

MEMORANDUM

From:	Built Heritage Officer		
Service	Green Infrastructure	App No:	250220 + 250221
Address:	36 & 38 Rose Street, Wokingham, RG40 1XU.		
Proposal:	250220: Householder application for the proposed demolition of the existing conservatory, replacement of 3 no. flat roofs and repairs to 2 no. pitched roofs at the rear, installation of new front canopy roof plus changes to fenestration and erection of garden fencing. 250221: Application for Listed Building consent for the proposed demolition of the existing conservatory, replacement of 3 no. flat roofs and repairs to 2 no. pitched roofs at the rear, installation of new front canopy roof plus changes to fenestration, refurbishment, and internal repairs.		
Heritage Asset:	36-38 Rose Street – grade II status listed building, since 1969. Wokingham Town Centre Conservation Area. Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas are classed as designated heritage assets under the NPPF (2024) and in the Council's Local Plan policies.		
Site Visit Made:	Yes previously.		

Summary Of Recommendations

Additional Information Required

Whilst the new information has provided welcomed additional details for the works being applied for here, however due to the nature of this new information the details in some cases is considered to be either insufficient to negate the need for the previously advised condition, and/or it is still thought the need for the condition is necessary, in order to ensure appropriate work measures to protect the historic significance and features of this pair of listed buildings.

The use of uPVC fir replacement windows and exterior door is a modern and inappropriate detailing given the listed status of the properties and their conservation area location.

It is also thought, the matter previously raised concerning apparent inaccuracies noted do not seem to have been addressed.

Comments On Proposal

These comments are with respect to the following additional information uploaded onto NEC doc. on 23rd April submitted in response to those initial WBC Built Heritage Officer consultation response, dated 7th April:

- Appendix D TVW Timber Windows & Door Design
- Appendix E TVW Rear Window & Door Design
- Drawing P003.500 Rev.00 – Proposed Replacement Heritage Style Sash Window
- Drawing P003.501 Rev.00 – Proposed Replacement Timber Front Door *
- Drawing P003.10-901 Rev.00 Site Plan – Proposed +
- Planning Conditions – CC1 Summary
- Planning Conditions – CM7 Summary
- Planning Conditions - Joinery Details Summary
- Planning Conditions (Complied with) Summary
- Floor Plans identifying location of lath & plaster ceilings.

* Same drawing/details submitted under the yet to be determined pair of applications 242929 & 242930.

+ It is noted that a later revision (i.e. Rev 001) of this drawing has previously been submitted, in that block plan scale text has been amended to 1:100.

Firstly, and before commenting on the submitted additional details it would seem prudent to reiterate the matter of plans already submitted with this pair of applications. As for, the still to be determined, applications (242929 & 242930) previously made by the applicants for what appears to be identical works includes documents/plans are the same as that of the previously submitted pair of applications. The seemingly absent documents still being:

- Separate documents to cover replacement of front doors, front windows and front entrance canopy to Nos.36-38 Rose Street.
- Drawing P003.10-502 Proposed Replacement Entrance Canopy

Likewise, there appears still the matter, with both this current pair of application and the earlier still to be determined ones, of previously noted apparent inaccuracies as set out in the WBC Built Heritage response of 7th April.

Comment on Additional Details Provided

With respect to the joinery details provided to cover the replacement of the windows and entrance doors to the front of both properties, these are considered both appropriate and acceptable in terms of design and details for these replacement features.

The proposals however for the existing timber framed windows and exterior doors to the rear of both properties to be replaced with new double glazed uPVC ones. Whilst onto the older pitched roofed gabled two storey rear extension and in part in filling the gap between them (including the conjoining conservatory that is to be removed) have been added mid-late 20th century addition, the existing rear windows and external

ground floor doors as such are of no historic value. Whilst not part of what is significant about these properties as themselves being designated heritage assets, the rear elevations do however part of the overall listed buildings. The introduction of uPVC framed windows and uPVC doors where there are presently none on a listed building is however from a heritage stance not considered acceptable, furthermore given the conservation area location. Furthermore, this change to uPVC from the existing wooden framed windows and doors goes contrary to the annotation on the submitted proposed rear elevation drawing P003.10-132 Rev.01 states that the proposal is for the windows to be 'upgraded in existing openings with new aluminium windows' that would be to the same configuration as the existing. It is noted no mention of the rear exterior doors (into the existing joint conservatory) being replaced. Whilst slender framed aluminium windows can prove to be visually acceptable in a historic context, uPVC ones represent a modern inappropriate replacement for timber framed windows for designated heritage assets.

Whilst these uPVC windows are stated in the 'Planning Conditions – Joinery Detail' document to be of 'flush casement design,' however the windows depicted in Appendix E TVW Rear Window & Door Design and in the absence of cross-sectional drawings, do appear to be of modern storm proof design.

From a heritage stance, the expectation is for the replacement rear windows and exterior doors to be, preferable, in timber (especially with respect to the rear roof dormer windows) and of a flush casement form. However appropriately designed aluminium framed windows could prove to be acceptable on the rear (ground and first floors).

The proposed replacement of the internal doors detailed in the document 'Planning Conditions – Joinery Details' whilst not previously indicated on the previously proposed floor plans as to be replaced are considered an acceptable detail for the room doors as the existing are modern of no significance. That said, the attic door to Stairs 2 (of the proposed floor plan) for No.38 Rose Street is a historic door (see picture below). The provided detail does not clearly state whether or not this attic door is to also be replaced, however from a heritage stance there is the expectation for it to be retained.

The now proposed thermally modified timber cladding stated, in the 'Planning Conditions – Joinery Details' for the rear first-floor elevation to the flat roofed extension of No.38 Rose Street are considered an appropriate choice of material in this case.

With respect to the submitted document 'Planning Conditions (Complied with)' whilst it is appreciated that the applicant stated intension for no mechanical/chemical stripping, drilling of/or sawing of historic timbers, for making good works to match the existing, as well as no replacement of exiting lath and plaster ceilings (without prior LPA agreement). Whilst written confirmation of these intension is appreciated however, as the works have yet to be undertaken, it is strongly advised that those conditions, covered under the 'Planning Conditions (Complied with)' document, still be included under any eventual permission given for this pair of applications (and for the yet to be determined earlier ones).

In terms of the proposed boundary treatment the additional details contained in the

document 'Planning Conditions – CC1' are considered in principle acceptable although it appears to only refer to the replacement of the existing boundary fencing and then does not make clear as to whether this would be all the existing boundary fencing, as the section that springs off the corner of 38 Rose Street kitchen evidentially belongs to No. 3 Rose Court (see attached picture below). No clarification appears to be provided that clearly states the form of the new boundary treatment to divide the rear gardens of Nos. 36 and 38 Rose Street from each other. Along with the need to clarify what the new garden boundary treatment for the two properties is to be, it is advised should the intention be for gated access for either property in the boundary fence to provide access to the passageway of Rose Gardens, as known is presently indicated and would need planning permission to do so later. As such, should the points raised here be satisfactorily responded to then the boundary condition would not be required.

As for the details set out in the document titled Planning Conditions – CM7 in terms of the identification of areas within the two properties where ceiling and/or walls are damaged it considered adequate for the purposes of locating where in the properties repair works are to be undertaken. With the proposed method of repair to the walls and ceiling there are considered acceptable as is the stated methodology for cleaning and redecorating the historic timbers inside the properties. As such with these additional detail part a) and b) of the previously advised condition CM7 is considered adequate to negate the need for these elements to still be conditioned. With respect to part c of condition CM7 concerning the existing fireplaces and in particular the front ground floor fire place of No.36 Rose Street, which has a non-historic modern fireplace surround that the applicants seek to replace with a more architectural period correct one and install a non-functioning new fireplace. Whilst in principle there is not necessarily an objection to these proposed changes it is however felt that the changes to the fireplace would still need to be condition to ensure the modification and replacement of the fireplace is appropriate. Whilst the document states the flues of the properties are to remain non-functioning, the indicative photograph of the type of fireplace being suggested appears to be of a form that would require alteration to open up and deepen the existing fire box to achieve its installation. As such, it is recommended the alteration and replacement of the fireplace to 36 Rose Street still be dealt with under a condition.

In summary, the newly provided information is largely welcomed however it is not necessarily sufficient in some cases to negate the need for the previously advised condition. Whilst there are also other of the proposed conditions still thought prudent, in order to ensure appropriate work measures to protect the historic significance and features of this pair of listed buildings. With respect to the proposal to replace the windows and exterior doors to the rear of both properties with uPVC replacements is, given the listed status of the buildings and their conservation area location, not considered acceptable from a heritage perspective. Lastly, the matter previously raised concerning apparent inaccuracies noted do not seem to have been addressed.

Advised Conditions

CM7 Further details required.

Prior to the commencement of the relevant works hereby approved the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority

and shall be implemented as approved prior to occupation of the properties as hereby approved:

- a] Details identifying location with no.38 Rose Street where repair to the walling, flooring, and ceiling where repair is required due to water ingress/damp has occurred. Details are to also set out the schedule/means for repair to these areas. Works shall then be undertaken in accordance with the details as approved.
- b] Details setting out the means by which the historic beam timbers are to be prepared for redecoration.
- c] Details setting out the alterations to be made to the fireplaces of each property.

Joinery Details (Rear Windows/Rear Exterior Doors/ Internal Doors)

Notwithstanding the details submitted, no works shall take place to install the hereby permitted new windows/external doors to the rear of nos.36-38 Rose Street, along with all new/replacement internal doors to the properties, until such time as full joinery details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Details are to include:

- 1:10 or 1:20 scaled drawings of the new window(s)/exterior and interior door(s), along with vertical and horizontal cross-section
- Profile drawings at 1:1 or 1:2 scale of the glazing bar and frame moulding details.
- Profile drawings at 1:1 or 1:2 scale for door frames and thresholds.
- Material for new windows frames and doors to be stated.
- External finishes to be stated.

Installation of the new windows and doors is to then be undertaken in accordance with the details as approved.

CN4 No mechanical or chemical cleaning

No mechanical or chemical cleaning or stripping treatment shall be applied to the timber frame of the building without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Lath & Plaster Ceilings

Notwithstanding the details submitted no existing traditional lath and plaster ceiling are to be replaced unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority prior to works to the ceilings being undertaken.

CN2 Matching finishes

All new works and works of making good to the retained fabric, whether internal or external, shall be finished to match the adjacent work with regard to the methods used and to material, colour, texture, and profile.

CP7 No sawing or drilling, channelling, and/or notching of Historic Timbers

No historic timbers or joints between timbers shall be sawn, drilled through, or notched/channelled in connection with the works hereby approved without the prior express consent in writing of the local planning authority. Any dismantled joinery shall be carefully stored under weatherproof and secure covers on the site until required for reuse in connection with the works hereby approved.

CC1 Details of boundary walls and fences

Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details of all boundary treatment(s) shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development or phased as agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be maintained in the approved form for so long as the development remains on the site.

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:	06/06/2025	Signed:	Keith Frost Built Heritage Officer
--------------	------------	----------------	---------------------------------------



Historic door to attic stairs of No. 38 Rose Street.

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.



Vertical close boarded fence off kitchen to No.38 does appear to belong to belong to 3 Rose Court.

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.