

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	252252
Site Address:	L'ortolan Restaurant, Church Lane, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9BY
Expiry Date:	27 March 2026
Site Visit Date:	3 October 2025 & 20 February 2025 (250331)
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a rooftop extension with terrace decking and a single storey rear extension to the existing main building, alterations to the fenestration and internal layout, the erection of a detached 1.5 storey garage with incidental first-floor accommodation, a single storey storage outbuilding, pergola and entrance gate together with landscaping and parking alterations, following the demolition of the existing single- storey rear extension.	

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 CP4 – Infrastructure Requirements 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 CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC06 – Noise CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development TB24 – Designated Heritage Assets TB26 – Buildings of Traditional Local Character and Areas of Special Character
Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update (LPU) (N.B. the LPU is considered to hold	SS1 – Sustainable development principles SS2 – Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy SS3 – Development within or adjacent to major and modest settlements C2 – Mitigation of transport impacts and highway safety and design C4 – Green and blue infrastructure and public rights of way C5 – Parking and electric vehicle charging FD1 – Development and flood risk (from all sources)

overall limited weight at this time).	FD2 – Sustainable drainage 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
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document Shinfield Neighbourhood Plan

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
241536 (Not implemented)	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed change of use to an office (Use Class E (g)(i).	Approved – 23/07/2024
233180 & 233181 (LBC)	Proposed change of use of existing buildings to 1no. residential dwelling and annexe (Use Class C3) with erection of a single storey rear extension and roof terrace following demolition of the existing single storey rear extension and changes to fenestration, plus erection of 1no. outbuilding following demolition of 2no. existing outbuildings and associated landscaping.	Conditionally Approved – 15/05/2024
233190 & 233191 (LBC)	Proposed change of use of existing buildings to 1no. residential dwelling and annexe (Use Class C3) and changes to internal layout and external appearance of the annexe.	Conditionally Approved – 26/04/2024
232856 & 232857 (LBC)	Proposed change of use of existing buildings to 1no. residential dwelling with associated annexe and outbuilding (Use Class C3).	Conditionally Approved – 05/02/2024
170753	Listed building consent for the proposed installation of new internal Air Conditioning Unit and associated external pipework.	Approved – 22/05/2017
163305	Application for Listed Building consent for the installation of 2no condenser units and 1no AHU (Air Handling Unit) (retrospective).	Approved – 19/01/2017

162599 & 162600 (LBC) (Not implemented)	Proposed erection of a detached development kitchen and store plus timber over-cladding of the proposed building and existing office building.	Approved 29/11/2016	–
LB/2013/2254	Application for retrospective Listed Building Consent for the erection of a single storey side extension to create an additional office area.	Approved 05/02/2015	–
F/2010/1868	Proposed erection of single storey side extension to create additional office area.	Approved 13/10/2010	–
LB/2004/3196	Listed building application for the proposed refurbishment of existing bathrooms and conversion of offices to dining rooms.	Approved 16/12/2004	–
LB/2001/3753	Proposed alterations to listed building.	Approved 25/05/2001	–
36670 & 36671 (LBC)	Proposed conservatory.	Approved 21/11/1990	–
09248	Change of use to partial restaurant and living accommodation.	Approved 23/11/1978	–

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Drainage: No objection
WBC Highways: No objection
WBC Landscape and Trees: No objection subject to conditions
WBC Built Heritage Officer: No objection subject to conditions
WBC CIL: Advice regarding CIL matters
WBC Ecology: No objection subject to conditions

External

Berkshire Archaeology: No objection subject to condition

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Shinfield Parish Council supports the application, welcoming the sympathetic improvements to the existing building, but seeks clarification on whether the proposed annex would function as a separate dwelling. It also requests an arboricultural survey with tree protection measures and a Construction Management Plan to prevent construction traffic using the narrow northern section of Church Lane. <i>Officer's Comment: The proposed works to the annex have been removed from the application. Impact on trees is discussed within the 'Trees and Landscape' section of the report, construction traffic is discussed in the 'Highway Access and Parking Provision' section of the report.</i>
Ward Member(s)	No comments received

