

7th June 2023

4/23/2094/0F1 - SHEELIN, WOODEND, EGREMONT

Dear Chloe ands Nick.

Thankyou for your response to my client application.

- You need some context.
- The property has already received planning permission for extensive extensions to the existing dormer and the lower level of the building and I was appointed to carry out the technical details to Building Regulations Stage 3.
- The approved plans have an extension to the existing flat roof dormer and two additional dormers and all four roofs including the the existing flat roof dormer are interlinked and adjoined.
- While all this can be achieved technically it is intricate and detail intensive. Building Regulations approval was achieved; however, I was duty bound to advise the applicant that not only would the works be difficult to achieve he would find it difficult to find a local builder who would take on the challenge as there would be a lot of elements of detail that could cause difficulty in construction and continued maintenance and repair.
- The dwelling is surrounded by woodland and valley gutters and particularly side abutment channel gutters would be vulnerable to blocking up with dead leaf and tree debris building up and this would not be a sustainable medium term to long term solution as it would involve a high levels of vigilance and continual maintenance to ensure the building fabric would not fail.
- The approved proposal roof was an ad hoc collection of different structural elements cobbled together with a preponderance of valley gutters abutment flashing and varying cladding and render materials.
- The previously approved proposals, from an aesthetic point of view, with the configuration of these elements of structure and the reconfiguration of the ground floor rear elevation had architectural relationship to one another formed a distorted and disjointed visual appearance and I could only describe it as a hotch potch of elements that just appear to be assembled at random like some beach hut that has developed organically with no consideration to its appearance.
- This did however receive Planning approval! I assumed that it was because it was on the rear of the building and cannot be seen from any other property other than the adjacent neighbour. Even then there is no view from within the neighbour house.
- The extension cannot be seen from any long views from the A5906 or the service road running parallel to it. The extension cannot be seen from the unnamed road running from east to west to the north of the site from Railway Siding to The old railway station to Croftend House because there are is a high stone wall backed up by dense shrubs and tall trees.
- The dwelling is surrounded by woodland and valley gutters and particularly side abutment channel gutters would be vulnerable to blocking up with dead leaf and tree debris building up and this would not be a sustainable medium term to long term solution as it would involve a high levels of vigilance and continual maintenance to ensure the building fabric would not fail.
- On my advice the applicant asked me if there was a better solution.
- Sometimes the best solutions are simplest and sometime the simplest solutions are the most elegant.
- The resultant design is certainly much simpler and elegant than the previously approve design with a mixture of roof pitches unbalance gables and the existing flat roof extended.
- The revised design considerable simplifies the design into simple structural elements.

- The elements of the new dormer tie into the existing dormer and they not only look much better than the original proposal but are much more sustainable in building construction and maintenance terms.
- The whole rear elevation is also rationalised with the opening forming a logical architectural sequence with windows and doors vertical and horizontal aligned .
- I believe the revised design is better than the previous design approved in many ways:
- Aesthetically the whole of the rear elevation is in balance architecturally and is pleasing to the eye whereas the original approved scheme was disjointed and visually confusing.
- The design is much simpler to build and much easier to maintain and is therefore more sustainable than the previous design which would be a construction headache and a maintenance nightmare.
- The materials used are the same as materials used elsewhere on the building.
- The type and actual material of the cladding I would suggest could be up graded to a modern mineral fibred board cladding boards to add a contemporary feel to the rear of the building which in the reality will only ever be fully enjoyed visually and appreciated by the applicants who will be the only people with a visual link to the rear of the property.

Policy DM18 – Domestic Extensions and Alterations

Proposals for extensions or alterations to existing dwellings will be permitted so long as:

A The scale, design and choice of materials involved respect the character of the parent property with the use of pitched roofs where practicable

- This interpretation of scale and design can be subjective however there can be no concern about the materials as they are generally the same as those already used on the property.
- I believe the building extension is well designed and by extension is also in scale and in proportion. Certainly, it argued that this proposal is much better designed and in proportion than the previous plans approved. I have detailed how the proportions and element relationships have been full considered and form a cohesive plan which is certainly more considered than the previous plans approved.
- My role is not to blindly achieve planning approval with any old design that meet planning criteria but where the design may need to push the planning boundaries challenge them. It was clear to me that while this extension could meet with negativity it should be considered on its merits to provide the applicant with a desirable and attractive extension. What also influence me is the site location and it is patently obvious from all around the site the back of the sheeling cannot be seen from any long medium or short view other than in the back garden of the Sheelin. While I will firmly defend my view that the extension is well design, much better than what has been previously approved, I do think that the privacy of the location should override any aesthetic prevarications you as the planning authority may have.

B They would not lead to a significant reduction in daylighting available to either the parent property or adjacent dwellings.

- This section is not relevant.

C They would not create potential noise nuisance, security or privacy or overlooking problems for residents of either the parent property or adjacent dwellings

Development Management Policies

Copeland Local Plan 2013-2028: Adopted Core Strategy and Development Management Policies

Page 162

- This section is not relevant as there is no impact on the adjacent properties.

D They would not result in a loss of 50% or more of the undeveloped curtilage of the parent property

- The property does not expand the footprint of the application previously approved and certainly does not exceed 50 percent of the cartilage of the property.

Proposals which involve listed buildings or properties within conservation areas must also meet the requirements of Policies ENV4 and DM27.

This policy does not apply to the alteration or extension of beach bungalows, which will not be permitted.

- This section is not relevant.

The application has also received significant neighbour concerns regarding the scale and the need for the number of bedrooms and the potential use as a HMO, holiday let etc. Please can you confirm the dwelling will remain as a single residential dwelling and the set out the requirement for the number of bedrooms?

- The applicant as far I know has no intension of using the house in multiple occupation or for bed and breakfast business. If the applicant did want to run a bed and breakfast, I don't believe there is any legal requirement to inform the planning department.
- I do know that while all the rooms are called bedrooms they can be used as a home office, music room or library and may pursuits which do not again need to be legally notified to the planning authority.
- The client has provided me with the following additional justification.
- Give my Youngest Daughter a Bed Room she's still under 3 and we want to place her bed room closer to the rest of the family (3 Kids and Two Adults)
- Again giving a Bed Room more near the rest of the family will allow us to install bigger bath room for all the family (Existing Bath Room is Very Small See Drawings)
- No not interested in Bed and Breakfast just want a home that's practical.
- Now for Parking we have already established via the UK Land Registry that at the front of our lawn is a Parking space which belongs to Sheelin / Myself.). (I have altered the block plan to reflect the land registry documents the applicant has provided me with).
- Further I have made a minor change to the extension internally to reduce the extension to just one additional bedroom shower room and dressing room. Hopefully this will reassure any one concerned that the building will be sold off to Holiday Inns!

There are also questions regarding the floor levels, given part of the dwelling is lower and the floors are split levels. To address the confusion, please can you either omit the bedroom on the end between the ground and loft floor level from the 'proposed loft floor plan' or add a label that this is this between the two levels?

- I have modified the plans to hopefully address the planning authority's confusion.
- I would have thought the vertical arrangement was very clear on the Sectional Elevation.

For completeness, please can you also update the block plan to include the existing outbuildings and the extent of the existing development within the curtilage of the dwelling.

- I have indicated the extension footprint on the block plan and the 2no garages. There are 2 no. parking spaces in front of the garages and turning and parking at the front of the property for another 2 motor vehicles making a total of six. The applicant does not have and does not intend to have six cars but if he did he could accommodate them.

In addition, significant concerns have been received regarding the parking requirement given the proposed number of bedrooms. I note the front parking is 4.8 metres in width to provide the two spaces, but is there scope to widen the front parking area to allow suitable parking, turning and pedestrian access to the front door? Alternatively, the installation of a new front pedestrian path would cover this.

- The parking to the front of the house is 5.58 Metres wide and 8.40 Metres deep. There is adequate space for two parking spaces and a footpath to the front door. The applicant has had no trouble reaching his front door in the past and I cannot see how an extension to the rear of the dwelling would make any difference top that situation.

- I have amended the drawing to show the applicants ownership more accurately based on the Land registry document and this now includes half of the common drive shared with Beechfield, there is a mutual agreement between owners to enable turn at the rear in front of the garage to enable leaving the site in a forward gear.

Conclusions.

I believe I have answered all your concerns where they are relevant to your policies. In conclusion I would suggest that the extension should be considered as acceptable design whether or not it will be visible to anyone but the applicant.

Further the design has been carried out to actually improve on designs which I believe should have failed to meet with your approval because the design criteria in DM18.

The design has also been carried to make the revised building buildable with simple building technology and sustainable by reducing the maintenance and repair burden on the applicant.

Geoff Wallace