

PROPOSED NEW DWELLING ON LAND ADJOINING LAKELAND VIEW, CHAUCER AVENUE, EGREMONT

DESIGN REPORT:

This report is prepared to respond to earlier comments made about the proposal. It should be read in conjunction with the submitted plans attached.

OVER DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE

See proposed site plan. The site is not overdeveloped. The area of land indicated within the red line boundary is very similar to the adjoining site where a large detached dwelling is sited. The proposed dwelling is accommodated easily within the site boundaries. Car parking provision, turning heads and private amenity space are all located within the boundary of the site.

The words "over development" are therefore incorrect.

IMPACT

A word often used in planning application. It is said that the proposed dwelling will have impact upon its neighbours. This is incorrect in our opinion, (refer to section plan 421/06101/01, file existing_proposed_site_section_additional).

As can be seen from this plan the dwelling is single storey with a flat roof. No windows from habitable rooms face the northern boundary and no.6 Park Home (the Park Home closest to the development site).

The levels proposed show that NO severe impact or overbearing will affect no.6, by the proposed development. A reduced level is proposed to help in this respect and by this reduced level the impact on no.6 will be minimised.

The only window of no.6 affected by this development is the kitchen window and the FFL of no.6 is much higher than the FFL of the proposed dwelling.

Furthermore a 2m solid panel timber fence is proposed to run along the northern boundary, which will screen the proposed dwelling from no.6.

We would also contend that the existing large detached dwelling already built on the adjoining plot impacts far more on Park Home no.7, than our proposal will on no.6 Park Home.

Because of the above factors we do not consider that the proposed new dwelling will have a serious impact on adjoining Park Homes, nor is it overbearing because of its size, proportion and height.

The proposed roof profile was chosen for this reason, to minimise the impact the proposal would have on existing adjoining Park Homes.

MATERIALS

Mention has been made that the proposed use of materials "is not in keeping with neighbouring properties". This is simply not correct.

The large detached dwelling adjoining is rendered, the Park Homes behind the site are of a painted render finish and our proposed dwelling is rendered, and it therefore does blend in properly with its neighbours.

DESIGN

Mention has been made that the design "is not in keeping with neighbouring properties". This is not correct.

Individual designs should be encouraged and one can find many examples of new dwelling designs which are very different to neighbouring properties.

The design of the Park Homes are typical of other Park Home dwellings and should not be copies or imitated.

The large detached dwelling on the adjoining site is of a modern style but completely different to the smaller detached single storey dwelling we propose.

There was no desire to “match” the style of the new dwelling with adjoining dwellings, as it would not have been appropriate for the reasons as given above.

HIGHWAYS

The proposed site is serviced by a new access off Chaucer Avenue. Visibility splays of 2.4m x 40m (standard for 30mph highways), can be achieved in both directions easily, and therefore consider that the proposed new access to the site is acceptable.

FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT

Regarding the Flood Risk Assessment we agree that this was outdated but this was sufficient enough for our previous application on the adjoining property Lakeland View which was within 3m of the watercourse. The proposed dwelling is in excess of 30m from the watercourse. The environment agency have now finished the flood defence works in Egremont and 105 new houses have now been approved to be built by Gleeson Homes which is within the same proximity as our proposed dwelling.

CONCLUSION

I consider that this report answers carefully and concisely all the previous comments made about the proposals, and it should be considered carefully and added to the application file for further consideration.

Wayne Dunn
25/04/24