

DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 8 DECEMBER 2010

Councillors Present: Barbara Alexander, Paul Bryant (Chairman), George Chandler, Hilary Cole, Paul Hewer (Vice-Chairman), Roger Hunneman, Gwen Mason, Andrew Rowles (Substitute) (In place of Jeff Beck), Anthony Stansfeld, Julian Swift-Hook and Tony Vickers

Also Present: Sharon Armour (Solicitor), Michael Butler (Principal Planning Officer), Derek Carnegie (Team Leader - Development Control), Debra Hammond (Conservation Officer) and Robert Alexander (Policy Officer)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Jeff Beck

Councillor(s) Absent: Councillor Gordon Lundie

PART I

40. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 17th November 2010 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to the following amendments:

Item 38(1) page 8 – Councillor Vickers believed that there had been a definitive answer to his question regarding the possibility to amend the Construction Management Plan to include an alternative footpath route for school children during term. Michael Butler responded that the contractor cannot be made to carry out an alternative footpath route, however Michael informed the Committee that it would be possible to put an informative that Sovereign Housing Association should endeavour to adhere to Health and Safety recommendations.

41. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Roger Hunneman declared an interest in Agenda Item 5 and reported that, as his interest was personal and prejudicial, he would be leaving the meeting during the course of consideration of the matter.

Councillor Julian Swift-Hook declared an interest in Agenda Items 1, 2, 3 and 5, but reported that, as his interest was personal and not prejudicial, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

All Members of the Committee noted that they had been lobbied on items 1, 2, 3 and 5.

42. Schedule of Planning Applications

42(1) Application No. & Parish: 10/02001/FUL Land at former GAMA site, Greenham Common

(Councillor Julian Swift Hook declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Greenham Parish Council that had previously discussed the application. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 8 DECEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

Before the Item began Councillor Paul Bryant informed the Committee that Item 4(1), 4(2) and 4(3) would all be discussed together, due to the applications all concerning the movement of temporary to permanent car storage. The applications would all be voted on separately, and would be minuted as such.

The Committee considered reports (Agenda Item 4(1), 4(2), 4(3)) concerning Planning Application 10/02001/FUL, 10/02005/COMIND, 10/02006/COMIND for the change of use of land to permanent storage of cars (B8) on site E at the land at the former GAMA site, Greenham Common, the removal of Condition 6 on planning permission reference No. 08/01146/comind and the removal of Condition 6 on planning permission reference No. 08/01150/comind respectively.

Michael Butler (Principal Planning Officer) outlined the report as detailed in pages 23 to 48 of the agenda and raised the following points:

- Should Members be minded to go against officer's recommendation and approve the application, the applications would still have to be implemented by September 2011 as with the extant permissions. If the scheme was not implemented by this date it would lapse.
- Should Members be minded to go with Officers recommendation (refusal), it was recommended that policy BE6 from the South East Plan be stated as an additional policy in the reason for refusal.
- English Heritage claimed that the scheme was not low impact as suggested, and English Heritage stated that proposal was contrary to policies HE9 in PPS5.

Councillor Paul Bryant enquired what would constitute implementation of the scheme. Michael Butler responded that all highways work on Brackenhurst Lane would need to be completed before a single car was stored.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Andrew Raven, Agent and Jon Gill from Oxford Archaeology, addressed the Committee on this application. Because the Agent and Mr Gill were discussing 3 applications the speakers were given fifteen minutes.

Andrew Raven (Agent) in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Mr Raven informed the committee that the site required the income, not for the infrastructure, but for its long term maintenance.
- Since temporary consent in 2007, Mr Raven informed the committee a marketing campaign had been undertaken. The only use that appears possible was car storage.
- In recent years English Heritage have not given sufficient help, grants and maintenance for bunkers. They recommended the use of a museum. However a museum was not a money making investment, and would not be able to fund the upkeep, as well as the junction having a limited number of movements.
- Mr Raven noted that the Council did not purchase the land, when they were offered it, and he could only assume they did not due to the upkeep. He also informed the Committee that they had offered to sell it to English Heritage, but to no avail, as whoever bought it would be faced with high maintenance costs.

