

## **19-00832-REM - 'LAND ADJACENT TO SUMMERFIELD' RESIDENTS REPRESENTATION**

'It is a legal principle that planning decisions may be quashed if the overall effect of the officer report significantly misleads about material matters and these are left uncorrected. The officer report does significantly mislead you about material matters relating to Mass, Context, Hedgerow, landscaping and AONB.

The Original Reserved Matters were refused in 2018 due to:

*'The overall scale and massing of the new dwellings would be significantly larger and higher than existing dwellings within this part of the village.*

*'External appearance and massing would urbanise the village'*

*'Large dwellings on this prominent site would be out of character and detrimental to this rural village location'*

*'The scale of the buildings would adversely affect the amenity of existing dwellings'*

The massing of the proposed dwellings is materially *unchanged* since then. Whilst there is a "Scale and massing" section in the latest officer report, it does not draw members' attention to the GEA or GIA figures. The paragraph 6.12 conclusion is based on incomplete analysis.

Gross External Area of each proposed house remains 39% larger than the average of surrounding dwellings on the southern side of The Ridge, where the building style comprises alternating bungalows and small houses. The proposed development would result in a monolithic slab of bricks and mortar, five equally-sized large houses that would not associate well with the existing eclectic mix of dwellings, and urbanise the eastern gateway.

In terms of context, the officer report is significantly misleading. The smallest GEA of the 5 proposed dwellings is 300m<sup>2</sup>, with the average being 302m<sup>2</sup>. By contrast, the GEAs of the two dwellings adjacent to the application site are only 188m<sup>2</sup> and 260m<sup>2</sup>. The average GEA of the 11 surrounding dwellings is 240m<sup>2</sup>. The context is thus one of dwellings with a much smaller GEA than the GEA of the 5 proposed dwellings.

### Hedgerow

The proposed access will destroy the majority of the existing frontage hedgerow that has incorrectly been defined as not being an important hedgerow on the basis of the flawed analysis of the criteria set out in the Hedgerow Regulations 1997.

### Landscaping and AONB setting

The conclusions as to landscaping and AONB setting are tainted by the errors described above.

Previously Mr Derek Carnegie gave assurance that sound architectural design and planning judgement would be brought to bear to ensure sympathetic development of the site. The plans before you today are precisely what Councillors Pick, Bryant, Beck and Simpson warned of at that time.

A more appropriate scheme would include 1.5 storey houses with bungalows at either end. Residents are fully accepting of this development, so long as scale and mass are appropriate, and the existing hedgerow preserved intact.

The strength of local objection must be taken into account.

The misleading aspects of the officer report must be corrected and for the reasons set out above this application should be refused. '

The above representations are stated to be on behalf of Cold Ash Residents with specific endorsement by Mr and Mrs Vanstone, Mr John Berry and Mr Paul Shave.

In addition, the above summary incorporates a separate objection from Mr Bernard Clark.