use etc of 109 (possibly similar as regards 111/113?) 3. 111 proposes to repair and repurpose the old coal cellars at the front of 111. The supporting wall there at 111 is in a very bad state and as it appears to support the public pavement should perhaps its replacement/suitable reinforcement there be required as a planning condition? 4. Also, in the coal cellar next to 109 a pressurised container is proposed for 111. In the adjacent coal cellar at 109, there is already a pressurised water tank. Should a suitable planning condition be imposed to protect against a burst in the new container at 111 causing/leading to a rupture in the tank already at 109 so as to protect the building and its use at 109? 5. Works are proposed at 111 to the existing rear extension, for installation etc of a new kitchen. I found from similar works to my kitchen (to which the new 111 kitchen will be adjacent) that the water table is very close to the surface in this part of the land. Can perhaps a suitable planning condition be imposed requiring an investigation into the water table level at and in the vicinity of the new 111 kitchen area; with a requirement that any due remedial measures must to be taken so as to ensure that the works at 111 do not displace water onto 109 nor increase risk to 109 from rising water table levels, so as to protect the continued quiet enjoyment etc of 109? (Similar as regards 113?) 6. Further, in relation to the new kitchen at 111, should a suitable planning condition be imposed to ensure that any vents eg from an extraction fan for a hob or oven do not vent onto 109 (or 113?) so causing a nuisance or interference with the quiet enjoyment of those properties; and similarly as regards protection from fire that might arise from use of cooking appliances abutting the 111/109 wall?

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

7. 111 proposes an extensive angled skylight/window from the rear wall of 111 to the roof of the proposed new kitchen. Viewed from 109 (and perhaps other properties), this seems to be quite intrusive in terms of visual impact, and perhaps to risk material light pollution of the rear areas of 109 and 113, if not other properties in the area, and cutting down/eliminating quiet reflective time for their owners, their well-being and enjoyment of a night sky. Should a suitable planning condition be imposed to provide for an "L" solution with a vertical glass panel meeting a horizontal glass panel on the kitchen roof; alternatively, a reduced angle of a "vertical" glass panel meeting a horizontal glass panel on the kitchen roof? Further, perhaps, also to reduce light pollution to 109, should a suitable planning condition be imposed for some sort of 45 degree angled wall be built on the 109 side (perhaps also on the 113 side?) of 111 to reduce light impact on everyday operations in 109/113 arising from any permitted installation of any such "glass wall" construction here?

8. 111 proposes to remove the chimney breast on the first floor and re-build it. Should a suitable planning condition be imposed to protect 109 from any weakening of the shared structural wall here?

9. 111 proposes a Garden Room/Space. Its location may lie over roots from the large tree immediately to the left of the bottom of the garden at 109, and which I think is a protected tree. Should a suitable planning condition be imposed to require an investigation into possible interference with/damage to that tree's roots from excavation and construction work for the Garden Room, with any due remedial measures to be taken?

10. Also, as regards the proposed Garden Room, a garden-wide glass frontage is proposed. This may also cause light pollution issues along the lines of similar effects as described at 7. above. Should a suitable planning condition be imposed for the protection of the enjoyment of adjacent properties, especially if the proposed landscaping garden works eliminate much of the current existing green shielding between 111 and 109 (and similar as regards 113?)?

A query: is ALC-209 in error? Item 1 does not exist; and if proposed, Item 1 would appear wrong as there is no proposed Basement Bedroom in the Application.

My thanks in advance for the Council's kind consideration of the above comments etc. I confirm, if relevant, that I do not object to 111 seeing these comments and queries/suggestions; and I am happy to respond to any queries as regards the above.

