

Item No.	Application No. and Parish	Statutory Target Date	Proposal, Location, Applicant
(4)	23/02591/HOUSE & 23/02592/LBC Hungerford	11 th January 2024 ¹	Two storey rear extension, new bathroom in existing roof space and replacement roof coverings. Little Hidden Farm, Wantage Road, Newtown, Hungerford Mrs Susan Acworth

¹ Extension of time agreed with applicant until 22nd July 2024

The applications can be viewed on the Council's website at the following links:

<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=23/02591/HOUSE>

<https://publicaccess.westberks.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=S44ECRRD00X00>

And

<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=23/02592/LBC>

<https://publicaccess.westberks.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=S44ED8RD00X00>

Recommendation Summary: To delegate to the Development Manager to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION

Ward Member(s): Councillor Denise Gaines
Councillor Tony Vickers
Councillor Dennis Benneyworth

Reason for Committee Determination: Called-in by Ward Member
Reason: Although the extension is to the rear of the main building and not prominent from any direction as an intrusion in the landscape, there is a possibility that it is enabling a division of the property into two dwellings. At this stage, there is no Conservation comment.

Committee Site Visit: 10th July 2024

Contact Officer Details

Name: Sian Cutts
Job Title: Senior Planning Officer
Tel No: 01635 519111
Email: Sian.cutts@westberks.gov.uk

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Committee to consider the proposed development against the policies of the development plan and the relevant material considerations, and to make a decision as to whether to approve or refuse the application.
- 1.2 This application seeks planning permission and listed building consent for a two storey rear extension, new bathroom in existing roof space and replacement roof coverings.
- 1.3 The application site is a grade II listed farmhouse of 17th century origins set within the complex of farm buildings which serve the active farm and riding school. The building is an attractive 2 storey vernacular building in flint with brickwork dressings, a catslide roof to the rear (which was probably added to the house in the 18th century) and a half hipped tiled roof. There were additional extensions in the 19th and 20th century, the most recent being an extension to the north of the house, which is residential on the ground floor, and on the first floor is self-contained office space.
- 1.4 The site is situated within the open countryside and within the North Wessex Downs National Landscape (formerly known as the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) Footpath HUNG/10/2 runs along the access track to the Little Hidden Farm, and around the farm buildings.
- 1.5 The application has been amended following the initial consultation exercise, and the application proposes the construction of a two storey rear extension to the rear of the house, which is proposed to be connected to the existing house by a single storey boot room link. The extension is proposed to provide accommodation for three generations of the applicant's family on a long-term basis. The extension is proposed to provide two bedrooms and a shower room on the first floor, and an open plan living, dining kitchen space, with a separate utility and shower room area on the ground floor. The first floor accommodation is contained within the roof space of the proposed extension, with rooflight and a small dormer to serve one of the bedrooms. It is proposed to install a bathroom under the eaves of the catslide roof on the first floor and install a conservation style roof light. The application is also proposed the replacement of the roof coverings, with the removal of the existing clay tiles on the main part of the house and replacing with a mixture of retained tiles and new handmade clay tiles. The slates over the northern part of the house are proposed to be removed, sorted and replaced, with any new slates being provided from a store of identical slates held on the farm. It is proposed to replace the lead roll covering to the hip edges with matching bonnet tiles. The roof works also propose the introduction of a new roof insulation material, which is fitted externally.

2. Planning History

- 2.1 The table below outlines the relevant planning history of the application site.

Application	Proposal	Decision / Date
81/14772/ADD	Additions and alterations to existing house	Approved 07/04/1981
82/18322/ADD	Additions and alterations to existing house	Approved 14/12/1982

99/55417/LBC	Underpinning and masonry reinforcement to repair damage by subsidence (retrospective)	Approved 09/11/1999
--------------	---	------------------------

3. Legal and Procedural Matters

- 3.1 **Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA):** Given the nature, scale and location of this development, it is not considered to fall within the description of any development listed in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. As such, EIA screening is not required.
- 3.2 **Publicity:** Publicity has been undertaken in accordance with Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. Site notices were displayed on 14th December 2023 at the entrance to the farm, with a deadline for representations of 8th January 2024. A public notice was displayed in the /Newbury Weekly News on 23rd November 2023; with a deadline for representations of 7th December 2023.
- 3.3 **Local Financial Considerations:** Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that a local planning authority must have regard to a local finance consideration as far as it is material. Whether or not a 'local finance consideration' is material to a particular decision will depend on whether it could help to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It would not be appropriate to make a decision based on the potential for the development to raise money for a local authority or other government body. The table below identified the relevant local financial considerations for this proposal.

