

## **Design and Access Statement**

### **4 Peterhouse Close**

#### **1 no. dwellinghouse, detached garage and vehicular access**

### **The Site**

The application site sits within a rectangular plot to the south of a cul-de-sac of 10 residential bungalows within the West Meads estate. The properties are of a similar appearance with no openings within the roof slopes and deep open front lawns meaning that the properties are set back from the road. There is a uniform character and appearance to the properties, with detached single bay flat roof garages straddling the boundaries.

### **The proposal**

A new residential bungalow is proposed to be sited to the east of the existing bungalow within the existing garden. The existing garage, vehicular access and parking is proposed to be retained to service the new property. A detached garage is proposed to the west of the existing house in line with the style and position of the nearby garages serving number 2 Peterhouse Close and number 2 Cambridge Drive. The existing lean-to would be reduced width to allow external access between the bungalows.

### **Sustainable Location**

The site is considered to be within a sustainable location as it is within the built up area with shops, public transport facilities and local services all within walking distance.

No new roads are required to accommodate this proposal which would utilise the existing infrastructure and the area is already serviced by the Council for refuse collection.

### **Visual amenities**

The proposed bungalow would be of a height, design, size, scale and of an appearance that would be sympathetic to the cul-de-sac and surrounding estate.

The existing plot measures approximately 1000 square metres and would be divided into two. The existing lean-to, positioned to the east of number 4, would be reduced in width to accommodate the new bungalow.

The rear garden of the new bungalow would measure, at its closest distance 8m in depth.

The existing boundary treatment to the rear garden includes 1.8m Close Boarded Fences to the east and south elevations. The neighbour to the east includes a 2m plus mature and well maintained evergreen hedge. A 1m wire fence is positioned on the western boundary with the neighbour's (no.2 Cambridge Drive) mature hedge growing into this at least 2m in height.

The front gardens primarily comprise of garages, driveways, lawns and a few shrubs and a small tree is close by. No means of enclosure are proposed to the front gardens and this open plan character would be retained.

The proposed property would have a footprint of 120 sqm and would sit within a plot measuring 430 sqm. Meaning that, the property would occupy approximately 28% of the plot, which would be comparable with the properties in the area and would not form cramped and/or overdeveloped site. Sitting comfortably within the plot and replicating the pattern of development in the area, without appearing cramped. The sense of spaciousness would be retained by the set back position of the property from the road and the deep open plan front gardens.

The refusal of outline permission for a bungalow here in the 80's is appreciated. Policy approach to development has changed considerably since this time. Higher densities are generally considered to be a more effective use of land and in any case the existing plot is considered to be the size of a double plot for this area and would accommodate the proposed property without appearing overdeveloped. Similar in size to no.3 and 5 Peterhouse Close directly opposite the site.

The combination of the factors discussed above would, to my mind, provide a property that would fit into the cul-de-sac without causing harm to the visual amenities of the area.

### **Neighbouring amenities**

The proposal has been carefully considered and designed to limit the impact on the neighbouring properties.

Number 4 and 4a would be in a reasonably close flank to flank relationship, approximately 3m apart. The resultant relationship here would not be at all unusual in an urban setting and would not result in an overbearing impact.

There would a larger gap between the proposed dwelling and number 6, as a result of the garages straddling the boundary. The distance between the flanks would measure 6m and 9m respectively. Furthermore, this neighbour has a mature hedge and greenhouse close to the boundary, between the flanks. The new bungalow would not encroach a 60 or 45 degree angle from the closest habitable openings to the front and rear. These factors would ensure that any impact on the living conditions arising from the proposed dwelling would be mitigated.

To the rear the back to back gardens would separate the properties and as no first floor accommodation is proposed there would not be an overlooking issue. The back to back distance would measure 14.5m which is sufficient distance between bungalows.

The properties to the over side of Peterhouse Close are separated by the road itself and given the open character of the frontages the impact in this direction would not be harmful.

### **Garages and parking**

The proposed garage would be positioned in line with the nearby garages that serve number 2 Peterhouse Close and 2 Cambridge Drive the proposed garage would be set within the site slightly away from the boundary. There is an alleyway closest to

the proposed garage that provides the occupant of no.2 Cambridge Drive pedestrian access to their bungalow. Therefore, the additional impact from the proposed garages in terms of neighbours' amenities would be limited. Visually, the garage has been designed with a flat roof to match those within the cul-de-sac. The additional footprint if proposed to allow the garage to be used for the parking of a modern motor vehicle, which are generally larger than in the past and for cycle storage to be accommodated within rear section of the garage, improving the transport options for the existing property.

In order to accommodate the new garage a new permeable driveway and crossover is proposed as per the submitted location and block plans. The road is a residential cul-de-sac with low speed and amount of movements therefore the additional new access is unlikely to cause harm to highway safety.

### **Bin and Cycle storage.**

The block plan provided clearly identifies allocated areas for bin storage to both properties. Cycle storage would be accommodated in the form of a lockable garden timber shed to the rear garden of the new bungalow and within the proposed garage for the existing property.

### **Drainage**

Connection to the existing sewerage network is proposed. There are no known problems with sewerage water capacity here and in any case the addition of one property is unlikely to be harmful. Surface water would be disposed of to soakaways limiting the additional impact on the sewerage network.

### **Biodiversity**

There is no evidence of Protected Species using this site and the existing garden is primarily maintained lawn framed with flower beds. This summer no wild birds have nested within the site.

There is a small tree to the south west corner however this would not be affected by this proposal. The small tree to the front (north east) of the site would also be unaffected.

### **Conclusion**

This is a sustainable site that would accommodate the proposal comfortably without causing unacceptable harm to the visual amenities of the area and to the neighbours.

Since the 1980's refusal policy has changed significantly. The 1980's application was for outline only and did not provide details of the proposed bungalow's siting or design. Therefore, the Authorities decision that a bungalow here would be cramped and overdeveloped is questionable, when it has been clearly demonstrated in this DAS that the plot is large, for the area, and the proposed bungalow would compliment the pattern of development in the area without appearing cramped and overdeveloped.