
MEMORANDUM

From:	Built Heritage Officer		
Service	Green Infrastructure	App No:	252784
Address:	Stanlake Farm Cottage, Waltham Road, Twyford, RG10 0AF		
Proposal:	Householder application for the conversion of existing outbuildings into ancillary habitable accommodation with erection of a link extension and changes to fenestration.		
Heritage Asset:	Stanlake Farm Cottage – Grade II listed since 1984 Granary and store at Stanlake Farm Cottage – Non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs)		
Site Visit Made:	No		

Summary Of Recommendations

No objection subject to clarification and condition

Comments On Proposal

Thank you for consulting Built Heritage on the above application.

The application proposes the alteration to, including a glass link between, a historic granary and store building at Stanlake Farm Cottage, a Grade II listed building. The granary, store and cottage(s) once formed part of the Stanlake farmstead which was associated with Stanlake Park, an Elizabethan building to the east of the site. The farmhouse, along with associated buildings were demolished in the 1960s, leaving only the aforementioned structures as remnants of the historic complex.

Typically, small historic farm buildings, such as granaries would be identified as being curtilage listed, however despite the close proximity to the listed building, this is not the case here. Curtilage listing allows for additional structures to be treated as part of the listed building – e.g. require listed building consent for their alteration etc. – provided the three tests are met, in that the structure existed prior to 1st July 1948, the structure was built in association and ancillary in purpose to the listed building, and that it had the same associated ownership at the date of listing. The granary and store fail two of these tests. The buildings appear to be 19th century in date, and thus pre-date 1948, however these buildings were construction and functioned in relation to the main farmhouse i.e. the building at the ‘top of the hierarchy’ and not the listed cottage. The main farmhouse was demolished in the 1960s, the date of construction is uncertain, it may have been 19th century, it may have been 16th century in origin – however as a historic

farmstead, the farmhouse would have been the focus of the complex and thus the highest building with the hierarchy. Stanlake Cottage is 17th century in core, and may (as is not uncommon) have been the original farmhouse, which was then usurped by a later building – it is uncertain. Further to this is the test of ownership, the application has provided details that confirm the granary and store were included in a separate parcel of land when the building was listed – although this land was subsequently acquired by the owner of the cottage. Given this, the buildings cannot be treated as curtilage listed. They are, however, of age, positively contribute to the setting and thus significance of the listed building and provide a physical remnant of the historic farm complex and therefore are identified as non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs).

The buildings are in moderate condition and currently used for storage, it is clear without intervention the condition would worsen. The timber weatherboarding does not appear to be historic, and the roofs appear to have been re-covered (perhaps re-using the original tiles), but the ridge and hip tiles are modern and incorrect for the type of structure. In terms of the proposed use of ancillary accommodation, whilst this move away from the building's original and historic function, and thus harm its significance, it is not considered wholly inappropriate.

In the main the proposed alteration is fairly 'lightweight' – these are simple modest buildings and thus any alterations need to reflect this character. In terms of the principle of linking the two structures, typically, glazed links are not now accepted in this historic environment (depending on context) due to the arising harm to the significance of the buildings' planform. As an overriding principle, where historic buildings are constructed as individual elements, they should remain as such. However, in this case the link would be very modest given the close proximity of the structures, and they would still be able to be read as two individual buildings. This is combined with the purpose of the link as to allow internal access to the 'en-suite' bathroom. Given the principle of conversion can be accepted from a heritage perspective, the link may be considered a necessary part of this proposal. It would also be considered this is part and parcel as the optimum viable use for the buildings as to allow for their future preservation.

In terms of design, a few points are raised:

- Overall, the proposed insertion of glazing is acceptable, however clarity is required for the design and function of the shutters. Such details would be condition; however it is helpful to have an idea as part of the application as to best understand the nature of the fenestration.
- Similarly, in terms of the door to the granary, this door appears to be historic and thus there is a preference for its retention, or if condition does not allow, a reproduction door included. As with the shutters, the door can either be permanently fixed open, or have an active function to be closed – with the glass door as proposed set back. This would therefore allow the historic appearance to be retained but also allow for additional privacy for the occupier if required. Similarly, with the proposed glazing of the top of the stable door in the store – this is well design, but again, would this top part of the door be fixed or have the ability to close?

- In terms of the rooflight, this should be specified as a true 'conservation type' from a supplier such as The Rooflight Company or Clement Windows – as these are correctly metal framed, top or side hung with a low-profile.
- As mentioned above, the extant ridge and hip tiles are modern and incorrect and should not be reused, but instead replaced with bonnet hip tiles (either new from the likes of Keymer, Tudor, Heritage, or reclaimed) for the hips and similar smaller appropriate ridge tiles. The extant clay plain tiles themselves are fine to re-use.

In summing up, it can be advised harm would occur to the significance of the granary and store as non-designated heritage assets. This harm would be akin to 'less than substantial' in NPPF parlance, but being non-designated, para. 215 is not engaged and thus no requirement to balance public benefits. The proposals would seek to preserve the special interest of the listed building and thus no harm would occur to the designated heritage asset's setting and thus significance.

Provided the above points are clarified/revised, there would be objection to the application from a heritage perspective.

If minded to approve, the below condition is advised to be attached to the grant of planning permission:

Conditions

Notwithstanding, and in addition to, the information shown on the approved drawings, no relevant works, shall commence on site until details of materials and finishes have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The submitted details should include physical samples as applicable. The works shall then proceed in strict accordance with the approved details. These requirements include provision of information relating to:

1. *the material, size, texture, colour, profile, and source of facing brickwork and jointing mortar, if required;*
2. *the material, size, texture, colour, profile, and source of weatherboarding;*
3. *the material, size, texture, colour, profile, and source of roofing materials, including hips and ridges;*
4. *materials and finishes to be used in the detailing of eaves and verges;*
5. *the proposed rainwater goods;*
6. *the proposed external windows and doors.*

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building. Relevant policy: National Planning Policy Framework Section 16 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan Policy TB24.

Date:	17/12/2025	Signed:	Roderick McDonald
--------------	------------	----------------	-------------------

			Built Heritage Officer
--	--	--	------------------------

Private: Information that contains a small amount of sensitive data which is essential to communicate with an individual but doesn't require to be sent via secure methods.

Public: Information that can be seen and used by everyone inside and outside the Council.