

## **Review of Application 20/02630/HOUSE**

- 1.1 I submit this letter to notify the committee of my client's objection. The council's statements have not been quoted due to the specific word count; However, I am willing to discuss these during the committee.
- 1.2 Size and Scale: This application is outside of the settlement boundary and, thus, must comply with policy C6.
- 1.3 Application 19/01624/HOUSE validates that the proposed size of the extensions is contrary to Policy C6. This is emphasised in the Parish Council Objections in which they conclude "*overdevelopment*".
- 1.4 Character: The council's assessment states that as the ridge height and the size are subservient then the proposal is acceptable. As above we argue this is not the case; however, Policy C6 states that the scale of the enlargements has to be subservient as to "*not impact the character of the existing dwelling.*"
- 1.5 In relation to this specific dwelling the proposed addition is detrimental to its character contrary to Policy C3.
- 1.6 This building is thatched and visible from a public footpath making its character important within the local identity. An increase of 77% in volume ensures that the thatched character of the dwelling will be diminished. At this size no longer complimentary.
- 1.7 Therefore, I disagree with the statement made within the council's case at 6.4.

- 1.8 In addition, it is confirmed in paragraph 6.4, that there is a discrepancy between the measurements provided by the applicants and the council. The large scale combined with the proposed materials has a detrimental impact on the character of the building, the AONB and the neighbouring footpath, conflicting with i), ii) and iii) of Policy C6.
- 1.9 This further conflicts with ADPP5, Policy CS19, Policy ENV.18 and Policy ENV.24, (C) of the WBDLP,
- 1.10 No special circumstances are proposed to validate this impact: Existing complies with space standards whilst building has already been “modernised”.
- 1.11 The proposal states in 6.4 that the development is “clearly visible” from the footpath, thus, out of character in regard to design as mentioned above.
- 1.12 The proposed materials are not matching in relation to a non-designated heritage asset; conflicting with paragraph 189 and 196 of the NPPF.
- 1.13 Amenity: The two-storey part of the extension contains a height of 6.9 metres and protects by 6.3 metres.
- 1.14 The council state that “*Given the modest eaves height... the additional shadow cast...would fall largely within the application site*”. The impact of overshadowing is relevant from the proposed ridge height, even with the separation distance the significant height will have an impact, especially from the ground floor kitchen.
- 1.15 Misleading/Inaccurate information: Within the support letter which is acknowledged by the officer it states that my client plans to implement

a similar extension. This is incorrect as the proposal only has a projection of 1.5m.

1.16 Misleading figures: Volume is larger, eaves height used for amenity assessment.

1.17 The planning officer has not visited the site; failing to see the detrimental impact on character, AONB and neighbouring amenity.

1.18 Parish council objection is valid

Word Count = 500 Words