

Applicants Response to Objections by Dr. David Chrimes of Homefield House Maiden Street Weston SG4 7AA.

We are well aware that Homefield is the property most affected by our application and we regret the impact that a new bungalow would have if it was built close to Homefield's boundary.

We are very sympathetic however we are limited in the position of the proposed bungalow as we have to centre the footprint of the building roughly centrally on the 17 metre boundary in order to allow adequate room for car parking in front of the bungalow and leave a modest amount of amenity space to the rear.

With regard to the proposed ridge height the design has taken account of the possible imposition of the new structure and this is why a 30 degree roof pitch was chosen rather than the 45 degree pitch of the two nearest buildings, Everglades house and Amberley house. The height of ridge is dictated by the roof pitch and in my experience lower than 30 degrees is unlikely to be acceptable to North Herts Planning Department in this part of Weston where most roofs are 45 degree pitch.

We sympathise totally with our neighbour's concerns over potential future upward extension and intend to construct the roof with a truss design that will obstruct a loft conversion.

In addition as a further gesture to allay concerns we are prepared to impose a covenant within the deeds of the bungalow excluding future upward extension.

I accept that there is less screening from the existing trees in Homefield's own garden than may be desired but this could be addressed in the future with the planting of a tasteful choice of young tree or trees such as an evergreen magnolia or laurel.

I accept that a particular method of building would be required to avoid any damage to the tree roots or stability problems but this would fall under the requirements of Building Control. I am expecting that as a minimum an engineer's designed ground beam would be required to support the bungalow on the side adjacent to Homefield House.

The design and positioning of the proposed bungalow footprint is more than 1 metre from any adjacent property including Homefield House which is more than many new build properties. I think that this should be acceptable in this village location as I know that the adjacent property Amberley has probably less than 1 metre from both its North East and South West boundaries. I also wish to point out that when Homefield House itself was recently built on the site of the former bungalow 'Wahroonga' in 2016 I was asked by the then Planning Officer Richard Tiffin to sign a Party Wall Agreement giving the builders permission to build Homefield House right up to my own boundary and my objections were over-ruled at that time.

Regarding Dr. Chrimes Requested Modifications:

We agree to adopt a version of a hip style roof that will reduce the height and visual impact of a full height brick gable wall close to the boundary with Homefield House. In order to keep the symmetry of the bungalow from the front and rear elevations the roof design would be balanced by having an identical hip design on the opposite gable on the boundary with the present Everglades House.

There are two reasons why we are not agreeing to a full end hip roof design taking the end roofs down to the top of the first floor walls (2.5m). Firstly the South facing rear roof slope would not have sufficient area for the required solar panels to meet the National Policy Framework - Planning for Climate Change.

Secondly we would not find a full hip design to be aesthetically pleasing and we believe that a partial hip design would look better and be more acceptable to North Herts Planning Department especially as the adjacent building Amberley House has Barn style hips on the main roof and the Amberley garage has large partial hips very similar to the style that we could achieve on the bungalow which is only 25m from Amberley garage.

We hope that this can be an acceptable compromise.

Unfortunately it does not seem possible to reduce the total roof height whilst maintaining a pleasing aesthetic front elevation design.

We agree to re-site the bungalow very slightly to the rear in the order of 1 metre approximately which can be decided when the outbuildings are demolished and a proper assessment can be made of the available space.

We hope that this also can be an acceptable compromise.

Jim & Tricia Caudle.