Dear Sir/Madam,

**Planning ref: 2017/00541/FUL**

I write in respect of your letter of 15 June 2017 regards the resubmission of the planning application for Northcliffe Lodge in Penarth, the location of which adjoins my property (37 Dyfed, Northcliffe).

I would like to **register my continuing objection to the proposal**. The impact on me and a significant number of my neighbours remains unreasonable. I note that revisions have been made to the proposal; although these are claimed to reduce the visual impact of the proposal, they do nothing to mitigate the broader impact on those who live in properties adjoining the site.

I noted in my original letter of objection to the original application (dated 27 January 2016) that although wary of the potential impact of the development on the surrounding properties (noise and disturbance, sight lines), I was not opposed to the development of the site in principle.

I did, however, flag a number of key concerns. Of note:

* The bulk of Block B is similar to the height of the existing foliage and is considered as being within reasonable bounds. However, the Eastern end of Block B (bottom of an 'L' shape) advances significantly beyond the line of the majority of the building and as far down the slope as Block C. It will therefore stand out prominently from the remainder of the proposed development and in consequence is overbearing and unreasonably intrusive; its height is the same as rest of the Block despite being located further down the slope and it immediately abuts the Northcliffe grounds. I would strongly urge that this part of the plan be amended.

Having compared the revised levels to those submitted as part of the original application, it is apparent that the size, height and location of this block appears unchanged, and my objections therefore remain.

I flagged two further concerns with the application in my original letter of objection. These remain valid.

* Any development should be mindful of the wider slope system, including the portion in front of the existing Northcliffe flats. Recent slippages have indicated that this portion of the slope is not stable; those efforts taken to secure the Northcliffe Lodge site should similarly secure the stability of the full breadth of the slope system.
* The site is heavily vegetated and contains a significant number of mature trees (many of which are subject to tree preservation orders). The development should seek to retain the character of the site via (where possible) retention of existing foliage and (where not possible) appropriate replanting.

I note also that based on the levels documentation, there has been a significant and somewhat perplexing increase in the height of Block C (28m as per the original application, 33.9m in the revised). This increase would, if accurate, gives further cause for concern.

Regards,

Richard Palmer