

Objection to application ref: 25/14981/PINS

Max Ochel and Amy Ward

2 January 2026

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

We live at no. [REDACTED]

Firstly, we would like to note that we are not opposed to the development of the site in principle. However, there are several issues that are of concern that we feel must be addressed in order to make the proposal acceptable in relation to planning policy and to minimise significant negative impact on the existing dwellings and surrounding streets.

A major issue is the lack of car parking spaces for the proposed new dwellings. Parking on Brentry Avenue and Tenby Street is already congested and frequently used as free parking for non residents. Whilst we appreciate that the near city centre location of the site and strong links to public transport justify a zero-parking scheme, the reality is that adding 8 new dwellings (all 3 and 4 bedroom flats) will add a massive amount of additional vehicles to the surrounding streets. This will be further impacted on by the recently approved 'car free' development of 9 new apartments on Sarah Street ref: 24/02988/F. With potential further parking pressure added by the major development pending planning consideration on Barrow Road ref: 24/04886/F, which proposes 390 new residential units with only 23 car parking spaces. The only feasible solution to this issue is the introduction of a Residents' Parking Scheme (RPS) to Brentry Avenue and Tenby Street which prioritises the existing residents of these streets. Whilst we appreciate that the mechanism for introducing a RPS is complex, it has to be taken into account in the consideration of this application that the proposal will have a significant detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties. We also believe that support for an RPS would be strong from the existing residents.

Another area of major concern is the impact on the privacy and amenity of no. 41 Brentry Avenue (and to a lesser degree the impact on no. 40 and no. 39). The proposed floor plans show windows opening directly onto the garden of no. 41. Whilst these are noted as 'obscure glazed' in an attempt to maintain some degree of privacy they would be particularly invasive to the privacy of the private garden of no. 41. Furthermore, in relation to fire safety and the Building Regulations it is likely that these windows will need to provide a means of escape, which means a minimum opening of 450mm at a height of max. 1100mm from internal floor level, which contradicts the planning guidance of non opening windows below 1.7m from internal floor level. The middle bedroom of Flats 1, 4 and 8 also looks directly across the gardens of no. 41 and the other houses in the terrace. This is especially compromising on the upper level flats. This issue makes the proposal non compliant with planning policies DM27, DM30 and BCS21. If Flats 1, 4 and 8 could be reconfigured to remove the windows overlooking no. 41 we would have no further objection in relation to this issue. It is also worth noting that the wall in question is a party structure and will thus need agreement from the owners of no. 41.



As an additional note, looking at the proposed plans it appears that insufficient private external amenity space is provided for the proposed units. It is likely that the proposed scheme is generally larger than is appropriate for the site. Reducing the size of the flats will provide an opportunity to address the privacy and amenity issues.

Thank you for considering our concerns,

Yours faithfully,

Max Ochel and Amy Ward