

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	260082
Site Address:	18 Primrose Lane, Winnersh, Wokingham, RG41 5UR
Expiry Date:	29 May 2026
Site Visit Date:	2 February 2026
Proposal: Householder application 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 the demolition of an existing chimney stack.	

PLANNING POLICY	
National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
Core Strategy (CS)	CP1 – Sustainable Development CP3 – General Principles for Development CP7 – Biodiversity CP8 – Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development TB24 – Designated Heritage Assets
Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update (LPU) (N.B. the LPU is deemed to overall hold limited weight at this time).	SS1 – Sustainable development principles SS2 – Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy SS3 – Development within or adjacent to major and modest settlements C4 – Green and blue infrastructure and public rights of way C5 – Parking and electric vehicle charging NE1 – Biodiversity and geodiversity NE2 – Biodiversity net gain NE4 – Trees, woodland, hedges and hedgerows NE5 – Landscape and design DH1 – Place making and quality design DH2 – Safeguarding amenity DH5 – The historic environment
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY

There is no planning history relevant to the proposed development.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways: No objection
WBC Built Heritage Officer: No objection subject to conditions
WBC CIL: Advice regarding CIL matters
WBC Ecology: No comments received

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Winnersh Parish Council raised no objections, express the need to ensure that any building work is carried out sympathetically and in accordance with listed property guidelines. <i>Officer's Comment: This is discussed in the 'Impact on Designated Heritage Assets' section of the report.</i>
Ward Member(s)	Cllr Prue Bray supports the application, notes that the proposed works to the rear would result in something more sympathetic to the listed building than what currently exists and overall create a more practical dwelling likely to give it a new lease of life as a family home. Raises slight concern with the linked side extension, but with the right materials this would not detract from views at the front.
Neighbours	Two comments received in support of the application.

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The site, also known as Meadow Cottage, is a grade II listed residential dwelling, the original part dating from the late 16th century. Prior to the late 20th century development surrounding the site, the dwelling was an isolated dwelling in a rural setting. The dwelling now sits on a prominent plot facing the cul-de-sac with a large front amenity space which significantly contributes to its setting and provides a degree of separation from the surrounding development. The historic cottage has been greatly enlarged to the rear including 2no. two storey pitched roof gable ended ranges that extend back from the ends of the original rear elevation.

Proposal:

This application proposes the erection of 2no. 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 plus fenestration changes to the existing dwelling and the removal of a chimney stack. The

proposed single storey linked extension would project from the south-western (side) elevation and would be connected to the existing dwelling by a glazed link with a total width of approximately 6.15m and total ridge height of 3.75m. An attached garage/workshop is proposed off the north-eastern end with a total width of 4.14m and total ridge height of 3.6m.

Following discussions with the applicant a revised scheme was submitted which includes the following amendments:

- The proposed part single part two storey extension was removed from the proposal.
- Alterations to proposed fenestration changes (more of existing retained)
- Alterations to proposed internal layout changes (requiring Listed Building Consent)
- Information submitted relating to previous unauthorised works.
- Structural engineer report submitted in support of the proposed removal of a chimney stack.

Principle of Development:

The National Planning Policy Framework has an underlying presumption in favour of sustainable development which is carried through to the local Development Plan. The Managing Development Delivery Local Plan Policy CC01 states that planning applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan for Wokingham Borough will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The site is located within the Major Development Location of Winnersh, as designated by Core Strategy policy CP9. Alterations and additions to an existing residential dwelling within settlement limits is acceptable in principle, subject to impact on other material considerations including the character of the area, heritage assets and neighbouring amenity.

Design and Character of the Area:

Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy states that development must be appropriate in terms of its scale, mass, layout, built form, height and character of the area and must be of high quality design. R1 of the Borough Design Guide SPD requires that development contribute positively towards and be compatible with the historic or underlying character and quality of the local area.

R23 of the Borough Design Guide SPD states that alterations or extensions should be clearly subservient to the form and scale of the original building in most situations, with a complementary design which either adopts the existing style or by a carefully considered contrast. The key considerations for all proposed additions to residential dwellings are they should be well designed, respond positively to the original dwelling, contribute positively to the local character and relate well to neighbouring properties.

In respect of the proposed single storey side additions, both additions would be set

well back from the principal façade of the historic property and all site boundaries, with appropriate ridge heights which would not encroach the eaves of the original dwelling. They would therefore appear subservient in form and scale to the host dwelling.

The proposed linked extension, while of a considerable width, would not directly add bulk to the side of the existing dwelling due to the inclusion of a glazed canopy. This would be of a small scale and retain the existing side elevation, marking an interesting visual transition between the historic property and the more contemporary in appearance timber boarded addition. The use of timber for both side additions creates a lighter appearance, further mitigating their visual bulk. While the front gable roof form of the garage extension does not particularly relate with the main roof form, due to its generous set back from the site's frontage it would not appear visually dominating or incongruous.