Jon Gill in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Mr Gill understood the particular issues that the application was having, however he believed that car storage could be used as a suitable way of making money to cover the upkeep of the site.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 8 DECEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

- The storage cars would be visible, but it would not be as harmful as parking on a prehistoric monument
- Mr Gill stated that he believed the application would preserve the national importance of the site, and that he felt the proposal would preserve GAMA for future generations.

Councillor Julian Swift-Hook asked Mr Raven whether his clients would ever build a museum on the site. Mr Raven responded that although museums tended to make a financial loss, his clients hoped to establish one. This would however only be after a car storage application had been successful. Councillor Swift-Hook enquired whether Greenham Common Trust had been approached for a grant. Mr Raven informed the committee that although the Trust had not been approached directly, they would have been aware of his clients marketing campaign. Councillor Swift-Hook asked if funding was to come through a private company, and no cars were to be stored over the next 3 to 4 years, whether Mr Raven's clients would consider selling. Mr Raven responded that they would consider selling as with a ten year time limit it would be difficult to implement storing the cars.

Councillor Tony Vickers asked whether the site had been internationally marketed due to its international attraction.

Mr Raven confirmed that this was the case. Councillor Vickers informed the committee that he could not see the harm of car storage being permanent. The agent responded that any harm would be minimal, if at all and that there would be a positive improvement in respect of site security.

Councillor Hilary Cole asked why the applicant bought the site. Mr Raven informed the Councillor that there were many similar sites throughout the UK and USA and that the applicants had wished to create a museum of international importance.

Councillor Swift-Hook wanted to know how visitors to the museum would get around the site. Mr Raven responded that he would suggest a minibus and that people would book in advance, traffic movement would be minimal.

Michael Butler said that it was up to the committee to make a choice over permanent versus temporary harm. It was the officer's opinion that permanent use for car storage would be demonstrably harmful. Mr Butler said that he had rarely seen such a strong recommendation to refuse from English Heritage and the Council Archaeologist.

Councillor Julian Swift-Hook as Ward Member raised the following points:

- Councillor Swift-Hook informed the committee that he only asked for the report to be called in if it was recommended for approval.
- The Parish Council have objected, English Heritage, Greenham Common Commission, Hampshire County Council and Archaeology all had objected to the application
- English Heritage approved the temporary condition, but not the permanent permission.
- PPS5 noted that you should not grant permission if it was for purely financial reasons.
- Greenham Common Trust had not been contacted in respect of grant funding.
- The proposal of parking cars permanently on the GAMA site has the same concern as parking on Stonehenge.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 8 DECEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

It is for these reasons that Councillor Swift-Hook proposed Officers Recommendation, to refuse the application. Councillor Roger Hunneman seconded the proposal.

Councillor Tony Vickers was keen to see a museum on the site. The Councillor said that there would be harm if the Council did not do everything in its power that it could do in finding a use for the site. Councillor Vickers felt that the application should be considered by the District Planning Committee.

Councillor Hunneman said that his position was regrettable as he could not approve permanent car storage on an important monument, however he understood that the applicant required some way of making money to help with the upkeep.

Councillor Swift-Hook felt that granting planning consent would not be doing everything the Council could do and would be referring its responsibility elsewhere. The Councillor said that cars would be visible through the fence. A museum would be favourable; however this would not generate the desired income.

Councillor Andrew Rowles admitted finding the application frustrating as he felt that West Berkshire Council should have bought the site. Councillor Rowles did not have a problem with cars being stored at the site. He felt that the applicant wanted to preserve the site and that they needed support.

Councillor Swift-Hook responded that Greenham Common Trust tried to buy the site previously, and that although the applicant was currently trying to preserve the site there was a possibility that others would want to preserve it.

Michael Butler informed the committee that if the application was approved Members should note that the applicant was not required to maintain the site; they were only required to make sure that no harm was done to the monument per se. Mr Butler also reminded the Committee that the application was not personal to the applicant and so any permission would apply to any subsequent owners of the site.

