

Item No.	Application No. and Parish	Statutory Target Date	Proposal, Location, Applicant
(1)	26/00449/LBC & 26/00448/HOUSE Kintbury Parish Council	07.05.2026 ¹	Erection of a single storey rear extension Hamstead Holt House, Kintbury Holt, Newbury, RG20 0DD Mr and Mrs Hume
1 Extension of time agreed with applicant until tbc			

The application details can be viewed on the Council's website at the following link:

<https://publicaccess.westberks.gov.uk/online-applications/simpleSearchResults.do?action=firstPage>

Recommendation Summary: To delegate to the Development Manager to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION and LISTED BUILDING CONSENT

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

Reason for Committee Determination: Called-in if recommended for refusal

Committee Site Visit: 14th May 2026

Contact Officer Details

Name: Miss Harriet Allen
Job Title: Planning Officer
Tel No: 01635 519111
Email: Harriet.Allen1@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 for the erection of a single storey rear extension to the grade II listed Hamstead Holt House, situated in open countryside and the North Wessex Downs National Landscape.
- 1.3 Hamstead Holt House dates to the late 18th century, with significance arising primarily from its handsome and relatively unaltered farmhouse character according to the Historic England listing description. Adjoining the house to the northeast is a curtilage-listed building, described in the applicant's Heritage Impact Assessment as a former dairy.
- 1.4 The house has been substantially altered over time, most recently by the addition of a single storey extension granted in 1992, and two-storey extension in 2009, both on the northeast elevation. Consequently, the ability to understand the farmhouse significance has been eroded, with the original farmhouse appearance only clear from the northwest elevation according to the submitted heritage statement.
- 1.5 The application proposes the demolition of utility rooms and a boot room, understood to date to the 20th century, followed by the erection of a further single storey extension off the northeast elevation with a garden wall, which would sit in front of the northwest elevation of the former dairy.

2. Planning History

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

Application	Proposal	Decision / Date
92/41285/ADD	Alterations to house and addition of garden room.	APPROVED 27.08.1992
08/02384/HOUSE & 08/02386/LBC	First floor extension with a new en-suite bedroom at north east side of the building on existing wall structure. Internal alteration includes replacing current family bathroom into dressing room and existing bedroom 2 into family bathroom. New Tennis Court to North West	APPROVED 17.02.2009
09/00655/COND1	Application for approval of details reserved by Condition 2: Full schedule of work, Condition 3: All works of making good and repair to the retained fabric, Condition 4: Adequate protection and support, Condition 5: Material use visible external to the new extension, Condition 6: Sample, Condition 7: Brickwork, Condition 8: Details of all new windows and Condition 9: Impact of the proposed	APPROVED 22.02.2010

	modification to the North East elevation of planning permission reference 08/02386/LBC	
09/00934/COND1	Application for approval of details reserved by Conditions 2 and 3 of planning permission reference 08/02384/HOUSE: Condition 2 - Landscaping . Condition 3 - Tree Protection	APPROVED 22.02.2010
21/03019/HOUSE	Construction of a domestic inground swimming pool and plant hut	APPROVED 02.02.2022

- 2.2 This current application follows withdrawn application refs: 25/00966/HOUSE and 25/00967/LBC which proposed a similar single storey extension that was objected to by the Principal Conservation and Design Officer.

