

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	260081
Site Address:	18 Primrose Lane, Winnersh, Wokingham, RG41 5UR
Expiry Date:	15 May 2026
Advert Publication Date:	20 January 2026
Site Notice Date:	26 January 2026
Site Visit Date:	2 February 2026
Proposal: Application for Listed Building consent for the proposed erection of single storey side extensions, a single storey rear extension with canopy, replacement of an existing rear box dormer with a gabled roof form, associated fenestration changes and internal alterations, and the demolition of an existing chimney stack.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

- Grade II Listed building
- Major Development Location – Winnersh

PLANNING POLICY

National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	TB24 – Designated Heritage Assets

PLANNING HISTORY

There is no planning history relevant to the proposed development.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

WBC Conservation	No objection subject to conditions
------------------	------------------------------------

REPRESENTATIONS

Cllr Prue Bray (Ward Member) supports the application. Notes that the proposed rear works would be more sympathetic to the listed building than the existing arrangement and would create a more practical family home. Raises slight concern regarding the linked side extension but considers that, with appropriate materials, it would not detract from views from the front.

No other third party representations received.

APPRAISAL

Site Description: The site, also known as Meadow Cottage, is a Grade II listed

dwelling, with the original part dating from the late 16th century. Before the late 20th century development around the site, the property stood in relative isolation within a rural setting. It now occupies a prominent plot facing the cul-de-sac, with a large front amenity area that makes a significant contribution to its setting and provides a degree of separation from surrounding development. The historic cottage has been substantially extended to the rear, including two two-storey, pitched-roof, gable-ended ranges projecting from either end of the original rear elevation.

The application proposes two single-storey side extensions, a single-storey rear infill extension with a canopy, the replacement of the existing box dormer with a simplified gabled roof form associated with the reconstructed rear element, associated fenestration changes, internal layout alterations, and the removal of a chimney stack. The linked side extension on the south-western elevation would be connected to the existing dwelling by a glazed link and would have an overall width of approximately 6.15m and a ridge height of 3.75m. An attached garage/workshop is also proposed at the north-eastern end, with an overall width of 4.14m and a ridge height of 3.6m.

Following discussions with the applicant, a revised scheme was submitted incorporating the following amendments:

- The proposed part single-storey, part two-storey extension was removed from the scheme.
- The proposed fenestration changes were revised to retain more of the existing fabric.
- The proposed internal layout changes were revised.
- Further information was submitted in relation to previous unauthorised works.
- A structural engineer's report was submitted in support of the proposed removal of a chimney stack.

The proposal complies in terms of:

Impact on heritage asset:



Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest.

Policy TB24 of the MDD Local Plan requires the Council to conserve and seek to enhance designated heritage assets and their settings by supporting proposals that preserve local character, setting, management and historic significance. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal, taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise, and should then take that assessment into account when considering the impact of the proposal in order to avoid or minimise conflict between the asset's conservation and any aspect of the development.

Following initial discussions between officers and the applicant, significant amendments were made to the scheme. These included the removal of a large two-storey rear extension, revisions to the fenestration and internal layout to retain more of the historic form, and the submission of further information, including a structural assessment relating to the proposed removal of a chimney stack. The Council's Built

Heritage Officer considers that the scheme has evolved positively in response to earlier concerns and now represents a more balanced and proportionate approach to the conservation of the listed building.

The omission of the previously proposed two-storey extension materially improves the scheme. As previously advised, that element would have harmed the significance of the listed building through the loss of architectural form and features that contribute positively to its special interest, together with excessive bulk, scale and massing in relation to the historic cottage. Its removal substantially reduces the degree of heritage harm arising from the proposal. The omission of the previously proposed new access between the historic core of the building and the reconfigured early-20th-century element is also welcomed, as this avoids further erosion of the historic planform.

In respect of the proposed additions to the rear, the Council's Built Heritage Officer raises no objection to the single-storey infill extension, with the amendments to the verandah/canopy resulting in a simpler form. Following the removal of the two-storey element, the first-floor gable addition is considered, on balance, to be acceptable. Although the proposals would alter the existing composition and appearance of the rear elevation, they would also provide a degree of consolidation to the later, more varied additions in terms of form, quality and condition.

