Application 3/2020/0669

Date issued:

14th October 2020

3 Bradley Court Thornley Road Chaigley BB7 3LY

1. First application submitted on 01/05/2020 and refused consent on the 12/08/2020.

We then spoke to the case officer to try and reach a compromise and were advised that the proposed French doors and roof light on the rear elevation was the main issue as this could possibly provide a precedent for the other dwellings.

However, after further discussions we were advised to resubmit the application showing the windows only on the gable elevation. We did then contact our architect who redrew the elevation taking into account the planning officers proviso that the windows were offset to avoid looking too domesticated.

2. Second application submitted 06/08/2020 and refused consent on the 07/10/2020.

Please see attached emails showing correspondence between both parties and we have tried our upmost to adhere to all issues raised including avoiding the bird nesting season.

SUMMARY

Both applications have been refused on the grounds of being overly domestic and affecting the visual detriment and character of the building.

We would strongly refute those claims as we are simply looking to add more natural light into a very dark corner. It has taken us a very long time to find the right property in the right location and feel our proposals actually enhance the building and give it a better balance.

It is absolutely essential as we approach retirement age that we can obtain as much natural light as possible for our own wellbeing. We have had quite a number of lengthy conversations with the planning officer and a very strong emphasis has been raised on their perspective to retain the agricultural look of the building.

Whilst we agree that there should be restraints, we also have to point

out the original application was nearly 30 years ago, but it did change then from an agricultural building to domestic use. Furthermore, as the building in question spans No. 1 to No. 6 Bradley Court there are two things we wish you to consider.

- 1. No.1, No.2, No.4, No.5 and No.6 all have Four windows on each elevation but No.3 only has two.
- 2. No.3 is actually the biggest property out of the six dwellings but has 50% less natural light, which to us does not seem fair or reasonable.

On a final point and with the councils stance of not changing the agricultural feel, could someone please explain to us why No.1 and No.2 have entrance porch canopies?

Could you please call me if any of the above details are not clear. My details are as follows: David Lang -0797393331

We would appreciate any feedback on our proposals as we seek to find a resolution to all these issues, as we are now five months and several thousand pounds in but just appear to be hitting a brick wall.