Members of the Committee were asked to review the case before them and vote on the proposal by Councillor Julian Swift-Hook and seconded by Councillor Roger Hunneman to refuse applications; 4(1), 4(2) and 4(3). 4 Members voted for Officers recommendation, and 6 voted against, for each application.

Officers noted that should the committee be minded to approve the application, this would comprise a clear departure from the Development Plan and so would need to be referred to District Planning Committee. .

Councillor Anthony Stansfeld agreed saying that if the application was to be approved it should be passed to District Planning Committee. Councillor Stansfeld thus proposed to refer the application up to District Planning Committee; Councillor Paul Hewer seconded the proposal.

For Item 4(1) Members voted to **REFER** the application to the District Planning Committee by 8 votes to 2.

42(2) Application No & Parish: 10/02005/COMIND Land at former GAMA site, Greenham Common

(Councillor Julian Swift Hook declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(2) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Greenham Parish Council that had previously discussed the application. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 8 DECEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

Councillor Stansfeld proposed to refer the application up to District Planning Committee; Councillor Paul Hewer seconded the proposal.

For Item 4(2) Members voted to **REFER** the application to the District Planning Committee by 8 votes to 2.

42(3) Application No & Parish:10/02006/COMIND Land at former GAMA site, Greenham Common

(Councillor Julian Swift Hook declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(3) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Greenham Parish Council that had previously discussed the application. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

Councillor Stansfeld proposed to refer the application up to District Planning Committee, Councillor Paul Hewer seconded the proposal.

For Item 4(3) Members voted to **REFER** the application to the District Planning Committee by 8 votes to 2.

42(4) Application No & Parish: 10/02320/FULD Riverside House, 1 Charnham Street, Hungerford

The Committee considered report (Agenda Item 4(4)) concerning Planning Application 10/02320/FULD for the proposed new dwelling at Riverside House, 1 Charnham Street, Hungerford.

Debra Hammond (Senior Planning Officer) outlined the report as detailed in pages 49 to 58 of the agenda and raised the following points:

- The application was for a 5 bedoomed detached house in the settlement boundary of Hungerford Town.
- The proposed application site was an area of important open space, as well as in the garden of a grade II listed building.
- Within Hungerford's Local Plan it noted that the character of the town was helped by the open spaces.
- The recent revisions to PPS3 mentioned important contributions to the development.
- There was a strong objection from the Georgian Group and English Heritage. The main concern related to the impact of the setting.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr James Podger, Applicant and Mr Arthur Hedges, Agent addressed the committee and raised the following points:

- The house was designed to reflect the structure of Charnham Street.
- The site was not in public view, and would be covered at all times of the year.
- The refusal reason referred to wooded open space, however the development would not affect the countryside as it was a private garden.
- The applicant wished to live next to his business, for security as well as to cut back on commuting from Swindon.

Councillor Paul Hewer asked what would happen should the antique business start to fall into decline. Mr Podger (Applicant) replied that antiques were a sustainable business,

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 8 DECEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

however should the property be sold separately there was still a car park and a large garden which would have a river setting.

Councillor David Holtby speaking as Ward Member in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- The Antiques industry was the biggest employer in Hungerford.
- The garden was not public open space, and there was no right of way through it.
- The stables have previously been restored by the applicant
- The two objectors did not live close to view the application, the neighbour at the Coach House had not objected.
- The development would enhance Hungerford, would guarantee a good employer and help cement it in the centre of England for antiques dealing.

Councillor Paul Bryant enquired why the applicant should wish to live next to his business, as most people did not. Councillor Holtby said that it was security as well as reducing his travel to Swindon.

Councillor Anthony Stansfeld said that although the open space was not public, it was still important in characterising Hungerford. Councillor Stansfeld raised the point that the proposed house would be in the garden of a listed building in a conservation area, and that the antiques business was not tied to the property.

Councillor Barbara Alexander said that the Committee should exercise consistency in its decision making process and therefore proposed to approve the application, Councillor Hilary Cole not creating one rule for one application and another for a different application, there should be consistency. Councillor Alexander proposed to approve the application, Councillor Hilary Cole seconded. At the vote the proposal by Councillor Alexander was lost 5 votes to 6.

Derek Carnegie noted at this point of the discussion that should this application be approved, due to it being an amendment to the policy, it could be referred up to the District Planning Committee.

Councillor Julian Swift-Hook reminded the Committee that the Council decided policy, not the Committee and that the application appeared to have strong grounds for refusal and that Members needed to pay attention to it.

Councillor Cole accepted Councillors Stansfeld and Swift-Hook's concerns on the precedent and policy. Councillor Cole said that the Council were discouraged from infill development, but this proposed development was to be built in the footprint of the old Orangery.

Councillor Roger Hunneman agreed with Councillor Stansfeld.

Councillor Tony Vickers said that there were different definitions of important open space, however he felt this application demonstrated a clear definition. Councillor Vickers noted that there was the Hungerford Town Plan which characterised the Town, and although the proposed development would not be visible from the public street, Councillor Vickers could not support the application.

Councillor George Chandler said that this proposed development would set the wrong precedent, and would therefore be hard to refuse similar properties.

Councillor Julian Swift-Hook made a counter proposal to refuse the application, Councillor Tony Vickers seconded. The motion was carried 6 votes to 5.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 8 DECEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

At the vote the motion was carried with Councillor Paul Bryant making the casting vote.

The Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to **REFUSE** permission:

1. The character of this wooded riverside garden makes an important contribution to the character of the wider area. The revised definition of previously developed land contained in PPS3 therefore has a primary bearing on the consideration of this application. The introduction of a large detached dwelling on this piece of Greenfield land would seriously harm the character of the area. The development of this garden would therefore be contrary to PPS1 and PPS3, Policies OVS2 and HSG1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 to 2006 Saved Policies September 2007 which seek to resist development which would harm the character of the an area.
2. The erection of a detached dwelling on this land would result in the loss of this important green riverside space. This would seriously harm the visual amenity value and special historic importance of this Important Open Space. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies OVS2, HSG1, and ENV31 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 to 2006 Saved Policies September 2007, which all seek to protect the Important Open Spaces important to the character of an area.
3. Riverside House is a Grade II listed early-mid eighteenth century house. The setting of this Grade II listed building owes much to the harmony produced by the building and the river, and the quality of space created between them. This historical relationship is reflected in the building's name - Riverside House. The introduction of built form of this scale in this area would seriously harm the riverside setting of this listed building, contrary to PPS5, which seeks to protect the setting of heritage assets.
4. The application site is located within the town centre Conservation Area and is considered to make a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. The importance of open spaces, albeit wooded, such as this, within the town centre is recognised in the Hungerford Town 2010 + Plan which notes that the town's character "owes much to the mix of buildings and open spaces, and the soft boundary between the town and its rural surroundings". The introduction of an urban form in this attractive wooded riverside setting would seriously harm the character of the Conservation Area contrary to PPS5 and Policy ENV33 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 to 2006 Saved Policies September 2007.

42(5) Application No & Parish: 10/02051/HOUSE - 7 Water Lane, Greenham, Thatcham, Berkshire

(Councillor Roger Hunneman declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda item 4(5) by virtue of the fact that he knew the applicant. As his interest was personal and prejudicial he determined to leave the meeting and would not vote on the matter)

Councillor Roger Hunneman left the meeting

(Councillor Julian Swift-Hook declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(5) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Greenham Parish Council. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 8 DECEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

The Committee considered report (Agenda Item 4(5)) concerning Planning Application 10/02051/HOUSE for the proposed two storey side extension at 7 Water Lane, Greenham, Thatcham, Berkshire.

Derek Carnegie (Team Leader – Development Control) outlined the report as detailed in pages 59 to 66 of the agenda and raised the following points:

- The first floor window would overlook the neighbour's garden.
- However the amended plans as detailed in 6.2.1 had been edited accordingly and Mr Carnegie believed this to be acceptable.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr K Watts (objector) and his agent Mr Chris Strang, and Mr Michael Tanner, Agent addressed the Committee on this application.

Mr K Watts in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- The proposed development would be overbearing, overshadowing and would restrict the privacy on the neighbours small rear garden.
- The extension would move the wall to the boundary.
- When the neighbour was in their garden they would have a brick wall facing them.
- The overshadowing would mean Mr Watts was to lose light to his garden much earlier than he currently did.