Neighbours/ Third-Party Representations	Other	5 comments received (excluding duplicates) objecting on the following grounds: - Loss of light, overbearing and overlooking impact from proposed garage/outbuilding. - Overlooking impact from rooftop extension, first floor fenestration changes and balconies. - Noise/disturbance impact from the use of the balconies, garage/outbuilding and patio area. <i>Officer's Comment: these concerns are discussed in the 'Neighbouring Amenity' section of the report.</i> - Height of proposed rooftop extension would be taller than all neighbouring properties. <i>Officer's Comment: This is discussed in the 'Design and Character of the Area' section of the report.</i> 1 comment received in support of the application.
---	-------	---

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The site comprises a mid-19th Century Grade II listed building located adjacent to the western edge of the settlement of Shinfield. The property was originally built as a vicarage for the nearby church (St Mary's), it was then occupied as a private residence until it's conversion into a restaurant in 1978. The restaurant remained in operation until the premises closed in 2024, the site's ownership has since changed hands.

The site benefits from 3no. detached outbuildings, including a large 'annexe' previously used as office space for the restaurant, to the rear of the main building, with private amenity space to the front and western side and a large car park area to the eastern side of the main building. The main building has been altered and enlarged over time during its use as a restaurant.

Following recent residential developments, the overall character of Shinfield is largely suburban. However, Church Lane retains a more rural 'village' feel due to the church and a number of attractive historic buildings being present, as well as its transition from the main settlement to the open countryside to the west. The site is bordered by a recent residential development (Garret Drive) to the north, which sits on higher ground, and public open space to the immediate west.

Proposal:

This application proposes a series of alterations and additions to the main dwelling plus the erection of a detached garage with first floor incidental habitable accommodation above, a detached storage outbuilding, a pergola, entrance gate and landscaping changes following the demolition of 2no. existing outbuildings and an existing single storey rear addition. The proposed works to the main building comprise:

- The addition of a new storey facilitated by the raising and modification of the

existing flat roof involving the erection of 2no. gable form additions with a crown roofed link, plus the insertion of rooflights. The main ridge height would increase from approximately 8.2m to 11.3m.

- The erection of a single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing single storey rear addition.
- The installation of PV (solar) panels on the flat roofed element and rooflights on the side facing roof planes of the proposed roof extension.
- The reinstatement of historic chimney detailing and extension of the existing chimney at the rear.
- The removal of existing external plant, including plant affixed to the main roof.
- Alterations to the internal layout and fenestration.

The design principles informing the proposed rooftop extension are informed by the building's history. The original building comprised gables and second floor accommodation, but these features were lost to a fire in the early 20th century with the current flat roof and parapet constructed instead of replacing the original features. A Heritage Statement corroborating this story has been submitted in support of the application.

Both proposed new detached outbuildings would be sited towards the north-eastern boundaries of the site, on and adjacent to the existing parking area adjacent to the Vicarage Court. The larger outbuilding would have a width of approximately 10m, total depth of 10m (7.4m at first floor level) and a total ridge height of 6.7m, providing garage parking/storage with incidental habitable accommodation (gym) within the roof space above. The smaller outbuilding, proposed for residential storage, would have a width of approximately 7.05m, depth of 2.5m and a total ridge height of 2.8m.

This application follows a series of applications (3no. full planning applications with associated Listed Building Consent applications, see planning history summary above) determined by the Council in early 2024. The single storey rear extension and part of the fenestration changes and internal alterations to the main dwelling benefit from extant consent ref 233180. Changes to these elements which are proposed under this scheme are indicated on the submitted plans.

Following discussions with the applicant, proposed alterations to the existing annex building and the landscape concept plan have been withdrawn from the application.

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 Modest Development Location of Shinfield, 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.

Policy CC02 of the MDD Local Plan states that development at the edge of settlements is acceptable where it is demonstrated that it is within development limits and respects the transition between the built up area and the open countryside by taking account of the character of the adjacent countryside and landscape. RD9 of the Borough Design Guide SPD requires that development on the settlement edge create an edge and incorporate soft landscaping to integrate to the rural setting.

