

**WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
ON 8 DECEMBER 2010**

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (2) **Application No:** 10/02005/COMIND **Page No.** 33

Site: Land at former GAMA site, Greenham Common

Planning Officer Presenting: Michael Butler

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking: N/A

Objector(s) speaking: N/A

Support(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Jon Gill - Oxford Archaeology
Andrew Raven - Savills

Ward Member(s): Councillor Swift-Hook
Councillor Drummond

Update Information:

Since the committee report was written the South East Plan has been formally re-instated.

Accordingly it is recommended that within the reason for refusal, policy BE6 in that plan is incorporated in addition to the other policies noted in the agenda report. This policy corresponds to the management of the Historic Environment – it notes [inter alia] that the regions internationally and nationally designated historic assets should receive the highest level of protection. A scheduled monument forms part of such assets.

English Heritage [EH] have responded to the further comments raised by the applicants' agent in regard to the justification for the application. It is noted that when the site was originally marketed in 2003, by Defence Estates, one of the specific uses that was identified as being unlikely to be acceptable was permanent car storage i.e. the present owners should / would have been aware of this document before purchasing the site in question.

Furthermore EH do not agree with the findings of the Historic Buildings Assessment [HBA] i.e. they do not accept that the scheme is of low impact. EH consider that the scheme will cause substantial harm to the monument and so will be clearly contrary to policy HE9.1 and 2 in PPS5 i.e. no wholly exceptional case has been promoted to allow the new use in question.

Amongst other things the HBA does not take into account clear evidence that large parts of the site were left open during its period of use, for good functional reasons [i.e. the car storage use would damage this open character for obvious reasons]. Aerial photographic evidence clearly shows this during the period 1983 to 1991. The committee may wish to refer to the aerial photograph at the meeting.

In addition policy HE11 in PPS5 notes that [inter alia] that decisions made regarding impacts upon heritage assets should , “ resolve problems arising from the inherent needs of the heritage asset , rather than the circumstances of the present owner , or the purchase price paid” .It is considered that this clear policy advice is relevant to this current application.

DC