

Trust you're well? I've noted the comments of your Landscape colleague Harry Mitchell CMLI, and would like to submit the following response:

Mr Mitchell appears confused as regards the differences between the extant and revised layouts – despite the GIFA increasing by 761 sqm (23%) to 4095sqm, the footprint of the building will actually reduce by 117 sqm (7%) to 1,600 sqm, therefore the site coverage of built form has actually reduced – resulting in a greater area of amenity space.

However, providing sufficient amenity space as required by Policy DM7 is not merely about quantum but rather useable space, therefore it is important to consider the impacts of these changes (as highlighted by the overlaid line shown on the revised site plan attached) upon future occupiers residing in all four wings of accommodation, as follows:

- North facing northern wing: Very similar level of amenity space provided (note this is the tightest elevation to the site boundary)
- South east facing northern wing: Enhanced space due to car park being moved east
- South west facing northern wing: Very similar level of amenity space
- North east facing southern wing: Enhanced space due to car park being moved east
- North west facing southern wing: Increased quantum and useable space
- South facing southern wing: Much improved quantum and useable space due to removal of retaining wall and levelling-out of grounds. The following screenshots highlight (in pink) the difference in useable space to the south of the building – which is clearly markedly improved.
-



I trust the above and the attached serves to demonstrate that the revised scheme actually improves not just the quantum but the useability of amenity space for residents, through better use of site levels, thus opening-up a greater proportion of the site for use by residents.

Notwithstanding the above, it is important to remember that the proposed development is for a Care Home, providing 24 hour care to residents, who are largely immobile and unlikely to be able to make significant use of the external grounds unless accompanied and supported individually, no matter how extensive the grounds. The revised proposals compare very favourably with other similar Care Home developments and therefore continue to represent appropriate levels of on-site amenity space and more than satisfactory outlooks for all residents. Should you be any further doubt

of this please consider the supporting documents including Design & Access Statement and the Planning Statement in detail.

Many thanks

Andy

Andy Marshall MRTPIA
Planning Director