

DRAFT

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

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 20 MAY 2026**

Councillors Present: Phil Barnett (Chairman), Clive Hooker (Vice-Chairman), Adrian Abbs, Dennis Benneyworth, Martin Colston, Paul Dick, Nigel Foot, Denise Gaines and Tony Vickers

Also Present: Debra Inston, Harriet Allen, Gordon Oliver, Thomas Radbourne, Anna Hart, Rebecca Hawkes-Reynolds

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Howard Woollaston

PART I

1. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2026 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 March 2026 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Nigel Foot declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was the West Berkshire Portfolio Holder for Culture, he was a member of the West Berkshire Heritage Forum, and was a member of the Newbury Town Council Steering Group. As his interest was personal, and not a prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

Councillors Dennis Benneyworth and Denise Gaines declared an interest in Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that they were the Hungerford and Kintbury Ward Members.

Councillors Dennis Benneyworth and Tony Vickers declared that they had been lobbied on Agenda Item 4(1)

3. Schedule of Planning Applications

**(1) Application No. and Location: 26/00449/LBC & 26/00448/HOUSE
Hamstead Holt House, Kintbury Holt, Newbury, RG20 0DD**

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 26/00449/LBC & 26/00448/HOUSE in respect of erection of a single storey rear extension Hamstead Holt House, Kintbury Holt, Newbury, RG20 0DD
2. Ms Harriet Allen introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material planning considerations. In conclusion the report detailed that the proposal was unsatisfactory in planning terms and officers recommended that the Development Manager be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons listed in the main and update reports.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 20 MAY 2026 - MINUTES

3. Ms Rebecca Hawkes-Reynolds made a presentation to the Committee which highlighted the following points:
 - The Principal Conservation and Design Officer did not object to the principle of a further extension but had concerns about the proposed design.
 - It was not considered best practice to continuously add extensions onto further extensions.
 - A suggestion to rationalise the existing extensions as part of the works, rather than simply adding another, was not taken up by the applicant, and therefore her concerns remained.
4. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Angus Hume, applicant, and Ms Caroline Downie, agent, and Tony Vickers, Ward Member addressed the Committee on this application.

Applicant/Agent Representation

5. Mr Hume and Ms Downie addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:

[Western Area Planning Committee – Recording](#)

Member Questions to the Applicant/Agent

6. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - The Agent clarified that she had communicated with the Case Officer regarding the plans, Harriet Allen, but had not been given the opportunity to speak directly with the Conservation Officer.
 - Mr Hume confirmed he had moved in in July 2017.
 - The Agent explained that the flat roof design would remain considerably lower than a second-storey window, which a pitched roof would have obscured.
 - The Agent clarified that her figure of 16% was based on the existing footprint of the house, whereas the officer's figure of 25% was based on the original footprint.

Ward Member Representation

7. Councillor Vickers addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:

[Western Area Planning Committee - Recording](#)

Member Questions to the Ward Member

8. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - Councillor Vickers confirmed that he would not take part in the debate or vote on the matter.

Member Questions to Officers

9. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - Officers confirmed that while no specific policy currently existed, officer practice was to measure from the original dwelling in order to assess cumulative impact.
 - Ms Hawkes-Reynolds stated that she was always open to discussions with applicants to work towards an acceptable solution.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 20 MAY 2026 - MINUTES

- Officers explained that under the NPPF, considerable weight was attached to any harm to a listed building. Any less than substantial harm had to be outweighed by the public benefits. In this case, the benefits were considered private (improving a family home) and not public, and therefore did not outweigh the harm.
- Ms Hawkes-Reynolds stated that removing the proposed garden wall would not alter her opinion on the level of harm, as her primary concerns regarding the bulk, massing, and size of the extension itself would remain.
- Ms Hawkes-Reynolds indicated that she could not base her assessment on a hypothetical situation of whether her opinion would be different if the adjoining dairy building were its original, larger size as seen on a 1900 map.
- Ms Hawkes-Reynolds confirmed she had not been able to visit the site but was accustomed to assessing applications from detailed plans and photographs.
- Officers clarified that ensuring the sustainable future of a listed building was in itself a public benefit. However, in this instance, the property was already a substantial and functional family home, so the extension was not required for its survival.
- Officers reiterated that as the house already functioned well and had a viable future, having a “nicer house” for future generations was not a sufficient public benefit to outweigh the harm.

Debate

10. Councillor Adrian Abbs opened the debate, stating that an officer recommendation for refusal carried significant weight. He was persuaded by the officer's distinction between public and private benefit as outlined in the NPPF. He felt the building was listed for a reason, and he could not see a justification for going against the professional officer recommendations.

Councillor Vickers left the meeting at 19:17

11. Councillor Clive Hooker stated that the site visit had been very useful, and in his view, the proposed extension did not appear as large on-site as it did on the drawings. He felt it fitted in reasonably well. He was surprised the Conservation Officer had not visited the site. He argued that houses must evolve to suit modern lifestyles, such as the move towards kitchen-diners, and viewed the application as a finely balanced matter.
12. Councillor Paul Dick supported the views of Councillor Abbs. He was not concerned that the Conservation Officer had not visited the site, as this was standard practice. He was sympathetic to the applicant but had not been persuaded to vote against the officers' professional recommendation.
13. Councillor Martin Colston noted that the two principal elevations of the house would be largely unaffected. He viewed the proposal as a natural evolution of the house, which should not be preserved "in aspic", and was minded to vote against the officer recommendation.
14. Councillor Nigel Foot highlighted that the fundamental reason for listing buildings, was to protect the building itself. He noted the Conservation Officer was not against an extension in principle, but against this specific design. He felt the protection of the building was paramount and supported the officer's recommendation to refuse.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 20 MAY 2026 - MINUTES

15. Councillor Dennis Benneyworth considered it a very finely balanced application. He felt the building had always evolved with time and struggled to find a reason not to support what he saw as a relatively modest addition. He stated he would reluctantly go against the officer's recommendation.
16. Councillor Denise Gaines said she had been undecided throughout the meeting. She felt that if the adjoining dairy had not been truncated in the past, the proposed extension would not seem as bulky. On balance, given the lack of any public view of the changes, she felt the extension would not cause enough harm and was minded to go against the officer's recommendation.
17. Councillor Abbs reiterated that the NPPF was now very clear on the protection of heritage assets, and in his view, the decision was not finely balanced.
18. Councillor Dick made the point that whether a listed building was visible to the public or not was not relevant; it was about looking after the building.
19. Councillor Foot proposed to accept Officer's recommendation and refuse planning permission and listed building consent for the reasons listed in the main report and update report for application 26/00448/HOUSE and 26/00449/LBC. This was seconded by Councillor Dick
20. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Foot, seconded by Councillor Dick to refuse planning permission for application 26/00448/HOUSE. At the vote the motion was carried.
21. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Foot, seconded by Councillor Dick to refuse listed building consent for application 26/00449/LBC. At the vote the motion was carried

RESOLVED that the Development Manager be authorised to refuse planning permission for application number 26/00448/HOUSE.

RESOLVED that the Development Manager be authorised to refuse listed building consent for application number 26/00449/LBC.

(2) Application No. and Location: 26/00036/MDOPO Street Record, Spring Meadows, Great Shefford

Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 26/00036/MDOPO in respect of Modification of Planning Obligation on approved application 87/30084/ADD (130084) - the Seventh Schedule section (F) of legal agreement dated 24th May 1988. Street Record, Spring Meadows, Great Shefford was deferred to a future meeting of the Western Area Planning Committee.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 7:37pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature