

**DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE
ON 21ST AUGUST 2019**

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (1) **Application No:** 18/03398/HOUSE **Page No.** 21 - 40
Site: Winterley House, Kintbury

Planning Officer Presenting: Derek Carnegie
Dennis Greenway

Member Presenting: N/A

Parish Representative speaking: N/A

Objector(s) speaking: N/A

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Marcus McNally (Applicant)
Frank Dowling (Agent)

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

Update information:

The application was deferred from the Western Area Committee dated 03 July. Additional draft amended plans for consideration have been submitted which are shown in the presentation.

The amendment consists of a reduction in the length of the proposed orangery and office of 2 metres. No changes to the overall scale or width of this linear element of the extensions or the two storey extensions.

The alteration is not considered to overcome the principle concerns outlined in the officers' report or the fundamental objections and dismissal of the previous appeal by the Planning Inspectorate which outlined a number of key elements which have not been addressed.

The Conservation Officer provided additional comments on the amendment as follows:-

In essence the amendments reduce the length of the extensions from 19.4 metres to 17.4 metres, but otherwise are as originally submitted and are not therefore considered to overcome my previously made building conservation objections.

By way of reference the existing frontage width of the dwelling is some 13 metres scaled from the application drawings.

It is worth referring to comments in the appeal decision letter in respect of the previous application on the site, which refers, inter alia, not only to the scale of the two storey extension not appearing subservient and having an unbalancing impact on the appearance of the existing building on the site, but also the single storey extensions introducing a strong linear element contrary to the compact square form of the existing dwelling, which would have a dominating impact given its substantial length, especially when compared with the existing footprint, and would not therefore appear as a subservient addition.

The appeal decision letter also refers to the length of built form eroding the spacious setting of the site, as well as other design issues exacerbating the impact of the proposals.

Following the DPC site visit, the Chairman has asked for further clarification on two issues – the extent of the application site and the definition of whether or not the house is a designated or a non-designated heritage asset.

The Site Curtilage: The attached plans indicate the application site outlined in 'red' and a plan attached to the original application which indicates a line located much closer to the west of the actual building. Officers considered that it may complicate consideration of the pure planning policy aspects of the determination if detailed enforcement investigations were commenced about the size of the plot indicated in the original plans however, following this determination, further investigations will commence with regard to the evidence which can be produced by the applicant regarding the size of the residential curtilage.

It will be interesting to note that a previous planning application on the site clearly indicated a much more limited curtilage to the property.

Designated or Non-designated: Whilst not currently included in West Berkshire's Local List of Heritage Assets (which is currently in its early stages), the house is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset within the meaning and definition contained within the NPPF.

Government guidance on the application of national policies is provided in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG): Conserving and enhancing the historic environment. The paragraphs of particular relevance, relating to the designation of non-designated heritage assets are Paragraphs 039 (Reference ID: 18a-039-20140306), 040 (Reference ID: 18a-040-20140306) and 041 (Reference ID: 18a-041-20140306). Paragraph 039 states that:

'Local planning authorities may identify non-designated heritage assets....In some areas, local authorities identify some non-designated heritage assets as 'locally listed'.

Therefore, whilst Local Lists are the most proactive way of identifying non-designated heritage assets, the NPPF does not preclude LPA's from establishing whether a building meets the meaning and definition of a non-designated heritage when considering a development proposal. Indeed, Paragraph 041 advises that

'when considering development proposals, local planning authorities should establish if any potential non-designated heritage asset meets the definition in the National Planning Policy Framework at an early stage in the process' .

In addition, the following breakdown of the building's heritage value might be useful.

Evidential Value:

Historic England suggests that - "Evidential value derives from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity". Mapping evidence supports an 18th century (or older) date for the building, as a small country house with subservient outbuildings/ staff accommodation. The building was originally nationally listed as Grade III (previously known as Mount Pleasant Villa) but was removed from the list after the 1980's review.

The house offers evidential value in that it documents the development of country houses during the C18th and C19th. Furthermore, whilst the building has been altered, survival of historic fabric is relatively high and architectural details and materials provide evidential value regarding methods of construction in the C18th and C19th.

Historical Value:

Historic England suggests that - "Historical value derives from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present. It tends to be illustrative or associative". Winterley House has an interesting history, beginning life as a small vernacular country house in the C18th. It was expanded and altered in several phases during the late C18th and C19th to become a substantial country house. These phases have considerable historical value, and illustrate the rise of 'polite' architecture during the C18th and C19th, where buildings were altered in response to changing architectural tastes and fashions during the C18th and C19th.

Communal Value:

Historic England suggests that: "Communal value derives from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory". Communal enjoyment of the house can be enjoyed through views of it within the landscape setting.

Aesthetic Value:

Historic England suggests that: "Aesthetic value derives from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place". I consider that the building possesses aesthetic value. The house is an attractive, well proportioned, mostly symmetrical house of Georgian origins, built using traditional materials and methods. Whilst the house has been altered, the alterations have been carried out in a sympathetic manner.

I therefore do not consider that these alterations detract from the character of the building. It is important to note that the Appeal Inspector agreed with this assessment:

"Winterley House is a handsome two storey over basement detached brick building with Georgian origins. It has been extended and remodelled over time during different eras to become a substantial and mostly symmetrical building of square proportions. The existing north, west and south elevations have an attractive regular appearance due to the height, length and depth of the elevations which results in a squareness of built form. This is enhanced by the arrangement of the size, positioning and design of windows and door openings."

DC

