

Comments by the Appellant on the further comments submitted by interested parties subsequent to the submission of the Appeal.

Interested Party 1:

Firstly the Appellant would like to thank this person for their meaningful and helpful comments.

Interested Party 2:

This person questions the meaning of the term 'Amenity Space'.

An amenity space is not necessarily a private area but can be an area of socialisation with neighbours such as the owners of Kyrenia with whom the Appellant has been very friendly for many years. In future years any new owners of the two facing retirement bungalows would also enjoy this amenity space.

Very many properties have virtually no front garden and if they do it is the Appellant's belief that very few use them for any **private** use, often using them for vehicle parking, bin storage with possibly a minimal lawn and flower bed.

The proposed bungalow would have a small private rear amenity space perfect for an elderly person or couple. When cleared to expose the Ridgewood brick wall at the rear South West boundary the total rear amenity space is estimated to be 114m² which is more than adequate for a modest two bedroom retirement bungalow.

Interested Party 3:

With regard to the note made by interested party 3 in respect to the apparent inconsistency of the height of the ridge of the proposed bungalow there is a very simple explanation. In reality the ridge would be level at a height of approximately 4metres from the existing ground level on the North West side of the proposed bungalow close to Everglades House however as mentioned in the Appeal Statement:

'The site lies within the triangle formed by Fore Street, Mill Lane and Maiden Street. This whole area is generally slightly sloping downwards to the South East but with no sudden changes in level.'

It therefore follows that if the height of ridge of the proposed bungalow were to be measured from a point further to the South East down the sloping tarmac drive then different measurements would be obtained. It is quite likely that a measurement in the order of 4.6 metres could result lower down the tarmac drive in front of the proposed bungalow garage door. This was only mentioned in the appeal statement as construction works inevitably destroy the majority of the existing levels in the area of the building works and therefore it is useful to have a measurement to a known reference point that will remain after all construction work is completed, such as the tarmac drive.

The Appellant would also add that general construction tolerances and possible modifications requested by the building inspector after foundations are laid can affect the final ridge height despite all good intentions of the builder to keep to the design drawings.

With regard to two other points raised in earlier comments, firstly the possibility of any future owner of the bungalow trying to obtain permission for upward development, the Appellant is prepared to make this virtually impossible by design of the proposed bungalow roof to be of a vaulted truss construction that could **not** be cost effectively modified for first floor habitation. See drawing JC 25/ 07 Rev 0 submitted with these comments in July 2026. As also mentioned earlier the Appellant would be happy for no upward development to be a condition of Planning Approval and in fact be incorporated by a Covenant into the Title Deeds of the bungalow if possible.

The second point raised by the owner of Homefield in an earlier submission was his concerns that the excavation for deep foundations close to Homefield's boundary would damage and weaken the root systems of existing mature trees in Homefield's garden that are close to the boundary of the proposed bungalow site.

By reference to the same new drawing JC 25/ 07 Rev 0 it can be seen that the Appellant now proposes an engineer designed concrete raft foundation to sit close to the top of the ground with minimal excavation and therefore also minimising damage to tree root systems.

Comment regarding North Hertfordshire District Council's Submission of the Appeal:

The Appellant confirms that the Appeal site is close to but NOT inside or abutting the Weston Conservation Area.