

Applicant's comments in respect of application no:  
19/02853/FUL

**Planning and Licensing Committee Meeting – 15 January 2020**

**Agenda Item 09 - Item 06 - 19.02853.FUL - Court Cottage, Brockhampton.**

**Spoken representation by the Applicant – Nicholas Barrett**

Good afternoon Madam Chairman and Members

To give you some context, this application is for an extension to make the cottage a suitable house to which I can retire. I am in my seventieth year and have issues with my knees, one of which was operated on last year and further surgery is suggested.

The proposal provides a kitchen at ground floor level and a bedroom on the first floor designed to allow access for future mobility needs. The bathroom will be on the same level as the bedroom – currently access to the bathroom is via several sets of stairs (as shown on the photographs which I hope you have)

I have lived in the village for over 25 years, and this application is so important to our family as not only will it provide a retirement home for me, but will allow my daughter to move into my present home next door with her young family.

A significant number of the properties in the village have gone to weekenders, or are now holiday lets, which has made it increasingly unaffordable for those who work locally to live in the village. Both my daughter and her husband work in nearby rural businesses. So, this application is our only solution to help care for our entire family, and to allow my daughter to return to the community in which she grew up.

With regard to the building: the officer report refers to an extension added to Rose Cottage next door as an acceptable precedent for us to follow. However, this would result in a double gable with a valley in the middle. The proposal provides a more harmonious and balanced aspect when viewed from the adjacent footpath, and respects the footprint of the original

Turning to the Conservation Area: the report suggests that the proposal fails to be subservient in height, but the extension 0.3 meters lower in both eaves and ridge height compared to the original cottage.

The report goes on to state that the proposed bay window is out of character, despite there being a bay window on the existing cottage and on similar properties in the village (as shown on the photographs)

Critically, the report clearly states that the extension will more than double the footprint of the original house. However, this is just not the case

The existing footprint is 61 square metres. The overall footprint as proposed is 104 square metres. This will be an increase of only 40%, not more than 100% as suggested in the officer's report.

The officer report also fails to give any weight to the proposed removal of a very large outbuilding at the rear of the cottage and a prominent parking space.

The overall proposal involves a net loss of 90 square metres.

This is not how the officer report portrays the application.

We have discussed our plans with the parish council and all our neighbours - who are pleased that this application could allow a young family to move back into the village - and they are confused by the recommendation from officers.

I therefore respectfully ask you to permit the application.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak today.