Following the removal of the two storey rear extension from the scheme, the proposed additions to the rear are fairly limited in footprint and form. The single storey infill extension would not encroach the rear building line and appear as a natural continuation of the later addition, while the timber canopy would add minimal bulk and appropriately tie in with the proposed side extensions. The first floor gable dormer addition would be contained within the main roof, subservient in form, and is in keeping with the existing gable ended ranges. Indeed, from a design perspective it is more appropriate than the later box dormer addition it would replace. It is noted that the host dwelling has already undergone substantial historic extension to the rear, the revised scheme seeks to rationalise and consolidate this evolved form rather than materially increase its overall bulk.

Overall, from a design perspective the proposed extensions would respond positively to the host dwelling and have an acceptable impact on the character of the area in accordance with Core Strategy policy CP3 and the Borough Design Guide SPD.

Impact on Designated Heritage Assets:

The application site comprises a Grade II Listed Building. 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 outlines that the Council will conserve and seek to enhance the designated heritage assets in the Borough and their settings by supporting development proposals that will conserve the local character, setting, management and historic significance of designated heritage assets. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF states that LPAs should avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Following initial discussions between Officers and the applicant, significant amendments were made to the scheme including the removal of a large two storey rear extension and alterations to the fenestration and internal layout changes to retain more of the historic form, alongside the submission of further information including a structural survey assessment relating to the removal of a chimney stack. The

Council's Built Heritage Officer notes 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.

In respect of the proposed additions to the rear, the Council's Built Heritage Officer raises no concern with the single storey infill extension with amendments to the verandah/canopy resulting in a more simplified form. Following the removal of the two storey element, the first floor gable addition is considered to be, on balance, acceptable. While there will still be a change to the existing ordering and appearance at the rear, the proposed works would allow for a certain degree of consolidation of the existing, later, varied form, quality and condition.

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

The Officer raises some concern with the proposed side extensions, as attached additions can risk creating a sprawling and unnecessarily enlarged planform to what originated as a simple cottage, thereby harming the significance of the listed building. However, taking into account the existing pattern of development, together with the lightweight form, limited physical connection and proposed materiality of these elements, they are considered acceptable on balance.

The submission of a detailed structural assessment in respect of the chimney stack proposed for removal is welcomed and report is considered to provide the "clear and convincing justification" required by paragraph 213 of the NPPF to support the acceptability of the loss of the chimney stack and the resultant harm to significance. Whilst 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 this basis, the previous objection to the removal of the chimney stack can be withdrawn. The structural report also identifies other areas of the building requiring attention, given their direct relevance to the building's structural integrity further details are secured by condition.

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. However, the identified harm is considered to be less than substantial and must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

To reiterate, the Built Heritage Officer concludes that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building, at the lower level of the adopted sliding scale. The identified harm arises from erosion to the planform, increased scale and massing as well as the loss of historic fabric. However, the proposal does result in benefits including the ongoing repairs and maintenance of the historic structure and the removal of inappropriate material alterations. Such benefits assist with the ongoing preservation of the heritage asset. On balance, the benefits outweigh the identified harm and the Officer raises no objection from a heritage perspective.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Given the site's existing relationship with adjoining neighbours and the scale of the proposal, with all additions set well in from the site's boundaries, there are no concerns in respect of potential loss of light, overbearing and overlooking impact.

Ecology:

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF is clear that new development should contribute to and enhance the natural environment by minimising impact on and providing net gains for biodiversity. Policy TB23 of the MDD Local Plan requires the incorporation of new biodiversity features, buffers between habitats and species of importance and integration with the wider green infrastructure network.

The Council's records show that the site falls within an identified area suitable for bat roost habitats and bats are known to be present in the area. A Bat Survey Report (AEWC, November 2024) has been submitted in support of the application which concludes that the host dwelling has moderate potential to support roosting bats. However, two emergence surveys were carried out during which no bats were recorded emerging from, or entering, the building. As no bat roosts were identified, the Ecologist concludes that the proposed development would not impact the conservation status of bats. Advice is provided in the unlikely event that a bat(s) is identified during the building works.

On this basis, the proposed development would not result in adverse harm to bats or any other protected species and is acceptable in this regard.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

The Council's Highways Officer has reviewed the proposal and raised no objections, noting that the retention of the existing vehicular access and off-road parking provision for at least three vehicles meets the Council's standards and is acceptable.

Conclusion:

The proposed works strike an appropriate balance between conserving the building's historic significance while supporting the applicant's desire to improve the layout and create additional habitable space more suitable for modern family living. No adverse impact on any material considerations has been identified. The application is therefore recommended for **approval** subject to conditions.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL): When planning permission is granted for a development that is CIL liable, the Council will issue a liability notice as soon as practicable after the day on which the planning permission first permits development. Completing the assumption of liability notice is a statutory requirement to be completed for all CIL liable applications.

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 key equalities protected characteristics include age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation. 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.

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

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS
Insert where relevant