Response to the proposed "Minor Material Amendment" (Planning Statement) to the permission granted under 17/10780/FUL, dated 15th June 2023.

I have been supportive of this development in principal as expressed in my Representation Letter of 29 June 2016. I understand the desire for Mr Forrester to create a home in this beautiful setting. As expressed to him at the time my concern regarding the proposed development was on the height of the new building within the setting of the Conservation area, and relative to the surrounding properties that includes Listed Buildings. This height concern was addressed to some extent in the permission given as a result of the Case Officers Report of 29th November 2017. I was therefore astonished and concerned to receive notification of a request to modify and remove these conditions in spite of the assessment and compromise already reached.

Section 5 in the above referenced Planning Statement document states:

"Proposed Modifications to Design

The applicant wishes to make the following changes to the approved design in achieving a new consent:

1. *construct a new plant room for PV and air source heat pump equipment*
2. *construct a porch on the front of the building (North elevation)*
3. *raise the roof by 500mm*
4. *installation of photovoltaic panels on the roof's South elevation*
5. *install flint panels to the North and West elevations, only above a line equivalent to the base of ground floor windows."*

I have no comments regarding 1, 2, 4, and 5, and note these – we appreciate the intention to build a more energy efficient house.

Comments on the modification of Condition 2

However, I do not consider "3. raise the roof by 500mm" as necessary or acceptable based on the justification given or in view of the conclusions of the Nov 2017 Case Officers Report. This request adds further to concerns over the height and therefore structural dominance expressed by myself and many residents living in the vicinity of the proposed development (reference **16/04714/FUL** Representation Letters), and in particular, as stated by the 2017 Case Officer Report.

"The principal issues to be considered are impacts on the character of the area (considering particularly the character and appearance of the conservation area) and upon the setting and heritage significance of Box Cottage as a listed building."

This was expressed in 7.4 Condition 5 of the Case Officers Report quoted below:

"….The relative heights of the dwellings has been a key issue in assessing the suitability of the proposal and the relative heights as annotated on the plans provides the precise and enforceable certainty of this."

<u>Justification for increase in height of the planned building</u>

With regard to the justification of this requested increase in height, this has been made solely on the need to install what has been stated as sufficient solar panels. The submitted Planning Statement states:

The design principles of the home will be based on the Solcer house project from Cardiff University, but with the look of the house being more traditional than the prototype home built in Bridgend[1]".

Referencing publicly available material on the Solcer house project I quote:

https://carboncopy.eco/initiatives/solcer-house-affordable-energy-positive-housing

"The south facing roof of the Solcer House is an integrated 4.3kWp PV panel system"

This ballpark can readily be achieved with the existing approved house design with the existing roof area using readily available 400Wp+ panels. (4KWp producing Solar Panels is the recommendation for an existing detached averagely insulated 3 to 4 property of this size in England). In conclusion therefore this is no justification on this basis for an increase in the roof height from the existing approved design.

Comments on the removal of Condition 5

Condition 5 was included for important valid reason that still stands.

Regarding the requested removal of Condition 5. The Case Officer stated in his Feb 2018 report:

Condition 5 requires the finished height of the dwelling to be no higher than as stated on the approved drawings relative to the neighbouring properties but the applicant suggests that is unnecessary and duplicates condition 2. The condition is required however as the 'Proposed Site Elevations' drawing, whilst stated as being at a scale of 1:200 includes perspective drawings which cannot be reliably scaled. The Council is also not in a position to verify the accuracy of ground levels at the site as shown on the Site Plan. The relative heights of the dwellings has been a key issue in assessing the suitability of the proposal and the relative heights as annotated on the plans provides the precise and enforceable certainty of this.

Despite the footings for this development having been completed this Planning Statement request only provides heights of the proposed building and not the relative height of it to neighbouring buildings. (No Elevation plan stating the relative heights has been submitted with this Planning Statement.) It's valid and important therefore that this condition remains in place for the reasons described by the Case Officer stated in the report in Condition 5, and in his preamble elsewhere in the report such as paragraph 6.4.