Consideration	Applicable to proposal	Material to decision	Refer to paragraph(s)
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)	Yes	No	3.4
New Homes Bonus	No	No	
Affordable Housing	No	No	
Public Open Space or Play Areas	No	No	
Developer Contributions (S106)	No	No	
Job Creation	No	No	

- 3.4 **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):** CIL is a levy charged on most new development within an authority area. The money is used to pay for new infrastructure supporting the development of an area by funding the provision, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure. This can include roads and transport facilities, schools and education facilities, flood defences, medical facilities, open spaces, and sports and recreational areas. CIL will be charged on residential (C3 and C4) and retail (A1 - A5) development at a rate per square metre (based on Gross Internal Area) on new development of more than 100 square metres of net floorspace (including extensions) or when a new dwelling is created (even if it is less than 100 square metres).

- 3.5 Based on the CIL PAIR form, it appears that the CIL liability for this development will be in the region of £19,534 and indexed. However, CIL liability will be formally confirmed by the CIL Charging Authority under separate cover following the grant of any permission. More information is available at www.westberks.gov.uk/cil. The CIL form includes an intention to apply for a exemption for a residential extension.
- 3.6 **New Homes Bonus (NHB):** New Homes Bonus payments recognise the efforts made by authorities to bring residential development forward. NHB money will be material to the planning application when it is reinvested in the local areas in which the developments generating the money are to be located, or when it is used for specific projects or infrastructure items which are likely to affect the operation or impacts of those developments. NHB is not considered to be a relevant material consideration in this instance, but can be noted for information.
- 3.7 **Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED):** In determining this application the Council is required to have due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. The Council must have due regard to the need to achieve the following objectives:
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 3.8 Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—
- (a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
 - (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
 - (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- 3.9 The key equalities protected characteristics include age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief. Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage, the duty is to have regard to and remove or minimise disadvantage. In considering the merits of this planning application, due regard has been given to these objectives.
- 3.10 There is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that persons with protected characteristics as identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application and there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.
- 3.11 The proposed extensions will be required to comply with Building Regulations which have their own criteria to apply for the design of buildings which also has due regard to the Act.
- 3.12 **Human Rights Act:** The development has been assessed against the provisions of the Human Rights Act, including Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of property), Article

6 (Right to a fair trial) and Article 8 (Right to respect for private and family life and home) of the Act itself. The consideration of the application in accordance with the Council procedures will ensure that views of all those interested are taken into account. All comments from interested parties have been considered and reported in summary in this report, with full text available via the Council's website.

- 3.13 It is acknowledged in the report that the proposal will have minimal impact on any neighbouring properties due to the separation distances involved. However, any interference with the right to a private and family life and home arising from the scheme as a result of impact on residential amenity is considered necessary in a democratic society in the interests of the economic well-being of the district and wider area and is proportionate given the overall benefits of the scheme in terms of provision of an extended home.
- 3.14 Any interference with property rights is in the public interest and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 regime for controlling the development of land. This recommendation is based on the consideration of the proposal against adopted Development Plan policies, the application of which does not prejudice the Human Rights of the applicant or any third party.
- 3.15 **Listed building setting:** Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special regard must be had to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 16(2) has the same requirement for proposals for listed building consent. Little Hidden Farm is a Grade II listed building, and the impact of the proposal on this building will be assessed below.
- 3.16 **Conservation areas:** Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. The application site is not within a conservation area.

4. Consultation

Statutory and non-statutory consultation

- 4.1 The table below summarises the consultation responses received during the consideration of the application. The full responses may be viewed with the application documents on the Council's website, using the link at the start of this report.

Hungerford Town Council:	Support
WBC Highways:	No objection
WBC PROW	Recommend informatives
LLFA:	Recommend informatives
WBC Archaeology:	No objection subject to a condition requiring a programmes of building work. An informative note is also recommended should artefacts of particular interest be found during groundworks
WBC: Conservation	1 st Response: A number of concerns, the application in its current form is not supported.

	2 nd Response: The proposed extension will impact the character and appearance of the rear of the building. The extension will result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building. Full comments can be found on the application file.
WBC: Ecology	Sufficient information has been provided and recommend conditions for protection, and mitigation.
AONB Board	No response received
Ramblers Association	No response received

Public representations

4.2 One email in support of the application was sent directly to Members and Hungerford Town Council has been received in support of the application. The comments can be summarised as follows

- The 1982 permission for a dormer the length of the catslide roof is not being implemented
- A rooflight which less obtrusive is proposed
- The volume of the extension has been kept to a minimum
- The rooms within the original farmhouse will be used flexibly across the generations
- Happy to agree the use of timber cladding and for this to be conditioned
- The extension is to the rear so invisible to visitors and people using the footpath
- Have amended the deign to remove dormers and reduce volume at roof level
- Ensured the link does not impact the ring beam of the original building and minimal impact on catslide roof
- Matched the half hips and roof pitch to keep roof ridge significantly below the existing roof.
- Need a family member on site to look after independent elderly mother
- Ned to provide accommodation and employment for daughter who has special needs
- Need to live on site to manage the farm and successfully continue Local Nature Recovery Strategy, Biodiversity Net Gain plan to provide Biodiversity Bank, and Soil Association Exchange

5. Planning Policy

5.1 Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The following policies of the statutory development plan are relevant to the consideration of this application.

- Policies ADPP1, ADPP5, CS1, CS14, CS13, CS16, CS17, CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 (WBCS).
- Policies C1, C3, C6, P1 of the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2006-2026 (HSA DPD).

5.2 The following material considerations are relevant to the consideration of this application:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2019-24
- WBC House Extensions SPG (2004)
- WBC Quality Design SPD (2006)
- WBC Sustainable Drainage Systems SPD (2018)

6. Appraisal

6.1 The main issues for consideration in this application are:

- Impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling
- Impact on the listed building
- Ecology

Principle of development

6.2 The application site is situated within the open countryside and within the National Landscape, where policy ADPP1, only allows appropriate limited development. Policy C1 includes the extension of existing dwellings in the countryside as an exception to the presumption against residential development outside settlement boundaries. The development is considered to be acceptable in principle, subject to the following material considerations.

Character and appearance of the dwelling

6.3 Policy C6 sets out the criteria for permitting extensions to existing dwellings in the countryside. It requires that the scale of the enlargement is subservient to the original dwelling and is designed to be in character with the existing dwelling, and that there is no adverse impact on the setting, the space occupied by the plot, or on the rural character of the area. The policy requirements of C3, CS14 and CS19 for a high quality design which respects the character and appearance of the area, the rural landscape, and the sensitivity of the area to change also apply.

6.4 The proposed extension will extend to the rear of the house by a depth of 11.7 metres. Whilst the half-hipped roof matches the roof of the original house, it has a ridge height of 7 metres, which is more than 1 metres higher than the existing extension to the north off the house. The depth of the extension is greater than the depth of the main part of the house. The proposed extension will be read as a significant addition and enlargement to the rear of the house, which will dominate the western elevation, and be particularly evident in views from the south and north where the extension will be particularly prominent, and have the appearance of a separately occupied building, which (despite the single storey 'link' to the house) will not appear to be subservient to the host building.

6.5 The materials originally proposed for the extension were larch horizontal cladding with handmade clay tiles for the roof. When the plans for the extension were amended following the initial comments from the Conservation Officer, it was then proposed to finish the external walls with a flint finish to match the house. However, the Conservation Officer has reviewed this again, and considers the wood cladding to be more contextually appropriate and would help to differentiate between the original farmhouse

and the extension, also giving the extension a lighter appearance. The applicants have indicated a willingness to this change, which can be secured through conditions.

- 6.6 The proposed extension will have a separation distance of around 5 metres to the boundary of the garden area to the field to the west. There is a more formal enclosed garden area to the south of the house, and the extension will not appear cramped within the boundaries, with plenty of garden area to serve the needs of the occupants of the extended house.
- 6.7 Overall, it is considered that the scale of the proposed extension, in terms of its height and massing, and prominence to the rear of the house will detrimentally harm the appearance and character of the building, particularly through reducing the visual prominence of the catslide roof, contrary to policies CS14, CS19, C3 and C6.

Impact on the listed building

- 6.8 In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
- 6.9 There is no statutory requirement to have regard to the provisions of the development plan when considering applications to granted listed building consent. However, the development plan is generally regarded to be a material consideration in such circumstances.
- 6.10 In large part the same heritage conservation considerations will apply as with planning applications. The Government's policy for the historic environment on deciding all such consents and permissions is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF does not distinguish between the type of application being made. It is the significance of the heritage assets and the impact of the proposals that should determine the decision. Paragraph 205 of the NPPF says when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset (including conservation areas), great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
- 6.11 Paragraph 208 of NPPF goes on to say that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
- 6.12 Consistent with the NPPF, Policy CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 states that particular regard will be given to the conservation and, where appropriate, enhancement of heritage assets and their setting.
- 6.13 Consequently, the main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural and historical interest, and therefore significance, of the listed building and its setting.
- 6.14 Following a thorough assessment of the proposal the Conservation Officer has raised objections to the impact of the proposed extension on the significance of the listed building.
- 6.15 The Conservation Officer notes that the farmhouse's significance arises primarily from its architectural/artistic, historic illustrative and evidential values. The building has undergone historic and more recent alterations and extensions, illustrating the building's adaptation to changing living standards and the evolution of the farmstead, described as possibly having 16th century origins in the West Berkshire HER. The list description identifies the oldest part of the farmhouse as the south end and chimney. An extension to the north would have followed, creating a lobby entrance plan. This historic planform

is still legible and has been partly retained. The next alteration would likely have been the catslide extension to the rear (likely 18th century). This is considered to be a sympathetic and attractive alteration that is of historic interest, which has had a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this building. A 19th century side extension was added to the north of the main building; a pitched 1.5 storey form in red brickwork and a slate roof. This was further extended in the 20th century to the north west, with another pitched form, similar to the 19th century extension in form, but appearing to be of lower quality and less sympathetic design. While the existing 19th century and 20th century extensions to the north are subservient to the main building in appearance, in terms of footprint, they amount to over half of the main building.

- 6.16 A number of concerns arise relating to the two storey extension surrounding issues of scale, appearance and cumulative impact. In terms of scale, the proposed roof is large in form with its ridge exceeding that of the existing C19th and C20th extensions to the north. The massing of the proposed extension reads as a significant addition and enlargement of built form. When seen from the north and south, it appears to visually compete with the main building. The form, materiality and detailing of the proposed extension gives it the appearance of being a new dwelling attached to the original, rather than a subservient extension.
- 6.17 Finally, the concern of cumulative impact arises from the further addition of built form to this once modest cottage. The combined volume of the existing side extension and proposed two storey extension approaches that of the volume of the main house, which alters the character and hierarchy of this listed building.
- 6.18 There are other works proposed as part of the application such as the replacement of the roof coverings to the existing house, and the insertion of a rooflight within the catslide roof. The proposal includes the removal of the existing tiles on the main house, many of which have slipped, and are in a poor state, and it is proposed to replace those which are damaged with handmade clay tiles which replicate the original tiles, and where possible re-use the existing tiles, with replacement slates over the northern part of the house. It is also proposed to add insulation to the roof while the works are taking place. The insulation is to be added externally, so that internal ceilings, and their historic fabric are not affected. These works are considered to be appropriate, with conditions to ensure that use of suitable tiles and slates.
- 6.19 There are no concerns with the insertion of the rooflight in the catslide roof to serve the proposed bathroom in the eaves.
- 6.20 The Conservation Officer concludes that the extension incurs a level of less than substantial harm to the significance of this listed farmhouse. This is due to the impact that the proposed two storey extension has on the character and hierarchy of the farmhouse, attributed to its scale, appearance and its cumulative impact alongside the existing C19th and C20th extensions. The NPPF (Para 201) advises that the LPA should look to avoid and minimise any conflict between a heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal. Additionally, the NPPF (Para 208) advises that any harm should be weighed against the public benefits of this proposal, and that this harm should be clearly and convincingly justified (Para 206). In this case, the benefits that would result from the proposal would be limited to private benefits. Furthermore, it does not appear as though alternative configurations of the extension have been considered, and there may be scope for a proposal that is more in keeping with the character of the listed farmhouse. This could significantly reduce the level of harm to the significance of this building.
- 6.21 The proposed extension will cause harm to the significance of the listed building, and as such is contrary to policies CS14, CS19, C3 and C6 so in accordance with paragraph

208 of the NPPF it will be necessary to weight the harm against the public benefits of the proposed development.

6.22 **Ecology**

6.23 Policy CS17 requires that biodiversity assets across the District are conserved and enhanced, and development which may harm habitats or species of principal importance for conservation they will only be permitted where compensation and mitigation measures are provided.

6.24 The application was submitted within an ecological survey which indicates the presence of bat roosts within the roof, as well as swifts and sparrow, with other bird species in nearby farm buildings. The survey has set out protection measures which will need to be undertaken by a licensed bat worker and agreed via a European Protected Species License. The survey also indicates mitigation measures for the bats which includes concealed roost units in the walls on the proposed extension, and additional house sparrow boxes and swift boxes to be installed around the house. The council's Ecologist is satisfied with the survey information which has been provided, and the protection and mitigation measures proposed. The protection and mitigation measures, as well as the proposed enhancement measures can be secured through conditions. In addition, a condition controlling external lighting can also be secured.

Town Council representations

6.25 Hungerford Town Council have confirmed that they support this application.

7. Planning Balance and Conclusion

7.1 The proposed extension by virtue of its size, scale and prominence will harm the appearance and character, and therefore significance of this grade II listed farmhouse. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF says "*where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.*"

7.2 The application has been submitted to provide accommodation for three generations of the family, who have lived in the house for 42 years, and now the farm is being run by a different generation, and for health and social reasons the generations need to live together, and evidence of this has been provided. In addition, there has been information provided about the farm reaching carbon net positive, as they absorb more CO₂ than is emitted, including the equivalent from livestock, through the management of the land, woodlands forestry and agriculture. In addition, the farm has also been exploring opportunities to provide Biodiversity Net Gain projects. It is argued that the extension to the house is required to assist with these wider environmental improvements and support the viability of the farm. Whilst these environmental improvements are noted and welcomed, they are not direct benefits which would be derived from the extension itself. There has not been any information provided about alternative solutions within the farm holding where alternative accommodation could be provided, such as conversion of redundant or underused buildings. The benefits of the proposed extension are limited to the private interests of the applicant and her family.

7.3 The assessment has concluded that there will be harm to this grade II listed building which is protected for its special historic and architectural merit and protected in the national interest. In addition, it is considered that the proposal will not be subservient to the existing dwellings, and so is contrary to Policy C6 of the HSA DPD. This is an identified environmental harm. Whilst some environmental enhancements are proposed

in the form of additional bird and bat boxes, these are limited as they also relate to the mitigation which is required as a result on the development. There are environmental improvements as a result of improving the insulation to the roof, however, these have not been considered to be harmful to the listed building and so are given neutral weight. There are limited social benefits to the family of providing the additional accommodation to serve their domestic needs. The proposal also has limited economic benefits beyond the construction phase of the development. Whilst the applicant's son has indicated that the works and will contribute towards the viability of the farm, by making it more efficient to be living on site, there has been no supporting evidence to demonstrate this.

- 7.4 The proposed extension to the house is considered to be contrary to the relevant development plan policies and the advice contained within the NPPF and is recommended for refusal.

8. Full Recommendation for 23/02591/HOUSE

- 8.1 To delegate to the Development Manager to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the reasons listed below.

Refusal Reasons

1.	<p>Impact on the character and appearance of the listed house</p> <p>The application is proposing a large two storey extension to the rear of the house known as Little Hidden Farm, which is a grade II listed building. In terms of scale, the proposed roof is large in form with its ridge exceeding that of the existing C19th and C20th extensions to the north. The massing of the proposed extension reads as a significant addition and enlargement of built form. When seen from the north and south, it appears to visually compete with the main building. The scale and form of the proposed extension gives it the appearance of being a new dwelling attached to the original, rather than a subservient extension. The combined volume of the existing side extension and proposed two storey extension approaches that of the volume of the main house, which alters the character and hierarchy of this listed building.</p> <p>The proposal would therefore fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of this listed building, contrary to the expectations of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>In finding harm in respect of the significance of heritage assets, paragraph 208 of the NPPF sets out that where a view is taken that the harm to the designated heritage asset would be less than substantial, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this instance, the degree of harm would be less than substantial in the context of paragraph 208. However, though less than substantial, there would, nevertheless, be real and serious harm. In this instance, the harm would not be outweighed by any public benefits, as the only benefits offered by the proposal would be entirely private.</p> <p>The proposal therefore conflicts with the statutory requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and conservation Areas) Act 1990, the NPPF, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) which require that proposals should preserve the heritage significance of listed buildings. The proposed extension is also contrary to Policies ADPP5 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policies C3 and C6 of the Housing Sites Allocation DPD which seek to ensure that the scale of any enlargement to a dwelling within the countryside</p>
----	--

	is subservient to the original dwelling, has no adverse impact on the historic interest of the building and its setting within the wider landscape.
--	---

Informatives

1.	<p>Proactive</p> <p>In attempting to determine the application in a way that can foster the delivery of sustainable development, the local planning authority has approached this decision in a positive way having regard to Development Plan policies and available guidance to try to secure high quality appropriate development. In this application there has been a need to balance conflicting considerations, and the local planning authority has also attempted to work proactively with the applicant to find a solution to the problems with the development; however, an acceptable solution to improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area could not be found.</p>
2.	<p>CIL for refused application</p> <p>This application has been considered by West Berkshire Council, and REFUSED. Should the application be granted on appeal there will be a liability to pay Community Infrastructure Levy to West Berkshire Council on commencement of the development. This charge would be levied in accordance with the West Berkshire Council CIL Charging Schedule and Section 211 of the Planning Act 2008.</p>
3.	<p>Refused Plans/Documents</p> <p>The following plans/documents were considered in the determination of the application</p> <p>Site Location & Block Plan Drawing No 21033-100E received 10th November 2023 Existing Plans Sections & Elevations Drawing No 21033-112A received 10th November 2023 Proposed Elevations & Sections Drawing No 21033-114C received 12th March 2024 Proposed Floor & Roof Plans Drawing No 21033-113C received 12th March 2024 Proposed Part Section Through Basement Drawing No 21033-115 received 10th November 2023</p> <p>Heritage Design & Access Statement prepared by Mathewson Waters Architects received 10th November 2023 Bat Survey & Mitigation Report prepared by Aluco Ecology Ltd dated November 2023 received 10th November 2023 Supporting Statement dated November 2023 received 10th November 2023 Existing Elevations Photographs received 10th November 20 Mathewson Waters Architects response to Conservation Officer dated 6th March 2024. Howard Waters email received 25th June 2024 Howard Waters email received 2nd July 2024</p>

9. Full Recommendation for 23/02592/LBC

- 9.1 To delegate to the Development Manager to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the reasons listed below.

Refusal Reasons

1.	<p>Detrimental Impact on listed building</p> <p>The application is proposing a large two storey extension to the rear of the house known as Little Hidden Farm, which is a grade II listed building. In terms of scale, the proposed roof is large in form with its ridge exceeding that of the existing C19th and C20th extensions to the north. The massing of the proposed extension reads as a significant addition and enlargement of built form. When seen from the north and south, it appears to visually compete with the main building. The scale and form of the proposed extension gives it the appearance of being a new dwelling attached to the original, rather than a subservient extension. The combined volume of the existing side extension and proposed two storey extension approaches that of the volume of the main house, which alters the character and hierarchy of this listed building.</p> <p>The proposal would therefore fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of this listed building, contrary to the expectations of the Planning (Listed Buildings and conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>In finding harm in respect of the significance of heritage assets, paragraph 208 of the NPPF sets out that where a view is taken that the harm to the designated heritage asset would be less than substantial, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this instance, the degree of harm would be less than substantial in the context of paragraph 208. However, though less than substantial, there would, nevertheless, be real and serious harm. In this instance, the harm would not be outweighed by any public benefits, as the only benefits offered by the proposal would be entirely private. The proposal therefore conflicts with the statutory requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and conservation Areas) Act 1990, the NPPF, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) which require that proposals should preserve the heritage significance of listed buildings.</p>
----	---

Informatives

1.	<p>Proactive</p> <p>In attempting to determine the application in a way that can foster the delivery of sustainable development, the local planning authority has approached this decision in a positive way having regard to Development Plan policies and available guidance to try to secure high quality appropriate development. In this application there has been a need to balance conflicting considerations, and the local planning authority has also attempted to work proactively with the applicant to find a solution to the problems with the development; however, an acceptable solution to improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area could not be found.</p>
2.	<p>Refused Plans/Documents</p> <p>The following plans/documents were considered in the determination of the application</p> <p>Site Location & Block Plan Drawing No 21033-100E received 10th November 2023 Existing Plans Sections & Elevations Drawing No 21033-112A received 10th November 2023 Proposed Elevations & Sections Drawing No 21033-114C received 12th March 2024</p>

Proposed Floor & Roof Plans Drawing No 21033-113C received 12th March 2024
Proposed Part Section Through Basement Drawing No 21033-115 received 10th November 2023

Heritage Design & Access Statement prepared by Mathewson Waters Architects received 10th November 2023

Bat Survey & Mitigation Report prepared by Aluco Ecology Ltd dated November 2023 received 10th November 2023

Supporting Statement dated November 2023 received 10th November 2023

Existing Elevations Photographs received 10th November 20

Mathewson Waters Architects response to Conservation Officer dated 6th March 2024.

Howard Waters email received 25th June 2024

Howard Waters email received 2nd July 2024