

## Applicant submission for area committee meeting 23 Sept - Quill Cottage 20/01083/FUL

It may not be the best way to begin a submission but it grieves me how this application has been dealt with. Despite the committee's recommendation and my persistent requests for a meeting, this has been refused by the Planning Officer. We have relied on the goodwill of Councillor Cole to share with us the committee meeting Agenda and understand what the Planning Officer thinks. There is much to comment on but I have stuck to the most important points.

### Procedural Matters

The Planning Officer 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

### Principle of Development

Measurements and drawings have been supplied and broadly agreed although for some reason the Planning Officer has disregarded half the existing bungalow in some of her figures. We believe this is fundamentally misleading to committee and gives the impression we want to build something far larger and grander than we do. This is not a 'substantial house'. At the submission stage a key drawing failed to load on the Planning Portal but it illustrates perfectly what the impact would be from the street. Councillor Cole and Rowles both have a copy but the Planning Officer has chosen not to share it with members (or for that matter any other documents we recently sent over).

Much has been said about the size of what we want to build but I don't believe members have a clear view. There is a single sentence in the Planning Officer's proposal which illustrates perfectly what we have designed – 6.13 of the report on page 99 states that the increase in volume is only 33% between existing and proposed. **This means that through clever design, reduced height and using the loft as habitable space we have managed to effectively add another storey onto a house of a similar footprint by only increasing the capacity by 1/3!** Disagreement over the presentation of figures can be put to one side when you consider this.

### Character and Appearance

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.

I will gladly answer any questions and hopefully you will have the chance to see the 'missing drawing' that neatly demonstrates our very modest 33% increase in volume.