



MAP Architecture
Studio 307 - Pelican House
144 Cambridge Heath Road
London
E1 5QJ

25th January 2021

Planning Statement

Response to Consultation Comments for 10 Edenhall Close Application

The above planning application has received comments from the owner and prospective buyer of no.12 Edenhall Close and this statement seeks to respond to each point with a view to mitigate their concerns.

We have offered to discuss the project with the prospective buyer (via the current owner) and would be more than happy to have a zoom / phone call if this would help. The best way to contact us is via the following email address rob@map-architecture.co.uk.

Our hope for the project is to create a beautiful, low energy home for our family. We fell in love with the 1970's house and want to extend and restore the property to be in keeping with the mid-century style and proportions whilst improving the energy efficiency of the building.

We appreciate the time taken by the consultees to review the plans and are sorry if this has caused them any concern for their purchase / sale. Although we feel that the current design is within planning policy (see our response to the comments below), we have revised the design of the extension with the hope that this alleviates the consultees concerns and shows that we are willing to compromise in order to foster a good neighbourly relationship.

The revisions can be summarised as follows;

1. **Roof Design** – In order to reduce the mass and scale at the front of the property, the extension roof design has been changed to a hipped roof at the front to avoid the tall gable wall and the forward projecting dormer has been omitted.
2. **Size** – The extension has been reduced in length at both the front and rear to address the concerns about mass and scale further.
3. **Boundary Wall** – The material to the boundary wall has been changed to brickwork with an inbound gutter on the applicant's side of the wall to address concerns about maintenance.
4. **Height** - Overall height of extension has been reduced by 100mm to allow for an inbound gutter and to further reduce the mass and scale.
5. **Rear Window** – The rear window to the main bedroom has been moved further away from the boundary to address concerns about overlooking into the side access of no.12.

Below we have responded to each concern raised by the owner and prospective buyer of no.12.

Mass and Scale (overbearing impact)

- A scheme was submitted to Pre-Application Advice with Reading Council in Autumn 2020 and following comments from the planning team the scheme was reduced in size and scale to bring it in line with planning policy.
- The roof of the original planning scheme was set lower than the height of the original roof to no.10 to ensure that it is subordinate to the host building. Due to the sloping site, this is considerably lower than the ridge on no.12 (circa 2m lower).
- The extension is also set back from the front elevation to reduce the scale and mass from street level and from no.12.
- It is also worth noting that the rear extension to no.12 is circa 4.2m in length from the original rear wall and due to the stepped site has a considerable overbearing impact on the rear windows and rear garden of no.10.
- *Revised Scheme* – The revised scheme seeks to reduce the mass and scale further as outlined above.

Daylighting / Loss of Light

- Following Pre-Application Advice, 45-degree angle test diagrams have been produced to show that the impact on the front bay window of no.12 is well within the BRE guidelines.
- There is no impact on all of the other windows of no.12 .
- The consultees have stated that the width between the two properties is 118cm rather than 125cm as shown on the survey. For the avoidance of doubt the measurement of 118cm has been adopted for the planning application drawings.
- *Revised Scheme* – The revised scheme has further improved the 45-degree angle test diagrams as shown within the revised drawings.

Privacy / Overlooking

- Existing side facing bathroom window will be removed as part of the proposal, thus increasing privacy to the front of no.12.
- Side facing rooflight will face the gable wall of no.12 and will be above 1.7m from floor level (circa 2.3m).
- The rear window to the side extension will largely face the blank brick wall of the 4.2m extension to the rear of no.12 with the remaining view being across the roof. This view is largely the same as the current views out of the rear dormers of no.10.
- The window is in a similar position to the window in the rear elevation of the extension to no.8.
- *Revised Scheme* – The window has been moved over further away from the boundary to make the view out towards no.12 more oblique.

Local Context / Character (scheme not in keeping with adjacent properties)

- No.10 is one of the only properties on the close that is unchanged from the 1970's design with the slender steel columns, flat roof canopy and timber clad dormers as per the original construction.

- The proposed extension seeks to use matching materials, complimentary detailing and roof form at the front of the property to ensure the scheme is cohesive with the local character and in keeping with the original design of the property.

Boundary Wall Concerns

- All work along the boundary will be subject to a Party Wall Award which we will organise in due course.
- The scheme will repair and improve the quality of the current garage wall and it will be left in a much-improved condition once the works are complete.
- Rainwater drainage will be fully compliant with Building Regulations.

Structural Concerns

- A full structural design and calculation package will be produced by a Chartered Structural Engineer, including a method statement for the safe construction and renovation to the new boundary wall.
- The Structural designs and calculations will need to be approved by Building Control prior to work commencing and there will be regular visits to site by a Building Control Inspector.
- Structural works will be subject to a Party Wall Award as noted above.
- Building regulations are much more onerous now than they were in 1970 and the boundary wall will be left in a better, more stable condition after the works are completed.