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design as well as any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents.

Proposed works to the main dwelling

R23 of the Borough Design Guide SPD states that alterations and extensions to a dwelling should be well designed, respond positively to the original building, contribute positively to the local community and related well to neighbouring properties. Its design must be well considered and should complement the existing building and should be clearly subservient to the form and scale of the original building, although a carefully considered contrast may be acceptable where there is no harm to local character. In respect of roof alterations, the eaves and/or ridge heights of a property should not be raised in height unless buildings in the local context are significantly taller, and gables may be acceptable if they are designed to become an integral part of the building.

The proposed raising of the roof would be a significant change to the existing building. The submitted Design & Access Statement states that the extension would restore the historic proportions of the property while adopting a sympathetic design, while materials and detailing will preserve the dominance of the main structure.

The proposed rooftop extension would inevitably add considerable bulk to the host dwelling and it would not appear as a naturally subservient addition. However, the gables are well designed in respect of their width and pitch which mitigates the bulk of the crown roofed link element and are not too dissimilar from the original gables. The extension is also appropriately set back from the parapet, reducing its dominance while retaining a prominent feature of the existing building.

The proposed use of hit-and-miss brick wall on the gable ends results in a visually interesting approach which is in keeping with the existing exposed brickwork while further mitigating its overall bulk. Further details on the proposed external materials are

secured via condition to ensure that the appearance of the extension is acceptable. It is also noted that the introduction of gable features would be in keeping with similar, albeit smaller, examples within the surrounding area and as such the proposal would not be wholly out of character in this respect.

Concern has been raised regarding the height of the dwelling following the development and its relationship with neighbouring properties. It is acknowledged that the roofline would exceed the ridge height of neighbouring properties. However, the character of the surrounding area is considerably mixed with neighbouring developments, constructed later than the site, contributing different styles which are reflective of their age and architectural eras.

The existing building positively contributes to this mixed character due to its distinctiveness, as reflected by its Grade II listed status, and is perceived as a dominant building within the immediate surroundings. From a design perspective, it is considered that the proposal would be an appropriate response that acknowledges the site's history while accommodating change and will continue to contribute positively to the local character. It is therefore considered that the increased height would not have an adverse impact on local character despite the significant change to the building's form and appearance.

Additionally, the history of the site and the intention of the proposal to restore the original second floor accommodation which burnt down in the early 20th century, should be taken into account. On balance, it is considered that the proposal is well designed in respect of acknowledging the building's past while introducing a contemporary extension. The bulk and height of the extension is sufficiently mitigated for the reasons discussed above and therefore, while a significant change to the host dwelling, the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the appearance of the site or the character of the surrounding area.

The proposed fenestration changes at the rear are not significantly dissimilar from the extant permission and would respect the overall architectural style of the historic dwelling. The proposed alterations to the approved single storey rear extension are de minimis and it would remain a subservient addition to the host dwelling.

Other proposed works within the site

Section 4.11 of the Borough Design Guide states that garages (or other outbuildings) should not be sited in front gardens or project forward of the building line of a property. Nonetheless, 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.

The proposed 1.5 storey ancillary garage with first floor habitable accommodation would be a considerable addition to the site, with a footprint of approximately 100sqm and total ridge height of 6.9m it would be sited away from the existing buildings within the existing parking area on an elevated ground level.

In terms of its size and scale, while the new building would appear as a prominent addition to the site it would not be disproportionate due to the size of the plot and the

existing buildings on the site. The proposal would also relate well to the closest built form (No.1 Vicarage Court adjacent to the south-east) in terms of its set down ridge height and similar pitched gable roof form. Its overall bulk is also further reduced by its set in from the rear elevation at first floor level, while the proposed external materials would assist in visually tying the proposal with the existing development on the site. Therefore, it would appear as a subservient addition to the host dwelling.

This proposed outbuilding would comprise a home gym and garage parking space. These proposed uses within the outbuilding would be incidental to the residential use of the site which would have an acceptable impact on the character of the area due to its reliance on and functional link with the host dwelling. The creation of a separate residential unit would potentially have greater impacts in terms of local character, parking and residential amenity which have not been considered here. As such, a condition is recommended which restricts the use of the outbuilding to incidental accommodation to the main dwelling only.

The smaller outbuilding proposed for storage would have a footprint of approximately 20m which is in keeping with the size of the 2no. outbuildings to be demolished. It would be appropriately sited within the north-eastern corner of the site, unassuming from any public vantage points, with a fairly modest ridge height and appropriate mono-pitched roof form. Given it's open sided nature and fairly modest height (circa. 2m) there are no concerns relating to the proposed pergola.

The proposed steel gate and brick/stoner pillars would be considerably taller than the existing entrance gates. However, due to the considerable set back from the highway (circa. 11m) and permeable steel frame edges it would not visually overbearing when traversing the street scene. While there are no similar examples within the immediate surroundings, the height of the piers would be in keeping with the brick wall fronting the boundary with the highway and as such it would not appear wholly out of character.

Overall, the proposed additions to the host dwelling would achieve an appropriate balance of enlarging the habitable floorspace and introducing contemporary elements while respecting its unique characteristics and original form. The proposal would therefore have an acceptable impact on the visual amenity of the street scene and local character in accordance with Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3.

Heritage and Conservation:

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that development must ensure the preservation of any nearby listed building, including its setting. Section 16 of the NPPF requires consideration of the harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset.

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.

The application site falls within the Shinfield Church Area of Special Character, a non-designated heritage asset. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account, with a balanced judgement required having regard to the scale of an identified harm or loss to its significance. Policy TB26 of the MDD Local Plan states that planning permission will only be granted where proposals demonstrate that they retain and enhance the traditional, historical, local and special character of the area.

The main building is Grade II Listed. This application has been subject to significant discussions between the applicant and Officers, with amendments submitted to address concerns raised in respect of the construction of the rooftop extension and other alterations to the listed building. Following final clarification from the applicant the Council's Built Heritage Officer has raised no objection to the application.

The design of the rooftop extension would not unduly impact the significance of this property as a designated heritage asset. Detailed drawings showing the construction of the extension confirm that it would be set back from the parapet and not result in its full or partial loss. The parapet is an important feature which positively contributes to the character and appearance of the building now. The Built Heritage Officer is satisfied that the proposed method of construction will not result in its full or partial loss.

A structural survey submitted in support of the application confirms the feasibility of carrying out the extension without the need to make major structural changes to the building. The Officer is therefore satisfied that the listed building is physically capable of being extended upwards. The proposed restoration of the chimney stack at the rear is welcomed along with the gable form of the extension which would positively contribute to recreating the overall original appearance of the historic parsonage. Subject to further details on specific elements of the proposed works being agreed with the Council via condition the Officer is satisfied that there would be no harm to the historic fabric of the building or its significance.

The Built Heritage Officer is also satisfied that the proposed outbuildings, entrance gate and pergola would have no harmful impact on the setting of the listed building or the Shinfield Church Area of Special Character.

Overall, subject to conditions, no harm to the conservation and setting of the listed building and area of special character has been identified and elements would enhance the significance of the listed building. The proposal therefore complies with the NPPF and MDD Local Plan policies TB24 & TB26.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy aims to protect neighbouring amenity and further guidance on this is contained in Section 4 of the Borough Design Guide SPD.

Overlooking: R15 of the Borough Design Guide SPD requires the retention of reasonable levels of visual privacy to habitable rooms, with separation of 22-30m to the rear and 10-15m to the street. R23 notes that the side walls must not contain windows, especially at first floor level.

There would be a minimum separation distance of circa. 34m from the rear elevation of No.111 Garrett Drive (the closest neighbour) to the proposed rooftop extension, exceeding the recommended minimum of 30m for back-to-back relationships within the Borough Design Guide SPD. The proposed rooftop extension would include a balcony on the eastern gable end which could give a greater perception of overlooking. However, the outlook from the balcony would not be significantly greater than a window in the same position, receiving an oblique view of the neighbourhood rather than direct views into the neighbouring gardens or windows. The risk of direct overlooking would also be mitigated by the hit-and-miss brick wall design of the gable ends.

No changes are proposed to the size and design of the single storey rear extension which comprises a large flat roof and a balustrade enclosing it. There would be a minimum separation distance of circa. 26m between the terrace and the rear wall of the closest neighbour, exceeding the recommended minimum of 22m for 1-2 storey development within the Borough Design Guide SPD. The distance between the terrace and the end of the rear garden of the neighbour would be approximately 15m. However, the rear gardens of Garrett Drive which back onto the site are elevated above the site by at least a metre, and views would be partially blocked by the existing annex.

In respect of the proposed 1.5 storey outbuilding, the main outlook for the first floor incidental accommodation would be to the front. The proposed rooflights at the rear, set back from the rear boundary by approximately 10.5m, would receive an oblique outlook of the skyline rather than direct views into the neighbouring properties.

As such, the design of the proposal and the distance maintained would adequately protect neighbouring windows and garden spaces from harmful overlooking impact and is therefore acceptable.

Sunlight and Daylight: R18 of the Borough Design Guide SPD aims to protect sunlight and daylight to existing properties, with no material impact on levels of daylight in the habitable rooms of adjoining properties.

Due to the position of the main building set well back from all boundaries, there are no concerns in respect of potential loss of light impact from the proposed single storey rear and rooftop extensions. In respect of the proposed 1.5 storey outbuilding, it would be sited approximately 5.6m from the western (side facing) elevation of No.1 Vicarage Court adjacent. Any potential impact on the west facing fenestration serving this property would likely be mitigated due to the distance between the built form and the pitched roof form. Nonetheless, the main private outlook for No.1 is to the rear which would be unaffected by the proposal with the windows on the side elevation offering a secondary outlook. Given the separation distances there would be no impact on the neighbouring garden spaces.

Overbearing and Sense of Enclosure: R16 of the Borough Design Guide SPD requires separation distances of 1.0m to the side boundary and 11m to the rear boundary.

For the reasons discussed above, there are no concerns in respect of potential harm to neighbouring amenity in terms of overbearing impact.

Noise and disturbance: Concern has been raised about noise and disturbance impact from the use of the balconies, garage/outbuilding and patio area. Normal domestic noise, e.g., children playing, conversations, is generally not considered a statutory nuisance and would be expected within the surrounding, primarily residential, neighbourhood. Nonetheless, due to the set-backs of the proposed built form from all site boundaries no adverse noise impact is anticipated following the development. Adverse noise pollution can be addressed through the relevant Environmental Health legislation in any situation.

Landscape and Trees:

Policy CC03 of the MDD Local Plan aims to protect green infrastructure networks, promote linkages between public open space and the countryside, retain existing trees and establish appropriate landscaping and Policy TB21 requires consideration of the landscape character.

There are no protected trees within the site, but trees and landscaping contribute to the pleasant setting of the Grade II listed building and the landscape character of the surrounding area. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) (ROAVR Group, 17/07/2025) has been submitted in support of the application. The submitted site plan includes tree protection fencing, but this is not based on the AIA and therefore cannot be accepted as adequate protection.

The Council's Landscape Architect has reviewed the proposal and raised no objection to the removal of lower quality trees indicated in the AIA. The AIA shows a number of trees will be subject to incursion from the development; the Officer is satisfied that these can be protected by an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS). Subject to securing an AMS and full landscaping scheme via condition, the proposal would comply with the aforementioned policies and the Officer has raised no objection to the application.

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 shows that the application site falls within an identified area suitable for bat roost habitats and bats are known to be present in the area. A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (ROAVR Group, 21/08/2025) has been submitted in support of the application which concludes that the main building has negligible potential bat roosting potential. The Council's Ecology Officer has reviewed the assessment and agrees with this conclusion. However, the existing annex building has a moderate potential bat roosting potential and habitats within the site, particularly in the vegetated garden area, provide potential foraging opportunities.

Following initial discussions with the applicant, the proposed works to the existing annexe building were withdrawn from the application due to the unknown risk of impact to bats and the requirement for further surveys. The Landscape Concept Plan has also

been withdrawn following concerns raised about the removal of and impact on trees within the north-western corner of the site which could support bats. The Council's Ecology Officer has confirmed that full detail concerning tree protection and landscaping can be agreed via condition. A condition restricting the installation of external lighting without the Council's consent is also recommended.

Subject to tree protection measures and a suitable landscaping scheme being secured via condition, the Ecology Officer is satisfied that the development would not have a direct impact on protected species in accordance with the NPPF and MDD Local Plan Policy TB23.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

Policy CP6 of the Core Strategy seeks to manage travel demand with sustainable transport modes, appropriate vehicle parking and minimisation of traffic impacts and highway safety concerns. Policy CC07 and Appendix 2 of the MDD Local Plan stipulates minimum off street parking standards, including provision for charging facilities and cycle parking standards.

The Council's Highways Officer has reviewed the proposal and raised no objections given the ample parking space proposed to be retained. Given the scale of the proposed works and the ample existing hardstanding on-site to facilitate the construction works it is not considered necessary to impose a Construction Method Statement condition in this instance.

Flooding and Drainage:

Policy CC09 of the MDD Local Plan requires consideration of flood risk from historic flooding. The site and access thereto is located within Flood Zone 1 and the proposal represents no additional flood risk or vulnerability. In principle, the proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of Policy CC09.

Policy CC10 of the MDD Local Plan requires sustainable drainage methods and the minimisation of surface water flow. A Sustainable Drainage Assessment (GeoSmart Information, 16/09/2025) has been submitted in support of the application which proposed soakaways, rainwater butts and other drainage improvements. The Council's Flood Risk & Drainage Officer has reviewed the proposal and raised no objection. The proposal therefore accords with policies CC09 and CC10 of the MDD Local Plan.

Archaeology:

Policy TB25 of the MDD Local Plan states that where development is likely to affect an area of high archaeological potential or an area which is likely to contain archaeological remains, the presumption is that appropriate measures shall be taken to protect remains by preservation in situ. Paragraph 218 of the NPPF states that LPAs should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence publicly accessible.

The application site does not fall within an identified area of high archaeological potential. However, it is likely to be within the grounds of the Medieval Manor of Shinfield, and evidence has been recorded at other sites in close proximity including within the adjacent field. This is demonstrated by Berkshire Archaeology's Historic Environment Record and as stated in the submitted Heritage Statement. The new garage building, landscaping and any services installation all have the potential to impact below ground archaeology.

Berkshire Archaeology has reviewed this application and has recommended that an archaeological monitoring and recording exercise in the form of a Watching Brief is likely to represent an appropriate programme of works given the scale of the proposed works. The scheme would include a provision for the publication and dissemination of the site investigation. Subject to the scheme being secured via condition the proposal would comply with Policy TB25 of the MDD Local Plan and paragraph 218 of the NPPF.

The Archaeology Officer has advised that the works to the existing buildings are unlikely to have significant impact due to previous ground disturbance, however in other areas of the property it is possible that there has been minimal previous ground disturbance, permitting potential archaeology to remain, and this will need to be tested. It is therefore appropriate for the condition to require the archaeological investigation to be submitted prior to the construction of the outbuildings only.

Conclusion:

On the basis of the above, and all comments received on the application, no harm has been identified to the significance or setting of the Grade II listed building or the Area of Special Character and there would be no unacceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity or other material consideration. As such, this application is 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:	23 March 2026
Earliest date for decision:	18 February 2026

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	24/03/26

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

- *Modest Development Location – Shinfield*
- *Grade II Listed Building*
- *Areas of Special Character – Shinfield Church*
- *Contaminated Land Consultation Zone*
- *Bat Roost Habitat Suitability*
- *Landscape Character Assessment Area – Spencers Wood Settled and Farmed Clay*
- *SSSI Impact Risk Zones*