

**Late Representations and Comments**  
**27 May 2020**

**Application Reference 126261 Land at Corner of Pollard Street and Munday Street**

Four further comments have been received in respect of this proposal outlining objections to the proposal, this includes an additional comprehensive letter received from a resident of Hat Box A which reiterates points which have already been submitted. The key points are as follows:

- The proposal is not in accordance with local and national planning policy;
- Officers did not undertake a site visit at an objector's property as requested;
- The report is misleading with reference of the height of Hat Box A. The report states the Hat Box A is 8 stories when in fact it is 7 stories;
- The developer has not provided any details on how the Hat Box would be insulated from the additional noise and vibrations that the occupants would be subjected to with the proposed development in situ;
- Hatbox A would be significantly overlooked which would cause a loss of privacy which is contrary to the Human Rights Act;
- There would be a loss of outlook;
- There are inadequate servicing arrangements on Pollard Street;
- Inadequate information of security arrangements;
- The proposal is out of character with the style and appearance of other developments in the area;
- The proposal is not compliant with BRE guidelines;
- The proposal does not make adequate provision of car parking, disabled car parking and travel planning particularly post the Covid-19 pandemic;
- There is inadequate green space for the development;
- There would be increased energy usage for the Hat Box A as a result of this development;
- The proposal would be taller, out of place, and oppressive to Hat Box A;
- The drawings in the report are not to scale and do not show the full extent of the impacts from this proposal;
- Wide stereotypical statements are made in the report without back up of evidence;

- There is already noise from construction in the local area;
- The report states that a sum of money would be available for off site affordable housing. 20% of properties built need to be of a social housing nature, that would be 13 properties in a block of 64 apartments. How does the sum of money equate to 13 properties and where would these be built?
- The site was earmarked for a supermarket, a facility needed within this area, why has this not progressed? This is the development local residents would like to see in the area as more amenities are required;
- The green space near New Islington Tram stop cannot be relied upon to provide outdoor space for this development;
- Greater weight is being given to delivering new homes than the health and wellbeing of existing residents;
- This application should wait until the whole elected committee is sitting again.

#### Director of Planning

Points which have been raised by the objectors with regards to height, appearance, daylight and the decision making process are dealt with in detail within the report.

It is acknowledged that a request was made to undertake a site visit from within an objector's property in order to determine the impacts on this home. There was no requirement in this instance to enter the objector's apartment. An external visit has been made to the site including understanding the relationship of the site to the Hat Box.

The height of the Hat Box is 8 storeys as outlined in the printed report. This consists of a ground floor (car parking area) and 7 upper floors of residential accommodation. The proposed development is 11 storeys and this consists of a ground floor entrance lobby, car park and other functional areas with 10 upper floors of residential accommodation.

The report acknowledges that the proposed development would need to be acoustically treated to deal with the noise from the surrounding road network and proximity to the tram lines. The same considerations would have been given to the Hat Box development. It is not considered that there would be any unduly harmful impacts that would warrant refusal of the application in terms of noise generated due to the tram running between the two buildings. Noise from construction activities are temporary and can be carefully managed.

The report outlines that this development cannot support a 20% affordable housing contribution. The an independent review of the viability report determines that a 5.8% contribution would be viable and ensure that the scheme remains deliverable in its current form

The proposal is considered to be an appropriate response to this site within this part of the City Centre. The recommendation remains Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a legal agreement which would secure a financial contribution towards affordable housing in the City.