

- The officer's findings contain substantial inaccuracies. Paragraph 6.12 inaccurately refers to two equivalent developments on Pangbourne Road. Neither of these two examples are equivalent to this application. Elangani is a significantly larger plot; in fact, as the Location Plan shows, the developed Elangani plot is larger than the entire existing Timberley plot! Elangani also has private access. Knappswood Close is a cul-de-sac within a substantially larger plot, and with its own adopted road for access.
- Conversely, the application proposes to squeeze a sizeable four-bedroom house into the modest back garden of the host property without any private access. The Location Plan shows how unusual, cramped and at odds with the neighbouring properties the proposed development would be. The plot in question is not big enough for a four-bedroom house. By allowing this application, the Council would set a precedent for dwellings to be built in any private, rear garden along the Pangbourne Road. Is this a precedent the Council wishes to set?
- Two previous applications have been refused and dismissed at appeal. As stated by the Inspector in the 2017 appeal, 'development at this location would have an unacceptable urbanisation effect' and this would have an 'adverse effect on landscape character and scenic beauty of the AONB'. This has not been mitigated by this latest application.
- For example, paragraph 6.16 misrepresents that the proposed application will have a reduced impact on the local environment because the proposed design has a lower mass than the previous application. However, paragraph 1.8 shows the proposed dimensions of the design have *increased* rather than decreased. The previous application had a maximum height of 6.8m and a footprint of 83.8sq.m. This application has both a greater maximum height of 7.3m and a larger footprint of 99.5sq. m. This means the adverse impact on the landscape, character and scenic beauty of this NWDAONB is greater than the previous application.
- The proposed application has misled the inspection officer. Many of the photographs submitted are inaccurately labelled. They have been taken from the adjoining open countryside; land that lies outside of the settlement boundary, and does not form part of the planning application. This makes the site appear much larger than it is. For example, the photographs labelled 'existing structure on site' contain a structure that lies outside of the planning application site and the photograph labelled 'within the site looking west' is taken from a position approximately 10m outside the site and the village settlement boundary.
- Approving this application would result in the overdevelopment of a cramped site, with no private access, which would ruin the landscape, character and scenic beauty of this NWDAONB. Building a four-bedroom house in the back garden of Timberley's modest plot is totally opposed to the rural nature of the surrounding area. To repeat the appeal Inspector's words, 'development at this location would have an unacceptable urbanisation effect'. The slight amendments to this latest scheme have not changed this.

Yours sincerely

William and Camille Howard