APPLICATION NO: 15/02043/COU		OFFICER: Miss Michelle Payne
DATE REGISTERED: 21st November 2015		DATE OF EXPIRY : 16th January 2016
WARD: Leckhampton		PARISH:
APPLICANT:	Arnica Dental Care	
LOCATION:	73 Leckhampton Road, Cheltenham	
PROPOSAL:	Change of use of the ground and first floor from C3 (residential) use to D1 (dental clinic) use in association with existing D1 use at basement	

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION

75 Leckhampton Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL53 0BS

Comments: 16th February 2016

1. We are concerned that our privacy will be invaded by the windows directly overlooking onto the side of our house and into our family garden, if planning is approved. See new surgery 3 and staircase window upper floor where new surgery will be recovery and staff room. We therefore would request a condition be made, that these windows would be opaque glass.

2. Noise from dentists drill etc and staff. The new surgery room (ground floor/surgery 3) which opens onto the decked balcony (directly next to ours). If the doors/windows were opened there would certainly be an increase in noise levels, I believe that this has not been taken into consideration by the Environmental Health officer. We request therefore a condition be made that the doors would not be open during surgery times, similar to planning restriction made for Vanilla Hair salon in Rodney Road, Cheltenham.

3. We also strongly disagree with highway planning TRICS report re-only two additional vehicles arriving per hour. Patients are going to Arnica for Specialised Sedation for nervous patients and Implants, which means that patients will take more time to recover from procedures than that of a normal dentist. Patients can also arrive early to appointments, extenuating the problem. Has this been considered in this survey? This as well as the additional staff and owners cars, parking we feel will certainly exceed that reported in the survey and certainly limit parking facilities for friends and family of the other residents close by.

4. If the plans were to be approved, there would make a very strong case for additional parking restrictions outside the adjacent properties on safety grounds.