

Quill Cottage – Applicant submission for committee

Our ambition is straightforward. We wish to create a better home for our family by replacing an unattractive 4 bedroom bungalow with an attractive and sustainable, 4 bedroom home of high quality design and construction.

We would like to address the WAPC agenda report, with the hope that our application, which is widely supported by neighbours and local residents, receives a fair hearing at committee.

1. Height

This is a two storey dwelling with reduced eaves and bedrooms pushed into the loft space. There is no scope, as in WAPC agenda, 1.1, to provide further accommodation in the loft. As the officer rightly identifies, the available loft height is a maximum of 1.6m at the ridge.

The proposed property will be 30cm higher and not 1.7m higher than the telegraph pole, as suggested by the officer in WAPC site photographs page 12. This photo is misleading due to perspective. Neighbouring dwelling The Glenn is circa 2.5m higher than the proposed dwelling. Relative building heights are demonstrated, to scale, on drawing 062A

2. Size

WAPC agenda, 1.6 details existing GIA as the sum total of individual room areas. By RICS definition GIA includes internal structures. As measured on CAD, existing GIA is 178sqm, not 165sqm.

WAPC agenda, 6.8 provides an analysis of the scale of the existing and proposed dwellings. The figures are based on part of the existing bungalow. As the officer notes: *It is important to note that the measurements of the existing dwelling are based on what is visible from the public domain, the current bungalow is staggered rather than flush as the proposed dwelling is, this is to assess the size in terms of visual impact:*

We strongly object to this as a method of analysis and believe that it is fundamentally misleading to committee. Policy C7 does not differentiate between parts of the dwelling. There are large parts of the proposed dwelling that would not be visible from the public domain, yet this is not accounted for.

The D&A statement provides a true comparison:

Footprint: existing 197.5sqm, proposed 180.6sqm, decrease 8.5%

GIA: existing 178sqm, proposed 287sqm, increase 61.2%

Frontage: existing 22.23sqm, proposed 15.19sqm, decrease 31.6%

3. Quality

WAPC agenda, concludes that dormers are inappropriate 6.27, and that the proposed materials are alien to the street scene 6.29.

We disagree, and propose that the designs meet with the predominant characteristics outlined in the Inkpen Village Design statement p15:

- i The majority of houses are two storey and constructed of red brick
- ii Some roofs are thatched but more generally roofs are tile or slate at 45 degree pitch set low on the external walls
- iii The first floor ceiling is often in the roof space with dormer windows
- iv Windows are generally side hung timber casements

Notwithstanding this, we would accept a condition requiring final approval of external materials.

4. Landscape

WAPC agenda, 6.26 objects to the brick landscape wall within the site. We will omit this from the application if conditional to approval.