

Item 4A

DC/2021/00125 - 10 St Andrews Drive, Crosby.

Mr Stephen Lavin (RAL Architects) –Response to Petitioner and Ward Councillor Statements

Word Count: 644

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the objections raised against our application to replace 10 St Andrews Drive. The clearest way to respond is to address the issues raised by the neighbour's and Councillor Howard's objections point by point.

Whilst the houses in St Andrews Drive are typically bungalows many are not true bungalows and five present 2 storey gables to the street namely numbers 1, 3, 6, 7 and 9. Our drawing L05 shows how number 6 relates to our proposals and you will note the heights are almost identical. Both have a 'bungalow' element bookended with a taller structure.

The proposed houses are designed to avoid overshadowing neighbours. They do not extend 3m above other houses in the street. For the most part both the eaves and ridge of the proposed houses are lower than the surrounding houses. Where the proposed houses are taller, this is kept to the centre of the plot so that any shadow only shades within the plot and does not affect the neighbouring properties. It is important to reiterate that even at its highest point the proposed houses are follow the heights of other houses in the street.

There is absolutely no way the proposed houses could ever cast shade on solar panels on the roofs of any surrounding houses.

The proposed houses combined frontage is 22m. The combined frontage of number 10 St Andrews with its garage is also 22m and the combined frontage of number 8 and its garage is also 22m.

The two proposed houses are therefore extending no wider than the existing on the plot, are lower at the boundaries and the only difference is that there is a gap between them creating two houses rather than one. We do not believe the existence of this gap will adversely affect the quality of the street scene on St Andrews Close. Whilst on a map the properties may alter the urban grain people do not experience their neighbourhood through maps. Regardless, adding rear extensions to houses also changes the urban grain but this would never be considered detrimental to a street scene.

The houses have been designed on the plots to retain all the existing trees on site, and we would be open to a condition being added that states the beech hedge is also retained. Retaining the current driveway access positions ensure that the new development can be screened from the street in much the same way as it is now. The petition stating that trees are endangered by the proposals is not accurate.

The draft planning conditions require bio-diversity enhancement and proposals for this will include bat and bird boxes leading to habitat enhancement rather than harm. The Ecology

report provided with the application found no protected species and the existing house has negligible bat roost potential.

The houses include windows to their side elevations, of these windows the only ones to an elevation overlooking a neighbour are to landings. We have no objection to these being both obscured and fixed.

Both the proposed houses will have the required three off-street parking spaces and there should not therefore be a need for on-street parking.

There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed development would create a wind vortex as suggested in the neighbours' petition.

Unfortunately building works create a degree of disruption to neighbours for a limited period but this is not a valid reason to refuse a planning application as it would effectively become a moratorium on all development.

We are familiar with the geology of the area and the high possibility of peat deposits. Prior to works commencing a site investigation would be carried out and the foundations designed to reflect the findings.

A sustainable drainage system for surface water will ensure the development does not create a flood risk, all hard surfaces will be permeable.

Thank you for your attention.

Stephen Lavin

RAL Architects.