Maurice Sheridan

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2325/P	Maurice Sheridan	02/09/2021 16:30:55	INT	<p>My name is Maurice Sheridan, and I live at 109 Arlington Rd, next-door to 111 Arlington Rd, the subject of the Planning Application. Please note my interest. I trust I have clicked the appropriate box below for "Comment Type".</p> <p>Please also note that my contact email address indicated on this Comments Form is from a work email address which I use solely for convenience here. This is not a work-related matter.</p> <p>I point out that I came across this Application by chance, not having been notified of it by the Council, despite its obvious concern to me as a next door terraced property neighbour. I do not know if, for example, 113 Arlington Rd has had this Application brought to their attention by the Council, which if not, seems unfair on 113 who may not have had the opportunity to present their comments, if any, on it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am not in principle opposed to the Application, which seems intended to restore much of the existing 111 to good repair and protect it for future generations, and enhance its utility and amenity benefit, but this is subject to the following comments/concerns which I ask the Council to take into account insofar as duly relevant to their planning etc decision on the Application. 2. The previous owner seems to have stripped out a layer of noise insulation between 111 and 109 on each floor. It is possible to hear people speaking through the walls, and the proposals for example for living/TV rooms sound systems and use of a piano for 113 risks the Council, if approving the Application, allowing a noise nuisance from 113 to at least 109: Should a suitable condition be imposed please to ensure appropriate sound insulation is installed against the 111/109 Party Wall as part of the proposed works to protect the amenity use etc of 109 (possibly similar as regards 111/113?) 3. 111 proposes to repair and repurpose the old coal cellars at the front of 111. The supporting wall there at 111 is in a very bad state and as it appears to support the public pavement should perhaps its replacement/suitable reinforcement there be required as a planning condition? 4. Also, in the coal cellar next to 109 a pressurised container is proposed for 111. In the adjacent coal cellar at 109, there is already a pressurised water tank. Should a suitable planning condition be imposed to protect against a burst in the new container at 111 causing/leading to a rupture in the tank already at 109 so as to protect the building and its use at 109? 5. Works are proposed at 111 to the existing rear extension, for installation etc of a new kitchen. I found from similar works to my kitchen (to which the new 111 kitchen will be adjacent) that the water table is very close to the surface in this part of the land. Can perhaps a suitable planning condition be imposed requiring an investigation into the water table level at and in the vicinity of the new 111 kitchen area; with a requirement that any due remedial measures must to be taken so as to ensure that the works at 111 do not displace water onto 109 nor increase risk to 109 from rising water table levels, so as to protect the continued quiet enjoyment etc of 109? (Similar as regards 113?) 6. Further, in relation to the new kitchen at 111, should a suitable planning condition be imposed to ensure that any vents eg from an extraction fan for a hob or oven do not vent onto 109 (or 113?) so causing a nuisance or interference with the quiet enjoyment of those properties; and similarly as regards protection from fire that might arise from use of cooking appliances abutting the 111/109 wall?

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

7. 111 proposes an extensive angled skylight/window from the rear wall of 111 to the roof of the proposed new kitchen. Viewed from 109 (and perhaps other properties), this seems to be quite intrusive in terms of visual impact, and perhaps to risk material light pollution of the rear areas of 109 and 113, if not other properties in the area, and cutting down/eliminating quiet reflective time for their owners, their well-being and enjoyment of a night sky. Should a suitable planning condition be imposed to provide for an "L" solution with a vertical glass panel meeting a horizontal glass panel on the kitchen roof; alternatively, a reduced angle of a "vertical" glass panel meeting a horizontal glass panel on the kitchen roof? Further, perhaps, also to reduce light pollution to 109, should a suitable planning condition be imposed for some sort of 45 degree angled wall be built on the 109 side (perhaps also on the 113 side?) of 111 to reduce light impact on everyday operations in 109/113 arising from any permitted installation of any such "glass wall" construction here?

8. 111 proposes to remove the chimney breast on the first floor and re-build it. Should a suitable planning condition be imposed to protect 109 from any weakening of the shared structural wall here?

9. 111 proposes a Garden Room/Space. Its location may lie over roots from the large tree immediately to the left of the bottom of the garden at 109, and which I think is a protected tree. Should a suitable planning condition be imposed to require an investigation into possible interference with/damage to that tree's roots from excavation and construction work for the Garden Room, with any due remedial measures to be taken?

10. Also, as regards the proposed Garden Room, a garden-wide glass frontage is proposed. This may also cause light pollution issues along the lines of similar effects as described at 7. above. Should a suitable planning condition be imposed for the protection of the enjoyment of adjacent properties, especially if the proposed landscaping garden works eliminate much of the current existing green shielding between 111 and 109 (and similar as regards 113?)?

A query: is ALC-209 in error? Item 1 does not exist; and if proposed, Item 1 would appear wrong as there is no proposed Basement Bedroom in the Application.

My thanks in advance for the Council's kind consideration of the above comments etc. I confirm, if relevant, that I do not object to 111 seeing these comments and queries/suggestions; and I am happy to respond to any queries as regards the above.

Maurice Sheridan
