

Applicant submission for area committee meeting 14 Oct - Quill Cottage 20/01083/FUL

Clearly the Planning Officer (PO) has spent a lot of time on this but none of it in consultation with us. Despite the Committee's recommendation there has been a refusal to engage. I've tried to concentrate below on responding to the main points.

Procedural Matters

The PO quotes two Appeal Cases in support of her argument but they are quite different to our application; one sites the proposed dwelling in an entirely different location to the existing and the other application proposes a property with a footprint 260% larger! We propose 10% larger

Appraisal – Principle of Development

Effectively what we're doing is adding a floor to a bungalow. The only difference is we're starting from scratch rather than using the old inefficient building.

Measurements and drawings have been supplied and for the most part adopted by the PO. Previously the figures were misleading to committee, giving the impression we wanted to build something far larger and grander than we do. This is not a 'substantial house'. I'd like to draw your attention to two drawings:

- Amended 062 A – Pro Street Scene
- Amended 060 B – Pro Elevations

Both drawings clearly show a comparison between existing and proposed dwelling as seen from the front. We propose an extra 10% on the footprint and less than 50% increase in height.

C7 has a presumption in favour of replacement dwelling but I agree it must be proportionate. We've gone to great lengths to make sure it is. No one can afford to build 'like for like' and as long as C7 is used to stop a modest increase in size then the Policy effectively stops replacement dwellings. All we're doing is adding a floor to a bungalow.

Appraisal - Character and Appearance

There seems to be much written by the PO regarding what might be seen of the house and from where. This is irrelevant because it's wholly dependent on what we do with the boundary hedges. Rather, the whole existing dwelling must be compared with the whole proposed dwelling. Whether this acts in our favour or not is a matter of opinion.

I take offence to the suggestion we would not build something of a high quality design. We have designed the house using the Village Design Statement on a road where no two houses are similar. I'm not sure how we find agreeable design features other than referring to the Village Design Statement, a document we have followed closely. When it comes to 'green credentials' we submitted a detailed Sustainability Statement with the application and this illustrates our wish to exceed current guidelines in making it environmentally friendly. The current dwelling is grossly inefficient.

The PO gives great weight to conserving and enhancing the landscape, I couldn't agree more. The proposal will be a vast improvement on what is currently there and we have local support.