

DRAFT

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

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 10 JULY 2019

Councillors Present: Adrian Abbs, Phil Barnett, Jeff Beck (Substitute) (In place of Jeff Cant), Hilary Cole, Carolyne Culver, Clive Hooker (Chairman), Claire Rowles, Martha Vickers (Substitute) (In place of Tony Vickers) and Howard Woollaston

Also Present: Sharon Armour (Solicitor), Jessica Bailiss (Policy Officer (Executive Support)), Derek Carnegie (Team Leader - Development Control), Paul Goddard (Team Leader - Highways Development Control) and Dennis Greenway (Conservation Officer)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Jeff Cant and Councillor Tony Vickers

PART I

13. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Clive Hooker, Hilary Cole, Jeff Beck, Carolyn Culver, Adrian Abbs and Phil Barnett declared that they had been lobbied on Agenda Item 4(1). Councillors Jeff Beck, Phil Barnett and Adrian Abbs declared that they had been lobbied on Agenda Item 4(2). Councillors Claire Rowles, Jeff Beck and Adrian Abbs declared that they had been lobbied on Agenda Item 4(3). However, they reported that, as their interest was a personal or an other registrable interest, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

Councillor Phil Barnett and Jeff Beck declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4 (1) and 4 (2), but reported that as their interest was a personal or an other registrable interest, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

14. Schedule of Planning Applications

(3) Application No. and Parish: 18/03398/HOUSE - Winterley House, Kintbury

(Councillors Jeff Beck, Adrian Abbs and Claire Rowles declared that they had been lobbied on Agenda Item 4(3). As their interest was personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.)

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(3)) concerning Planning Application 18/03398/HOUSE in respect of a two storey and single storey extension.
2. Derek Carnegie introduced the application which was located within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and was classed as a non-designated heritage asset. In Officers' view, if approved the proposal would harm the existence of the non-designated heritage asset. There were no clear reasons to accept the application.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2019 - MINUTES

3. The Committee resolution for the application on 13th March was for the deferment of the application pending appeal decision. The appeal was subsequently dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate. The application had been considered again at Committee on 12 June 2019 but deferred pending a second Committee site visit, which had since taken place. Mr Carnegie confirmed that the appeal decision was included with the report and emphasised the concerns raised by Officers.
4. If Members were minded to approve the application, it would need to be referenced up to the District Planning Committee for final decision.
5. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Markus McNally, applicant, Frank Dowling, agent and Councillor Claire Rowles and Councillor James Cole, Ward Members, addressed the Committee on this application.
6. Markus McNally (applicant) and Frank Dowling (agent) in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - Mr Dowling stated that Members who had attended the site visit had been shown an artist's impression of the proposal.
 - The building was not listed and was not featured on West Berkshire's list of heritage buildings. The previous application had however, referred to the building as a Heritage Asset.
 - The main building had been altered over the years and had two modern frontages.
 - The current application set the extension down and back and was clearly subservient to the main building.
 - Mr Dowling explained that although the Orangery might look strange, orangeries were long and narrow by nature. The home office was located towards the back of the orangery.
 - The artist's impression of the proposal showed the extension was truly subservient to the existing dwelling.
 - The extension had been reduced by two metres from the previous application and did not protrude further than the existing garage.
 - No objections had been raised by the Parish Council, AONB or neighbouring properties.
 - Consideration to the impact on the existing building was highly subjective.
 - Mr Dowling gave a similar example of a property in Leckhampstead where the Planning Officers had recommended refusal but Members had taken a different view.
 - Mr McNally drew attention to a note in the update sheet which stated there was no change in the overall scale of the development. Mr McNally stated that the proposal had been reduced by two metres and therefore there was a significant change in scale.
 - Mr McNally emphasised that they were very proud of the house and were complimented by the fact that it was considered a heritage asset.
7. Councillor Hilary Cole noted that Mr McNally had stated that there had been a significant change in the proposal and that the extension would be set down and back from what was previously proposed. Councillor Cole asked Mr McNally to clarify this point. Mr McNally confirmed that the ridge height had been reduced by

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2019 - MINUTES

nearly 500mm. The walled part of the extension had been brought down and set back.

8. Councillor Cole referred to Mr Dowling's comment regarding an application in Leckhamstead and asked if he understood that each application was judged on its own merits. Mr Dowling was aware of this point.
9. Councillor Claire Rowles asked Mr McNally if he owned the other two dwelling located on the plot and he confirmed that he did.
10. Councillor James Cole, in addressing the Committee as Ward Member, raised the following points:
 - In Councillor James Cole's view the house was a mock up and was in fact a very good fake of a house built in a much older period. This was why the house was not a listed building.
 - Councillor James Cole stated that he lived in a modern Georgian style house and the building under consideration was also a property built in modern times.
 - Based on the fact that the building was a mock up, the proposal should be approved. The extension was subservient to and in keeping with the main building.
11. Councillor Claire Rowles in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - There had been no objections received from nearby residents.
 - There had been no concerns raised regarding the view point from the road.
 - Mr Carnegie had stated that the proposal would be detrimental to the area due its scale however in Councillor Rowles view, considering the size of the plot and considerable garden size this would not be an issue.
 - The size of the proposed extension was very much subservient to the main building.
 - Councillor Rowles did not see how the proposal could be considered a poor design.
12. Councillor Adrian Abbs stated that Planning Officers' had looked at an artist's impression of the building and assumed it was built earlier than it was. Councillor Abbs was concerned about the patio area to the right of the proposal and steps down to a seating/garden area, which was in a pleasant setting. Councillor Abbs referred back to plans, where a red line was shown on the diagram and stated that he could not recall seeing a fence in the area. Mr Carnegie stated that discussions had not concluded regarding the accurate size of the plot and this could be deferred until full details of the development had been received. From Officers' point of view, the reductions made to plans since the previous application was not enough to warrant approval.
13. The Chairman stated that the garden only extended to the line shown and therefore the area being considered was not overly large. Dennis Greenway, Principal Conservation and Design Officer, stated that the plan did not show the change in size of the proposal, which had been reduced by two metres.
14. Councillor Cole noted that the building had been described as a fake. Mr Carnegie confirmed that this could be true however, the building had been listed in the past. Mr Carnegie referred to the Planning Inspector's comments, which emphasised the points made in the Planning Officer's report. The building was not listed however,

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2019 - MINUTES

was within the sensitive AONB, which should not be harmed by an overly sized extension.

15. Councillor Rowles referred back to the size of the plot and asked Mr Carnegie if he agreed that it was a large plot that was being discussed. Mr Carnegie agreed with this point and also that the plot perimeters needed further investigation. Mr Carnegie confirmed that the planning plot was considered to be what had been used for residential purposes/garden area for over 10 years. Councillor Rowles felt that it was difficult to make a decision when the size of the plot needed further investigation.
16. Councillor Cole recalled that queries about the plot and garden size had been raised at the site visit. It seemed that agricultural land might have been taken in to the curtilage and if this was the case then investigation was required.
17. Councillor Howard Woollaston noted that the plot would not be seen from anywhere nearby. Mr Carnegie stated that if this was the criteria then the application could be deemed acceptable however, the impact on the countryside had to be taken in to consideration.
18. The Chairman invited Members to begin a debate on the item.
19. Councillor Jeff Beck stated that he had visited the site about three times and since visiting the site the proposal had been reduced in size. Councillor Beck had no objection to the application and proposed Members approve planning permission.
20. Councillor Abbs stated that he had visited the site on two occasions. He felt assured that Officers would investigate the plot size. He could however not see a reason to go against the Planning Officer's recommendation for refusal.
21. Councillor Cole referred to the size of the proposal. She did not feel that the applicant had addressed the concerns raised in the Planning Inspector's report regarding the size of the extension. Councillor Cole felt that Members would be unwise to approve the application given the advice from Officers and the Planning Inspector regarding the proposal. The site laid within the AONB and therefore there were stricter planning considerations that needed to be taken in to account. Councillor Cole felt that Members were being side tracked by the large plot size and that there had been no objections raised. These were not reasons to approve the application.
22. Mr Carnegie reminded Members that if they were minded to approve the application it would be referenced up to the District Planning Permission for decision.
23. Councillor Phil Barnet expressed his support for the application and that he could see no reason to refuse it. He felt that the applicant had considered the proposal very carefully. He felt when visiting the site that the proposal would blend in to its surroundings.
24. Councillor Rowles referred to the last meeting where the application had been considered and that there had been a discussion around what caused a building to be classed as a Heritage Asset and it had been concluded that there was uncertainty on how to define a heritage piece. Councillor Rowles felt that some aspects of the Planning Inspector's report had marred the application. Councillor Rowles did not feel there were any good enough reasons to refuse the application.
25. Councillor Beck repeated his proposal to approve planning permission and this was seconded by Councillor Rowles. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Beck, seconded by Councillor Rowles, and at the vote the motion was carried.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2019 - MINUTES

RESOLVED that Members agreed that the Head of Development and Planning should be authorised to grant planning permission. As a result the item would be referred to the next District Planning Committee for decision for the following reason:

- In the opinion of the planning officers, the application was clearly contrary to adopted national and local planning policies and had been the subject of a very recent planning appeal decision to refuse.

15. Appeal Decisions relating to Western Area Planning Committee

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

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.34 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature