



**REPORT of  
DIRECTOR OF STRATEGY, PERFORMANCE AND GOVERNANCE**

to  
**NORTH WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE  
29 JULY 2020**

**MEMBERS' UPDATE**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 5**

Application Number	<b>20/00490/FUL</b>
Location	Land At The Summer House Back Lane Wickham Bishops
Proposal	Erection of 1No. dwelling (amendment to planning permission ref. RES/MAL/16/01475)
Applicant	Mr D Brown
Agent	Mr Jonathan Brown - Reeve Brown
Target Decision Date	14.07.2020 EOT requested
Case Officer	Hannah Bowles
Parish	Wickham Bishops
Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council	Member call in from Cllr Jarvis Reason: The proposed development looks far too large for the plot, appears to be back-garden development and is outside the LDP. I believe that's policies S1 and D1. This would merit debate, before one could conclude on a recommendation.

One further letter of objection has been received following the publication of the Officers report.

**7.3 Representations received from Interested Parties** (*summarised*)

<b>Objection Comment</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
It is concluded that the dwelling now being proposed would "have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area" However, on the 18 <sup>th</sup> May 2020 your report on the identical proposal (20/00300/RES) stated that " <i>The scale of the proposed addition cumulatively with the siting, is considered to result in a development which is substantially different in terms of design, appearance and scale, from the one which has been approved.</i> "	Please see paragraph 5.6.1 of the Officers report, which explains that the previous application was for a variation to a condition. The assessment of that application was to determine if the proposed works went beyond would could be considered a minor material amendment and whether the proposal was outside of the limitations of the outline permission. It was not assessing the application in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the area.
During consideration of 16/01475/RES, MDC had made it quite clear that a	This is not strictly true. At the time of the 2016 permission a larger dwelling

<b>Objection Comment</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
building of this larger scale would not be approved.	was initially applied for but due to the potential of it falling outside of the limitations of the outline permission, it was reduced in size. This application is a full application without the limitations of the previously approved outline permission.
Committee Report states that the maximum ridge height has been increased by 0.2m from 9.1m to 9.3m. This is incorrect as the elevation drawings in the existing planning permission (i.e. specified in 16/01465/RES) show a ridge height of 8.35m and hence the increase now being sought is much larger than stated.	The ridge height varies due to the site gradient, the ridge heights quoted are the maximum ridge heights, as clearly stated within the report.
Expresses disagreement with the assessment of the principle of the development.	The Council stand by the assessment contained within section 5.1 of the Officers report.
By saying that the “principle of a dwelling on the site is established”, the Officer appears to be suggesting the council’s own conditions and requirements (e.g. on size, on the exclusion of a garage) can be swept aside.	This is not correct; a full assessment of the proposal has been carried out within the Officers report.
Discussion around two approved applications Little Hill Farm (19/00345/OUT) and 2 Grange Road (19/01207/OUT) and the differences between the approved schemes and this scheme.	Noted.
As there is a clear “fall-back” position whereby the developer continues to implement planning permission 16/01475/RES, there would need to be a much stronger argument presented as to why it would be appropriate to override the provisions of the LDP (specifically S1 and S8) in order solely to allow a developer to increase the size of the house he is building in his back garden. Approving this application would create a new precedent which would be damaging to the District and the value of the LDP.	A dwelling is currently under construction at the application site and the proposed changes to the previously approved design are considered to be acceptable.

**7.4 Statutory Consultees** (*summarised*)

<b>Name of Internal Consultee</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>
County Highways	No objection.	Noted.