Mr Chris Strang in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- The extension would be out of keeping with the area where there were little or no extensions.
- The extension would result in engendering enclosure and confinement to the garden.

Mr Carnegie drew the Committee's attention to a Google maps image on the projector, it demonstrated current overshadowing of the neighbours garden. Mr Carnegie believed that the extension would not increase the overshadowing of the neighbours property.

Councillor Swift-Hook commented that the elevations of the proposal would be the same height as the ridge height.

Councillor Hilary Cole asked Mr Watts at what time when did he currently lose sunlight? Mr Watts responded that in the winter it was about 10am.

Councillor Swift-Hook asked Mr Strang what he meant by the comment that the garden would become engendered? Mr Strang commented that he used the language taken from the Inspectors report in relation to an appeal decision that was dismissed. It stated that the "sheer proximity [of an extension] would block out the greater majority of visible sky, engendering a much greater sense of enclosure and confinement to the space."

Mr Michael Tanner in addressing the committee raised the following points:

- The highways issue had been addressed.
- The bricks and materials would be the same as the current house.
- The extension was set down by 25 degrees and this was shown in the drawings, therefore the extension would not be overshadowing any more than the current property was.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 8 DECEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

- The extension was required because of a growing family; if privacy was a problem the applicant would be willing to opaque the window.

Following a question from Councillor Swift-Hook Mr Tanner replied that the ridge of the extension was set down by 800mm.

Councillor Julian Swift-Hook speaking to the Committee as Ward Member raised the following points:

- The applicant had overcome several issues such as highways and character of the extensions.
- The neighbour's garden which was used the most would be overshadowed, and there was still an issue of privacy concerning the window.

Councillor Swift-Hook proposed to refuse the application; Councillor Tony Vickers seconded the proposal. At the vote this motion was lost by 4 votes to 5.

Councillor Hilary Cole said that it was a modest extension; however she could understand the neighbours concern, but the extension would not affect the light in the house.

Councillor Swift-Hook remarked that any development would cause harm, and that there was too much harm on the application. The existing house was already close to the neighbouring property and this extension would make it 2.7 metres closer and affect Mr and Mrs Watts enjoyment of their property.

Councillor Vickers said that in his professional opinion, as a surveyor, there would be significant overbearing and overshadowing should the extension be allowed to go ahead.

Councillor Cole proposed to approve the application; Councillor Paul Hewer seconded.

At the vote, the motion was carried to **GRANT** Planning Permission subject to the following conditions:

1. The development shall be started within three years from the date of this permission and implemented strictly in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to review the desirability of the development against Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 - 2006 Saved Policies 2007 should it not be started within a reasonable time.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with drawing title number DH/01 Revision A dated 11/10/10 and received on 17th November 2010.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted details assessed against Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 - 2006 Saved Policies 2007.

3. Irrespective of the provisions of the current Town and Country Planning (General Development) Order 1995, no additional openings shall be inserted in the northern elevation without the written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policies CC6 of the Regional Spatial Strategy May 2009 and OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 – 2006 Saved Policies 2007.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 8 DECEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

INFORMATIVES

1. The decision to grant planning permission has been taken because the development will be designed to a standard that will preserve the features of the local landscape without harming the amenities of the neighbouring residents or the character and appearance of the area. This informative is only intended as a summary of the reason for the grant of planning permission. For further details on the decision please see the application report which is available from the Planning Service or the Council website.*
2. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Berkshire Act, 1986, Part II, Clause 9, which enables the Highway Authority to recover the costs of repairing damage to the footway, cycle way or grass verge, arising during building operations.
3. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Highways Act 1980, which enables the Highway Authority to recover expenses due to extraordinary traffic.

42(6) Application No & Parish: 10/02164/FUL & 10/02084/LBC Holt Manor Farm, Kintbury Holt

*Councillor Julian Swift-Hook left the meeting at 9:23.
Councillor Roger Hunneman rejoined the meeting at 9:25*

The Committee considered report (Agenda Item 4(6)) concerning Planning Application 10/02164/FUL & 10/02084/LBC for the proposed two storey extension and alteration to house, replace existing porch entrance, part removal of existing boundary wall to create drive way parking, demolition of existing large stable and hay barn, replacement with pond and paddock at Holt Manor Farm, Kintbury Holt.

