

We have just received the EH officer comments which address one of the key considerations of the application only a couple of hours before the deputations are due which is not acceptable, given the timescale from when we submitted them to you. We submitted a revised noise report which clarified the vibration monitoring locations in December 2020 and it has taken 5 months for the Council to conclude that the vibration impacts are acceptable. However, you have decided to take this application to committee, with the same recommendation of refusal, using the same reasons, specifically the noise without having had comments back from your EH officer so the report does not detail his comments, or provided members the opportunity to ask questions about this at the site view working party which has already taken place.

The EH officer comments confirm that the proposed ventilation system can be provided, but that this is not optimum. However, whether it is the optimum solution is not the consideration here within the context of the titled planning balance. The appeal decision referred to mentions the impact on external amenity space at that particular appeal site, our application does not provide external amenity space. We have deliberately not provided a rear garden amenity area, which is not uncommon for a flats development, so we do not think the appeal decision is an appropriate citation. The appeal reference seems akin to the previous appeal at the site, which did offer amenity space.

We would like these comments to be published on the Council's website on the planning file please.

Kind regards,

Ed Allsop MSc, MRTPI
Senior Planner - Planning