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 02.04.2026 to a gate at the entrance to the property, with a deadline for representations of 25.04.2026. A public notice was displayed in the Weekly News on 19.03.2026; with a deadline for representations of 02.04.2026. Notification letters were sent to Hamstead Holt Farm, The Granary, The Bothy, The Smithy and The Stables. The deadline for a response was 10.04.2026,
- 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. No local financial considerations are material to this application.
- 3.4 **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):** Community Infrastructure Levy (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. CIL will be used to fund roads and other transport facilities, schools and other educational facilities, flood defences, medical facilities, open spaces, and sports and recreational areas. Subject to the application of any applicable exemptions, CIL will be charged on residential (Use Classes C3 and C4) and retail (former Use Classes A1 – A5) development at a rate per square metre (based on Gross Internal Area) on new development of more than 100 square metres of gross internal area (including extensions) or when a new dwelling is created (even if it is less than 100 square metres). CIL liability, and the application of any exemptions, will be formally confirmed by the CIL Charging Authority

under separate cover following any grant of planning permission. More information is available at <https://www.westberks.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy>

- 3.5 **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.
- 3.6 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.
- 3.7 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.
- 3.8 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.
- 3.9 **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.
- 3.10 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.

- 3.11 **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. This application affects the Grade II listed Hamstead Holt House. A heritage impact assessment has been provided by the applicant, and the Council’s Conservation Officer has also commented on the impact of the proposal on the building’s special historic interest. Consideration of the assessments is provided in this report under the relevant headings.
- 3.12 **National Landscapes (AONB):** Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act 2000 (as amended) provides a general duty for public bodies: “Any relevant authority exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to effect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty in England must seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty).” AONBs have been rebranded to be known as National Landscapes, although their legal AONB status continues.

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.

Kintbury Parish Council:	No objection.
WBC Principal Conservation and Design Officer:	Objection – Less than substantial harm identified which has not been sufficiently justified or outweighed by public benefits.
WBC Public Rights of Way Officer:	No objection. Informatives advised.
North Wessex Downs	No response received.
Ramblers’ Association	No response received

Public representations

- 4.2 No representations were received within the 21-day public consultation period.

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.

Development Plan Document	Relevant Policies
<p><u>West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2023-2041</u></p>	<p>Strategic Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy SP1 The Spatial Strategy • Policy SP2 North Wessex Downs National Landscape • Policy SP3 Settlement Hierarchy • Policy SP5 Responding to Climate Change • Policy SP6 Flood Risk • Policy SP7 Design Quality • Policy SP8 Landscape Character • Policy SP9 Historic Environment • Policy SP10 Green Infrastructure • Policy SP11 Biodiversity & Geodiversity • Policy SP19 Transport <p>Development Management Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy DM1 Residential Development in the Countryside • Policy DM4 Building Sustainable Homes & Businesses • Policy DM7 Water Resources & Waste Water • Policy DM9 Conservation Areas • Policy DM10 Listed Buildings • Policy DM15 Trees, Woodland & Hedgerows • Policy DM28 Residential Extensions • Policy DM30 Residential Amenity • Policy DM44 Parking

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

- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- National Design Guide
- Quality Design SPD (2006)
- Sustainable Drainage Systems SPD (2018)

6. Appraisal

Principle of development

- 6.1 According to Policy DM28, the principle of the extension of existing permanent dwellings will be supported. The policy gives criteria where residential extensions will

be permitted; these relates to the impacts of the development and are considered, as appropriate, under the headings below.

Character and appearance and impact on the listed building

- 6.2 According to Policy SP7, new development will be required to strengthen a sense of place through high quality locally distinctive design. The policy further expects opportunities to be taken for the conservation and enhancement of character and appearance.
- 6.3 The conservation and, where appropriate, enhancement of listed buildings specifically is a requirement of Policy SP9.
- 6.4 Supporting the above requirements, Policies DM28 and DM10 provide specific criteria to be complied with.
- 6.5 The proposed extension would have a 3.5m high flat roof, 1m higher than the element to be demolished, that aligns with the eaves of the former dairy and existing single storey extension. The materials and fenestration indicate a traditional design approach, with painted timber frames and a mock bricked-up window, and handmade brick for walls detailed to match the existing extension. A contemporary glazed link is also proposed to connect the extension to the former dairy.
- 6.6 The Conservation and Design Officer acknowledges that the further detail provided on the age of the rendered extension shows that it includes elements of an early/mid 20th century extension alongside the second storey added in 2008 (ref: 08/02384/HOUSE & 08/02386/LBC). This alleviates their previous concerns regarding the removal of historic fabric. However, they remained concerned regarding the size and design of the proposed extension.
- 6.7 Combined with the glazed link, the footprint would be circa 46sqm, and following the demolition of an existing extension the net increase would be 39sqm. Within the context of the original and existing building, the scale is considered significant and disproportionate given it would be close to the footprint of the curtilage-listed former dairy (55sqm), and almost a quarter of the original house footprint (120sqm). It would also appear wider than the two existing extensions and be sited to one side in front of the thinner two-storey element, resulting in a lack of consistency of built form and overlapping building and ridge lines.
- 6.8 The extension would project 7m from the northeast elevation, and the garden wall by a further metre. Consequently, more of the curtilage-listed building would be obscured, further eroding the farmhouse character on the northeast and northwest elevations.
- 6.9 Overall, taking into account the cumulative impact of three extensions and proposed garden wall, by virtue of the volume, form and materials, the proposed development would appear as a heavy and bulky addition, disproportionate to the scale and character of the farmhouse, further complicating the northwest and northeast elevations, and thus eroding the building's historic interest.
- 6.10 Criterion (b) of Policy DM28 requires extensions to be of a high-quality design, and criterion (d) requires the historic and/or architectural interest of the existing dwelling to not be harmed.
- 6.11 According to Policy DM10, unless justified otherwise, development will not be permitted if it would adversely affect the character, scale, proportion, design, detailing, or materials used in the Listed Building (criterion i), or result in the loss of/or

irreversible change to original features or other features of importance or interest (criterion ii).

- 6.12 Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, and paragraph 215 states 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.
- 6.13 Reasons are given for the scale and bulk being acceptable in the heritage impact supplementary statements. These refer to the previous erosion of the building's farmhouse character and truncation of the dairy, existing "muddled" appearance to the rear due to the previous extensions, and lack of affected public views of the development.
- 6.14 In this context, the primary requirement is for the listed building, its setting and special features of historic interest to be preserved. Therefore, the existing somewhat muddled appearance and erosion of historic interest over time does not justify development that would exacerbate these matters. As it stands, the dwelling is listed and great weight must be given to its remaining features of historic interest which includes the farmhouse character and curtilage-listed building on the northwest and northeast elevations, which this proposed extension would erode.
- 6.15 The lack of a public view of the development does not warrant harm to the intrinsic historic character of the building itself, the conservation of which is to be given great weight.
- 6.16 The consideration is whether the significance is sustained and enhanced which it is not. The proposed extension will project further than the existing extensions and former dairy. It will also introduce a large expanse of flat roof which is out of keeping with the overall form of the building and the various roof forms and heights. While the parapet of the extension will be aligned to the eaves datum of the existing single storey extension, the proposed extension will slightly obscure the feature window within the stair hall. The rear elevation drawings highlight just how odd the proposed extension will sit alongside the other extensions.
- 6.17 The proposed north east elevation drawing further highlights how odd the proposed extension will sit amongst the various roof forms and massing of the different extensions. A new garden wall has been added with this application presumably in an attempt to provide screening. However, this adds further bulk and brickwork and more linear extension forms across this elevation as well as further changes in heights.
- 6.18 Further justification given is that the extension and associated internal alterations would create a large kitchen, posed as a benefit in enabling a large space to be the "heart of the home", now needed due its enlargement over time.
- 6.19 Regarding the posed internal layout improvements, the Conservation Officer does not consider this to be sufficient justification, noting that the extension would move a large living space away from the rest of historic parts of the house. They also note that it has not been demonstrated that the continued viable use of the property as a residential dwelling is dependent on the proposal as the building has an ongoing residential use that would not cease in its absence.
- 6.20 For the reasons above, it is considered by officers that the proposal fails to preserve historic interest, adversely affects the character, scale, and proportion of the listed building, would result in the obscuration of features of interest, and does not represent high quality design, contrary to national and local policy requirements.

Residential amenity

- 6.21 The proposed extension is a single storey and behind a two-storey element. It is not considered that the proposal would result in any harmful overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking impacts on the occupants of neighbouring dwellings and their private amenity spaces in accordance with Policy DM30.
- 6.22 The private functional amenity space for Hamstead Holt House would be largely unchanged, remaining sufficient in scale and quality following the construction of the extension.

Highway matters

- 6.23 According to Policy SP19, development that generates a transport impact will be required to (amongst others) mitigate any adverse impact on local transport networks. Criterion h of Policy DM28 requires that following construction of the extension, sufficient space is available for on-site vehicular parking in accordance with policy DM44 in a way that does not detract from the character and appearance of the area.
- 6.24 No changes are proposed to the number of bedrooms, nor existing access and parking arrangements. There are therefore no highways implications.

Flooding and drainage

- 6.25 The application site is less than 1ha, not in Flood Zones 2 or 3, nor in an area identified as being at risk of flooding from rivers and sea, surface water, or groundwater. As such, no flood risk assessment is required in accordance with Policy SP6. It is not considered that the proposed single storey rear extension, which would be on existing hardstanding, would exacerbate flood risk on the site nor elsewhere.
- 6.26 Given the lack of flood risk and nature and scale of the proposal, it is not considered proportionate to require details of surface water drainage to render the proposal acceptable in terms of its flooding and drainage impact.

Ecology

- 6.27 According to Policy SP11, development proposals will be required to demonstrate how they conserve and enhance biodiversity and/or geodiversity including their long-term future management and, where required, deliver Biodiversity Net Gains. Criterion k of Policy DM28 requires that the proposal conserves and enhances biodiversity, in accordance with policy SP11.
- 6.28 The extension would be on an existing patio area and not result in the loss of any habitat.
- 6.29 Householder development is exempt from mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain.
- 6.30 No adverse impact on biodiversity nor conflict with Policy SP11 has been identified.

Trees

- 6.31 According to Policy DM15, development which conserves and enhances trees, woodland and hedgerows will be supported. Criterion j of Policy DM28 requires that the proposal would not result in adverse impacts on trees (including their roots and

canopy spread) on and off site, in accordance with policy DM15. Trees should be retained where possible.

6.32 The proposal would affect an existing area of hardstanding and have no significant impact on any green infrastructure.

6.33 No adverse impact on trees nor conflict with Policy DM15 has been identified.

Climate change, energy and water

6.34 According to Policy SP5, the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation will be required to be embedded into new development. Proposals should be accompanied by a Sustainability Statement which demonstrates how the principles in Policy SP5 have been embedded into the development, proportionate to the scale and nature of the development proposed. Policy DM7 requires development to be water-neutral as far as practicable.

6.35 No sustainability statement has been submitted however it is acknowledged that the scale and nature of the proposal is minor, and the extension would be appropriately insulated as required by building regulations.

6.36 As such the lack of specified energy and water efficiency measures is not considered to amount to a harm sufficient to merit a reason for refusal.

7. Planning Balance and Conclusion

7.1 Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions. It includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development which means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay. However, where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not usually be granted.

7.2 For the reasons given in this report, the proposed development result in a low level of less than substantial harm to the special interest of Hamstead Holt House without sufficient justification or public benefit.

8. Full Recommendation for 26/00448/HOUSE

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

Refusal Reason

1	Impact on significance The application site comprises the grade II listed 18 th century building known as Hamstead Holt House, and curtilage-listed former farm building. Significance of the building arises from its handsome late-18 th century farmhouse character, and features of interest contributing to this include the original northwest elevation, and the curtilage-listed building most visible on the northeast and northwest elevations.
----------	---

	<p>The proposed extension would project 7m from an existing two-storey extension on the northeast elevation, and the garden wall by 8m, completely obscuring the remaining northwest-facing wall of the curtilage-listed building. Furthermore, the extension would be greater in width than both the two-storey element and adjacent single storey extension, have a similar footprint to the adjoining curtilage-listed building, and be almost a quarter of the original house in footprint terms. Consequently the proposed extension would complicate the northwest and northeast elevations by introducing more overlapping building and ridge lines.</p> <p>Overall, taking into account the cumulative impact of three extensions off the northwest elevation, and proposed garden wall, by virtue of the volume, form and materials, the proposed development would appear as a heavy and bulky addition, disproportionate to the scale and character of the farmhouse, further complicating the northwest and northeast elevations, and eroding the building's historic interest. The proposal therefore fails to preserve historic interest, adversely affects the character, scale, and proportion of the listed building, would result in the obscuration of features of interest, and does not represent high quality design.</p> <p>The low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building has not been sufficiently justified nor has public benefit outweighing the harm been sufficiently demonstrated.</p> <p>The proposal therefore fails to comply with the statutory requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and conservation Areas) Act 1990, the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policies SP7, SP9, DM10 and DM28 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2023-2041.</p>
--	---

Informatives

1	<p>Refusal</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 the local planning authority has been unable to find an acceptable solution to the problems with the development so that the development can be said to improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.</p>
2	<p>Plans considered</p> <p>The following plans/documents have been considered in the determination of this application:</p> <p>2504_LP_001 REV A Location Plan received 10.03.2026 2504_SP_002 REV A Block Plan received 12.03.2026 2504_P_20_200 REV E Proposed Elevations received 10.03.2026 2504_P_20_100 REV F Proposed Floor & Roof Plans received 10.03.2026 2504_XP_20_100 REV B Existing Floor & Roof Plans received 10.03.2026 Design & Access Statement received 24.02.2026 Flood Risk Assessment received 24.02.2026 Heritage Statement & Impact Assessment received 24.02.2026 Supplementary Heritage Statement & Impact Assessment received 24.02.2026</p>

9. Full Recommendation for 26/00449/LBC

- 9.1 To delegate to the Development Manager to REFUSE LISTED BUILDING CONSENT for the reason listed below.

Refusal Reason

1	<p>Impact on significance</p> <p>The application site comprises the grade II listed 18th century building known as Hamstead Holt House, and curtilage-listed former farm building. Significance of the building arises from its handsome late-18th century farmhouse character, and features of interest contributing to this include the original northwest elevation, and the curtilage-listed building most visible on the northeast and northwest elevations.</p> <p>The proposed extension would project 7m from an existing two-storey extension on the northeast elevation, and the garden wall by 8m, completely obscuring the remaining northwest-facing wall of the curtilage-listed building. Furthermore, the extension would be greater in width than both the two-storey element and adjacent single storey extension, have a similar footprint to the adjoining curtilage-listed building, and be almost a quarter of the original house in footprint terms. Consequently the proposed extension would complicate the northwest and northeast elevations by introducing more overlapping building and ridge lines.</p> <p>Overall, taking into account the cumulative impact of three extensions off the northwest elevation, and proposed garden wall, by virtue of the volume, form and materials, the proposed development would appear as a heavy and bulky addition, disproportionate to the scale and character of the farmhouse, further complicating the northwest and northeast elevations, and eroding the building's historic interest. The proposal therefore fails to preserve historic interest, adversely affects the character, scale, and proportion of the listed building, would result in the obscuration of features of interest, and does not represent high quality design.</p> <p>The low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building has not been sufficiently justified nor has public benefit outweighing the harm been sufficiently demonstrated.</p> <p>The proposal therefore fails to comply with the statutory requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and conservation Areas) Act 1990, National Planning Policy Framework, and Policies SP7, SP9, DM10 and DM28 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2023-2041.</p>
---	--