Debra Hammond (Senior Planning Officer) outlined the report as detailed in pages 67 to 72 of the agenda and raised the following points:

- The application sought permission for Listed Building and Full Consent.
- The Building was characterised by traditional gables.
- English Heritage and the Georgian Group both voiced strong objections.
- There was no reason to refuse the proposal to the rear of the property as it was in keeping with the current design of the house.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Andrew Plumridge and Michael Pagilaroli, Agents addressed the Committee on the application:

Mr Andrew Plumridge in addressing the committee raised the following points:

- The two letters of objection received were not believed to be serious concerns. The Georgian Group's concern could be seen on page 69 in paragraph 6.2, however Mr Plumridge did not believe this should be classed as a serious objection.
- The projection was to the rear of the property, and there was already one projection on the other side. Mr Plumridge made the point that the applicant was not altering anything of historical interest.
- The alterations were sensible and logical alterations.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 8 DECEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

- The alterations would allow you to get to the front door of the house from the front drive, instead of having to go round the back of the property.
- The proposal would allow the applicant to remove the blights and the large asbestos stable and replace it with a pond.
- The elevations would not be affected by the development.

Councillor Anthony Stansfeld questioned how it could be an 17th Century building, with a Georgian front, but not back. Mr Plumridge informed the Committee that the Georgian's were notorious for making the front of the building in keeping with their time period, whilst not paying much attention to the back of the building.

Following a question from Councillor Paul Hewer, Mr Plumridge responded that the splays were at an angle as the applicant did not wish to affect the existing character of the building.

Councillor Hilary Cole enquired how old the stable block was that the gables were reflecting. Mr Plumridge said that it was a 19th Century building.

Councillor Andrew Rowles speaking as Ward Member said that it would tidy up the house and evolve the property should it be approved.

Councillor Anthony Stansfeld speaking as Ward Member said that it would allow huge improvements to the current property; however he had some concerns about the windows that were proposed.

Derek Carnegie commented that in principle the proposed work was good, but Mr Carnegie said that he was uncomfortable with the plans and the extensions.

Councillor Cole said that she was not happy with the splay out of the gables. Councillor George Chandler echoed this point.

Councillor Andrew Rowles proposed to accept the proposed application; this was seconded by Councillor Tony Vickers. This was put to the vote, and was not carried. A counterproposal was proposed by Councillor Paul Hewer this was seconded by Councillor Roger Hunneman to refuse the application.

At the vote the motion was carried to **REFUSE** planning permission and listed building consent for the following reasons:

1. Holt Manor Farm is a Grade II listed seventeenth century farmhouse with an eighteenth century re-fronting, which appears to retain the majority of its historical plan-form. The design of the proposed extension is unsympathetic and fails to reflect the proportions, character and detailing of this Grade II listed building. The 'kicked out' splays on either side of the roof appear ungainly and do not reflect the traditional gables, and cat-slides of the main building. Furthermore, the extension would obscure part of the southern elevation. The proposal would therefore seriously harm the special interest of this Grade II listed building contrary to advice contained within PPS5.
2. Whilst it is accepted that the existing casement windows are replacements and therefore not of historic interest, the openings are of historic interest. Triple light casement windows set under segmental arches are a common feature of vernacular buildings in this area. The mix of vernacular and Georgian features found in this building makes an important contribution to the special interest of the building. The applicants have failed to convincingly demonstrate that the window openings are modern alterations and that they were indeed sashes. The removal

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 8 DECEMBER 2010 - MINUTES

of these openings and replacement with opening to fit vertically proportioned sash windows is considered to harm the significance of the building, contrary to advice contained within PPS5 which seeks to protect the special interest of listed buildings.

43. **Appeal Decisions relating to Western Area Planning Committee**

Members noted the outcome of appeal decisions relating to the Western Area.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and closed at 9.50pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature