

Response to Planning Comments – 4/22/2375/0F1

Ms A. Taylor

**Proposed Detached House, on site of Former Dwelling,
Vale View, Egremont**

Date: November 2022

Prepared by : L C S Coe for Day Cummins Ltd

Revision: -

The following document forms a formal response to Copeland Borough Council's and Statutory Consultees' comments regarding the above planning application (Reference CBC emails to DCL between the 5th and 13th October 2022.) This document should be read in conjunction with the specific consultee's correspondence (as emailed by CBC) and revised drawing 5567-01C Proposed Plans and Elevations, as issued to Copeland Borough Council 17 November 2022;

Emailed Comments Copeland Borough Council 05/10/22:

- In order to further reflect the character of the area, the windows on the front elevation have been increased in width. (Refer to revised drawing 5567-01C)
- The comments pertaining to the division of stonework to the front elevation have been considered however, our client prefers the original proposal. We believe the design is such as to reflect the character of the surrounding terraced properties without needing to look like "two" houses. There are a variety of widths to the properties along Vale view, some narrow and others double fronted and we consider the proposal reflects this, in the proportioning of the stone and render on the front elevation.
- Due to the height of the stairs, against the front elevation and with consideration to CDM, the window to the stairwell has not been split as suggested. Image 1 below, illustrates some properties on Bridge End Road, with two terraced elevations next to an 'end' property which, has a 'stair' window opening. While the terraced properties going further up Vale view have a rhythm with regards to the fenestration, the windows are at differing heights and widths so, we do not consider the stair window inappropriate. In addition, the top property of the Vale View terraced has a bay window (Image 2), illustrating that elements of variation are in-keeping, especially for an end property which, our proposal is.
- Our client would have no objection to a full schedule of materials being conditioned as part of any approval.



Image 1 – Bridge End Road Terrace



Image 2 – Bay window to top of Vale View.

Egremont Town Councils comments:

- We note that the Councillors have no objections.
- With regards to the checks that were carried out on the Vale View foundations and report; Building Control have confirmed that they were present at public meetings and given access to surveys conducted by the Environment Agency although, we do not have a copy of any notes/reports. We also understand from Building Control that footage was taken, by a diving team, employed by the EA, that clearly showed scouring had already taken place under other properties along Vale View and as a result, it was left to insurers and property owners to resolve their own scouring issues however, Building Control have commented that to date, no applications for underpinning have been made nor works undertaken to the existing Vale View properties.
- The proposed development is distanced from the main Vale View dwellings and is behind the flood defences. Any proposed foundations/groundworks would be in accordance with Structural Engineers details for their location and the ground conditions of the site, as well as being in compliance with current building regulation requirements.
- Having consulted with EA and Building Control, we understand that the former mill property was lost due to scouring of its foundations, which was worsened for a period, as a result of damage to the adjacent weir and a subsequent storm. The weir has now been repaired and flood defences constructed. The FRA notes that the defences will protect the wider location as well as the immediate site but, that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the wider area.

Flood and Coastal Defence engineers' comments

- We note an objection has been raised however, it is acknowledged that the FRA provides supporting evidence for the proposed development.
- Since the flood defence walls were constructed, we don't believe there has been a recorded flood event on the site and in considering the footprint of the former building (on site during the last flood event) the smaller footprint of the proposed building offers a net gain in flood storage by comparison.
- While the development is not considered a replacement dwelling the site has in the recent past been that of a dwelling. Since its demolition flood defences have been constructed and the proposal takes into account access for their maintenance and that of the adjacent weir, all of which benefit the wider community.

EA Emailed comments dated 06/10/22 and revised comments dated 13/10/22

- As stated, the proposal, specifically its positioning on the site, were a result of discussion with EA Asset Performance team carried out over a some significant timeframe.
- Original requirements from the EA were that; a gap would be needed between the flood wall and proposed development so, that they were structurally independent and that there was enough room for inspections and maintenance. It was also noted that it would be useful for a gap to be provided at the upstream end of the site to enabling machine access to replenish the rip rap at the toe, adjacent to the weir. It was these comments that determined the position of the proposal, to ensure there was no detrimental impact on the flood wall and that future maintenance of the weir was possible.
- While we note that some concerns have been raised, we believe that these can be addressed or are a misunderstanding of the proposal;
 - Any proposed foundations/groundworks would be designed and constructed in accordance with Structural Engineers details for their location and the ground conditions of the site, as well as being in compliance with current building regulations. The design and construction method would take into consideration the proximity to the flood defence wall, to ensure that the proposed development would not apply load to/adversely affect the structural integrity of the flood defence wall foundations.
 - For clarity we have revised the drawing note regarding the SW layout. While we are proposing that the surface water will discharge into the river this would be via a pumped system, over the top of the wall. There has never been the intention to penetrate the flood defence wall.
- Our client would have no objection to a condition requiring additional details and methodologies to be provided and approved before any construction could commence.

UU comments

- We note that UU confirm the proposals are acceptable in principle.
- Our client would have no objection to the proposed condition requiring additional drainage details to be provided and approved before any construction could commence.

Cumbria County Councils Highways:

- We note that Highways have no objections.