

Ref: DAS/001/SD

Design and Access Statement

Dear Planning Team,

The application before you seeks to amend the drawings associated with the reserved matters application PA18/04475. The application that was originally drawn for the site was drawn assuming the site was flat and created a standard 2 storey dwelling. When visiting the site, it is clear that the site is far from flat –there is more than a 2.5 meter level change across the site.

The nature of the level change resulted in foundations that were required to go down almost an entire storey to achieve good ground. The contractor/developer when undertaking this work has created a lower ground floor as part of the construction. Without it, the dwelling would not have been viable, as the cost of constructing a lower ground would have all but been met, without any way of recovering the money spent. The lower ground floor is only perceived from within the context of the site and has little impact on adjacent properties.

The proposed dwelling as constructed on site allows for a front porch. The front porch is within the dimensions of an allowable porch under permitted development. The permitted development rights were not removed from the site and the porch would have been allowable on completion of the currently approved plans. As such this porch should not be contentious.

The rear dormer to the garage roof is also allowable under permitted development and as such should not be contentious.

The front dormer to the garage is an insertion that would not be seen to be permitted development, but should be seen to be non-contentious. The window within the dormer is more than 25 meters from the facing window on the adjacent property. It is also of note that there is a significant level change as well as in situ foliage between the dwellings. As such there can be no overlooking or right to privacy issues. The dormer is within the mass of the roof, and as such it cannot be an issue of mass or amount. In terms of planning this is a relatively minor insertion.

Throughout the application there are several alterations to sizes and proportions of the fenestration. This type of amendment is typically dealt with under minor amendment and can be seen to be non-contentious. If there is any fenestration that is of particular concern please advise and we can provide more information to support the application.

We note that within the minor amendment application that was previously submitted in error on this site, there was comment raised by the adjacent neighbour that the raised deck to the rear allowed for overlooking to their property. We would remark that the approved dwelling is shown with a flat rear access. The would suggest a level rear garden. With no other drawings to suggest otherwise this must be the assumption. As such the cut back of the level garden to the rear of the ground floor as proposed can only be perceived as a

76 Hyde Park Road, Plymouth, PL3 4RG

T: 01752 223 686 E: studio@erclc.co.uk

www.erclc.co.uk

betterment. Overlooking cannot be achieved from the lower ground floor garden which is now the context on the boundary. With this in mind it is clear that these comments are not material to this application and should carry no weight.

I believe this to be a straightforward section 73 application to vary the conditions of the approved application. We are aware that the LPA are overburdened with applications, and we are happy to provide any additional information that may be required to allow for a timely decision on what is a very straight forward application. Please also advise if 3D visualisations would be of use to allow for ease of interpretation.

Kind Regards,



Eric Davis BA(Hons), BArch, PgDip, ARB