

# UPDATE PAPER

## Northern Area Planning Committee

**Date:** Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> February 2022

**Time:** 5.30 p.m.

**Venue:** Conference Room 1, Beech Hurst, Weyhill Road,  
Andover, Hampshire, SP10 3AJ

**Northern Area Planning Committee – 17<sup>th</sup> February 2022  
Update Paper**

The purpose of the report is to provide information on planning applications which has been received since the agenda was printed.

Report of Head of Planning and Building

**1. Background**

- 1.1 Reports on planning applications are prepared for printing on the agenda some 10 days before the date of the Committee meeting but information and representations received after that time are relevant to the decision. This paper contains such information which was received before 10.00am on the date of the meeting. Any information received after that time is reported verbally.

**2. Issues**

- 2.1 Information and representations are summarized but the full text is available on the relevant file should Members require more details. The paper may contain an officer comment on the additional information, amended recommendations and amended and/or additional conditions.

8. **21/03006/FULLN (REFUSE) 13.10.2021**  
SITE: Edelweiss, Church Road, Abbots Ann, SP11 7BH  
**ABBOTTS ANN**

**35 - 55**

**CASE OFFICER:** Ms Gillian Wheeler

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	21/03006/FULLN
<b>SITE</b>	Edelweiss , Church Road, Abbots Ann, SP11 7BH, <b>ABBOTTS ANN</b>
<b>COMMITTEE DATE</b>	17 February 2022
<b>ITEM NO.</b>	8
<b>PAGE NO.</b>	35-55

---

**1.0 ADDITIONAL SUBMISSION**

- 1.1 The council has received a further email from the agent raising concerns over the wording of the committee report (email attached). As a result, an amendment has been proposed in the following section.

**2.0 AMENDMENT**

- 2.1 In the first sentence of paragraphs 3.1 and 8.10 of the Officer's report, insert the word 'approximately' in front of '2.3 metres' to reflect the half-hipped roof design.

**3.0 VIEWING PANEL**

- 3.1 On Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> February at 9am a viewing was held.

- 3.2 Apologies were received from the following Members:

Councillor D Coole  
Councillor L Lashbrook  
Councillor P Lashbrook  
Councillor N Lodge

- 3.3 The following Members attended the viewing:

Councillor C Borg-Neal  
Councillor Z Brooks  
Councillor J Budzynski  
Councillor T Burley  
Councillor K North

**From:** Roger Prescott  
**Sent:** 14 February 2022 10:49  
**To:** Prior, Sally  
**Cc:** Cllr Coole, David Wheeler, Gillian  
**Subject:** RE: Northern Area Planning Committee - Thursday 17th February 2022

Sally,

Thank you for your prompt service, as always.

We have now read the committee report in depth, and I regret that there are factual errors and omissions in it that should, for the sake of following due process and transparency, be drawn to the attention of committee members, in order that they may make a safe, objective, and informed decision. I hope you are able to pass on this email to them. I have copied this email to Councillor David Coole as our clients' ward member.

Please note that I do not make references to matters of degree or opinion.

#### Omissions

The principal omission is the lack of reference to the heritage statement, prepared by our professional consultant. The officers' report refers to documents and plans we submitted, but not to the statement.

The NPPF provides some guidance as to the importance of setting out the significance both of heritage assets and of the impacts upon them. This is the role of a Heritage Statement. In its document "*Statements of Heritage Significance:*

*Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets Historic England Advice Note 12*", Historic England comments:

*"10. In summary, what is needed is an impartial analysis of significance and the contribution of setting. A Statement of Heritage Significance is not an advocacy document, seeking to justify a scheme which has already been designed; it is more an objective analysis of significance, an opportunity to describe what matters and why, in terms of heritage significance."* (My emphasis.)

Therefore, there is little doubt about the importance and independence of such statements, and their findings should be drawn before committee.

Presenting the comments of the conservation officer but not those of fellow professionals might be regarded by external observers as one-sided, and not impartial.

Moreover, given that this application turns on the impact on the setting of historic assets, one might have imagined the officers' report would have made reference to Historic England's "*The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment - Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition)*". However, neither the conservation officer, in his comments, nor the planning officers, in their report, draw attention to it. I can only presume the conservation officer will attend committee next week to advise members how the proposal aligns with guidance from the Government's principal advisors on the historic environment.

#### Factual errors

3.1 The comment "to increase the roof height of the host property by 2.3 metres across the full width of the dwelling" is simply erroneous. The application before committee shows plans with hips at either

end, so that the roof height does NOT extend across the full width. Note: a similar statement is also made at para 8.10.

8.6 The report states: "*this increased height would be very apparent, particularly from the entrance to Church Close from Church Road.*" This is incorrect. Standing at the junction of Church Road and Church Close, you have to be standing right on the left hand side curb stone of Church Close to even see anything of Edelweiss which is actually masked from view by East Manor House until one is half way up Church Close. We invite the viewing panel to test the veracity of the officers' comments.

8.11 The report states: "*the increased height of the dwelling would obstruct views of the conservation area from the public right of way*". However, it is already not possible to see that part of the conservation area from the right of way, because of the existing presence of hedge and Edelweiss in its present form. Again, we invite the members to check matters on site.

I'm sure you will agree that, in pointing out these issues, we are not seeking to lobby you. The intention is to achieve a fair, informed and balanced decision to be made.

Regards

**Roger Prescott BSc MBA MRTPI FRGS**

**PLEASE NOTE: I work on Wednesdays and Thursdays only**