

Project: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (2 UNITS TOTAL)
Site: LAND AT THE REAR OF 2 ASH CLOSE, SUMMERHILL
Applicant: MURRIGHT LIMITED
LPA reference: P/2021/0558

Description: CODI 2 ANNEDD / ERECTION OF 2 DWELLINGS

Document: SCHEDULE OF LPA COMMENTS
WITH RESPONSES
Prepared by: MATTHEW ASHTON RIBA
MGMA ARCHITECTS LIMITED
Date of issue: 02.09.2021
Document status: LPA ISSUE

MGMA ARCHITECTS LIMITED
ORIEL CHAMBERS SUITE 37
14 WATER STREET
LIVERPOOL
L2 8TD

+44 (0) 151 236 6627
studio@mgma-architects.co.uk

	NOTE	
	Generally, comments are added to follow as they are received and responses are added adjacent as issued. Where an additional response has been provided to an earlier comment, it will be found adjacent. Revised drawings issued are listed at the rear of the document.	
	LPA COMMENT	AGENT RESPONSE
1	CASE OFFICER (26.08.2021) - The dwellings, by virtue of their siting, would cause some significant overshadowing impacts to one another, and would also result in some overbearing impacts. Local Planning Guidance Note 20 sets out the general principles to follow when assessing impacts of building proposals to neighbouring properties, particularly having regard to impacts on light. The plots and dwellings themselves require re-siting to ensure overshadowing impacts to habitable rooms are avoided and that there are no overbearing impacts. - The layout has also resulted in parking for the eastern most plot being located in front of the dwelling, which should generally be avoided where possible. Re-siting the properties may help to overcome this. - I am still waiting for comments from the Highway Authority as it stands, as soon as these are received, I will send them on to you. - In terms of impacts to neighbouring properties, this appears to be acceptable at this stage, however I am waiting to be able to formally measure the distances between the existing and proposed dwellings at this stage. - Can you please confirm the size of the garden areas serving both dwellings?	26.07.2021 We will wait for the highways comments before responding in full to the points raised. In the interim, I am pleased to confirm the garden areas as follows: Property A (left hand side) private rear garden: 87.2m² Property B (right hand side) private rear garden: 77.9m² 06.08.2021 The attached sunlight/ shading study has been prepared to illustrate the consideration given to daylighting and sunlight in the composition of the dwellings on the site. It demonstrates how the siting of the dwellings in the stepped arrangement as submitted has been carefully considered to ensure responsiveness to the daylight conditions during the course of the day. The stepped arrangement improves provision of private rear garden amenity space, particularly to property A (left hand side). It is noted that an offset arrangement could create an overbearing impact were the adjacent property an extension, and therefore a change to existing conditions. The application by contrast presents a new build proposal, and the stepped siting of the dwellings has been carefully considered to balance the site orientation and geometry, the aspect of the properties, and the dwelling layouts responsive to daylighting.

		The tapered nature of the site results in the configuration of parking to the front of the properties. An open, shared driveway is the most effective layout and allows for planting at the boundaries and adjacent to the dwellings. If the local authority would consider a reduction in the provision of car parking spaces from three per dwelling to two, the amount of car parking visible in front of the dwelling would be reduced, whilst still providing sufficient parking comparable to the adjacent sites. The pre-application enquiry (reference ENQ/2020 /0032 dated 04.03.2020) stated that a minimum garden area of 50m² would be required. With reference to the garden areas shown on the submitted drawings and confirmed by email 26.07.2021 (see above) it can be seen that the amount of private rear garden provision for each property substantially exceeds the minim requirements.
3	HIGHWAYS OFFICER (16.08.2021) Telephone conversation to review the site layout as submitted. Further investigation requested: • Improve the parking layout, if possible to achieve adjacent (side-by-side) spaces rather than the stacked arrangement on the submitted proposals. • Consider a reduction in parking provision to provide 2 spaces per dwelling to achieve adjacent parking bays.	19.08.2021 The attached revised site plan drawing 9-003_101 revision C shows an amended parking layout providing 2 spaces per dwelling in an adjacent arrangement. The revised layout allows for a more standard access to the highway in common with other driveways in the local area. It is hoped the revised design satisfies the highways comments.
2	CASE OFFICER (16.08.2021) I have read through the assessment provided on 6th August. Whilst I acknowledge the justification put forward, I do not consider that this is sufficient to overcome the impact the proposals would have on one another in terms of overshadowing.	19.08.2021 In light of the LPA response (16.08.2021) to the additional supporting information submitted 06.08.2021, it is assumed that the proposed design as submitted would not be approved.

	The 45 degree guideline, whilst a guideline only, remains relevant and is generally a good indicator of whether proposals are considered to be acceptable or not in terms of overshadowing. My previous comments made in respect of this remain.	To progress the application, the attached revised design proposals have been prepared. The following points are noted: • The revised design substantially reduces the stepped plan to address the concerns of overshadowing. • The revised plan complies with the 45° guideline. • The plan positions have been altered slightly, and the revised amenity provision for each property is as follows: A - 87.2m² B - 77.9m² It is hoped that the revised design proposals satisfy the overshadowing comments and that the application can be approved on this basis.
3	CASE OFFICER (24.08.2021) Thanks for sending revised plans. Do you have a contextual rear elevation you can send me please? Are the proposed parking spaces provided sufficient to allow turning of vehicles wholly within the curtilage of the site and independently of one another? Can you also please provide details of the proposed materials to be used on each dwelling? From the plans, it appears that this is render but can you please confirm. I assume solar panels are proposed on the roofs.	24.08.2021 Thanks for your email. I will prepare a contextual rear elevation for submission, please bear with me. There is not sufficient space to turn a vehicle wholly within the curtilage of the site to the front of the dwellings. The revised parking layout represents the closest possible arrangement to the driveways of other properties on the street. The proposed materials are described on drawing 9-003_103 revision B. The elevations are faced in render. A solar PV panel array is proposed for each dwelling on the south-east facing roof slope. 02.09.2021 Further to my email of 24th August, I am pleased to attach the drawing 9-003_102 revision C Proposed Contextual Elevations with the added rear elevation as requested.

	SUMMARY OF OBJECTION RECEIVED	AGENT RESPONSE
-	-	-
-	-	-

REVISED DRAWINGS/ DOCUMENTS ISSUED TO LPA POST-SUBMISSION			
NO.	REVISION	DATE ISSUED	TITLE
-	-	06.08.2021	Sunlight/ Shading Impact Study
9-003_101	C	19.08.2021	Proposed Site Plan
9-003_102	B	19.08.2021	Proposed Contextual Elevations
9-003_103	B	19.08.2021	Proposed Plans + Elevations
9-003_104	A	19.08.2021	Proposed Block Plan
9-003_102	C	02.09.2021	Proposed Contextual Elevations