While the proposed fenestration would not replicate the existing in terms of materiality and proportions, the Built Heritage Officer advises that this is not necessarily problematic in this instance, given that the extension is intended to be an honest contemporary addition. However, clarification is required regarding the detailed treatment, including whether leaded lights or timber casements with glazing bars are proposed, the finish of the brick infill panels, and the treatment of the timber framing, in order to fully understand the resulting appearance. These details are secured by condition.

The proposed side extensions give rise to some concern, as attached additions can create a more sprawling and enlarged planform to what originated as a simple cottage, thereby diminishing the legibility of the building's historic evolution and causing some harm to its significance. However, having regard to the existing pattern of later additions, together with the lightweight form, limited physical connection and proposed materiality of these elements, that harm is moderated and is not considered sufficient to warrant refusal.

The submission of a detailed structural assessment in relation to the chimney stack proposed for removal is welcomed, and the report is considered to provide the "clear and convincing justification" required by paragraph 213 of the NPPF to support the loss of the chimney stack and the resulting harm to significance. While there remains a general preference for the retention or reconstruction of historic features where feasible, it is acknowledged that reinstatement of the stack would likely be incompatible with other elements of the proposal. On that basis, the previous objection to its removal has been withdrawn. The structural report also identifies other areas of the building requiring attention and, given their direct relevance to the building's structural integrity, further details are secured by condition.

The proposed investigative works to the brick noggins to the front are welcomed and considered to be a thoughtful approach to better understanding the historic fabric and informing any future alterations.

A number of unauthorised works have been carried out to the Grade II listed building, including the replacement of two windows, alterations to the roof structure, removal of lath and plaster within the attic space, and alterations to the timber frame and infill panels, and further information has now been provided by the applicant to explain the nature and context of these works. For clarity, under Section 7 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, listed building consent is required for any works that affect the character or special interest of a listed building, a position reinforced by Historic England Advice Note 16 (2021), and the works identified fall within categories that require consent.

In this instance, the owners sought advice from the Council's former Urban Design and Conservation Officer in 2017 and acted in good faith on that advice. However, the guidance provided was incomplete and inconsistent with legislative and policy requirements, which has led to the current situation. Notwithstanding this, the unauthorised works do affect the significance of the listed building and should be regularised through a Listed Building Consent application, failing which they may be subject to enforcement action. Exploratory works to the front of the dwelling are proposed under this application to inform a later remedial strategy, allowing for the submission of a comprehensive Listed Building Consent application to regularise the position in due course. This approach does not prevent the current proposal from being assessed on its own merits.

Overall, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II listed building, at the lower end of the spectrum. That harm arises principally from some erosion of the historic planform, a degree of increased scale and massing, and the loss of limited historic fabric. In accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF, that harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

In reaching this conclusion, it is acknowledged that the proposal gives rise to a degree of conflict with policy TB24 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan and with the statutory duty under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, insofar as it results in some erosion of the building's historic planform, limited loss of historic fabric and a degree of increased scale and massing. These impacts attract considerable importance and weight, and great weight has been given to the conservation of the designated heritage asset in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. However, for the reasons set out below, the identified harm has been assessed as less than substantial and, when applying the balancing exercise required by paragraph 215 of the NPPF, is considered to be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal.

In this case, the works would facilitate the ongoing repair and maintenance of the historic structure, secure further investigation and informed treatment of parts of the building affected by structural issues and remove or regularise inappropriate alterations. Collectively, those benefits would assist in the long-term conservation of the heritage asset. Having had special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building, its setting and its features of special architectural and historic interest

and having weighed the identified harm against the benefits of the scheme, it is concluded that the public benefits outweigh the less than substantial harm. The Council's Built Heritage Officer therefore raises no objection to the application, and the proposal is acceptable on heritage grounds.

The Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010):

In determining this application, the Council is required to have due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. The relevant protected characteristics include age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief. There is no indication or evidence, including from consultation on the application, that persons with protected characteristics identified by the Act have or would have materially different needs, experiences, issues or priorities in relation to this proposal. No significant adverse impacts would arise as a result of the development.

RECOMMENDATION

Conditions agreed:	Yes
Recommendation:	Approve
Date:	28 May 2026
Earliest date for decision:	10 April 2026

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	28/05/26