

**WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**22<sup>ND</sup> JULY 2020**

**UPDATE REPORT**

**Item No:** (1)      **Application No:** 20/01083/FUL      **Page No.** 15-38

**Site:** Quill Cottage, Craven Road, Inkpen, RG17 9DX

---

**Planning Officer Presenting:** Sarah Melton

**Member Presenting:** N/A

---

**Written submissions**

**Parish Council:** N/A

**Objector(s):** N/A

**Supporter(s):** N/A

**Applicant/Agent:** Ashley Jones – Applicant

**Ward Member(s) speaking:** Councillor Dennis Benneyworth  
Councillor James Cole  
Councillor Claire Rowles

**1. Additional Consultation Responses**

<b>Public representations:</b>	None received
--------------------------------	---------------

**2. Call-in**

This application has been called into Committee by Cllr Claire Rowles and Cllr James Cole.

**3. Committee report clarifications**

The label of the photograph of the rear of the existing dwelling, submitted with the Committee report is incorrect. No plan has been submitted with the application documents that is capable of being able to accurately measure the existing post. The measurement of 1.7m should be disregarded by Members. The submitted 'pro visualisations' is the only document that shows the existing post and the proposed dwelling.

#### **4. Plan 062A**

The applicant's written submission for Committee refers to a plan reference 062A. No plan with this reference, or showing neighbouring properties, has been submitted as part of the current application. The LPA do not have plans which show the height of the dwelling known as The Glenn, as such officers are unable to confirm the applicants assertion that this dwelling is 2.5m higher than the proposed development. Should The Glenn be 2.5m higher than the proposed development, this would mean that The Glenn is 10.07m high.

#### **5. Measurements**

The measurements referenced in the Committee report are those which the case officer has measured from the submitted plans. It is noted that the GIA measurements annotated on the submitted plans differ to the measurements made by the case officer. The case officer is only able to assess and measure the details of an application based on the plans submitted. The case officer has measured the areas and dimensions of the submitted plans and remains of the view that these are correct. The measurements do not include the floor area (existing and proposed) that are occupied by walls, the floor space of each room as been measured individually.

As per the wording of the supporting text of policy C7, the aim of the this policy is to protect the character and beauty of the NWD AONB, and ensure that new development is not visually harmful;

*“replacement of dwellings will be assessed on the basis of the impact of the new development relative to the existing property on the character and local distinctiveness of the rural area”*

This is the justification of the view taken at paragraph 6.8 of the Committee Report. For the sake of clarity, the comparable element of the proposed development is 9.6m and the existing 7.9m, this is a 1.7m increase.

#### **6. Amendments proposed by applicant**

The use of a condition requiring the approval of materials will not overcome the design issues of the proposal scheme. The inappropriate design of the proposal scheme goes beyond the choice of materials, this is detailed in the Committee Report.

The applicants written submission he has suggested the removal of the 1.8m flint and brick wall along the front elevation. It is not possible for Members to approve plans or a design that are not before them as part of the current application. However, should members be minded to approve the application, but still wish to see alternative boundary treatment to the proposed wall at the front of the property or the retention of a hedge, a condition could be attached to the decision requiring full details of the treatment of the front boundary be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the LPA.

It should be noted that part of the character and street scene of this section of Inkpen is the variation of dwellings in terms of design and size. Should all the dwellings along Craven Road be replaced with large suburban dwellings this would cause demonstrable harm to the rural character and appearance of this section of the NWD AONB.

This application has received one letter of support and has been objected to by Inkpen Parish Council for reasons detailed within the Committee report (section 4.1).

#### **7. Additional photographs**

Additional photographs are submitted as part of this update report, however it is not possible to present photographs which show the existing dwelling as part of a street scene with neighbouring properties. The reason for this is that the spacing between the dwellings is too large for a camera to capture the dwellings within the same shot.



Approaching the site from the north west



Approaching the site from the south east