

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Number:	260114
Site Address:	Endalls Farm, Blakes Lane, Wargrave, Wokingham, RG10 9SY
Expiry Date:	31 March 2026
Site Visit Date:	20 March 2026
Proposal: Householder application for the erection of a single-storey extension, the application of waterproof render, and associated alterations to the dwelling.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Bat Roost Habitat Suitability
Scale and Location of Development Proposals – Countryside
Green Belt
Landscape Character Assessment Area

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 CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals CP11 – Proposals Outside Development Limits CP12 – Green Belt
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC07 – Parking TB01 – Development within the Green Belt TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update (LPU)	SS1 – Sustainable development principles SS5 – Development in the countryside SS6 – Development in the Green Belt C4 – Green and blue infrastructure and public rights of way C5 – Parking and electric vehicle charging NE1 – Biodiversity and geodiversity
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Wargrave Parish Design Statement

PLANNING HISTORY		
Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
970924	Proposed Erection of Replacement Farm Dwelling	Approve 29 th August 1997
001092	Proposed demolition of existing dwelling, stables and storage buildings, removal of hard standing and erection of new dwelling, ancillary lodge, barn and garage. Part change of use from vehicle storage and commercial stabling to residential.	Refuse 8 th February 2001
010001	Proposed demolition of existing house and storage buildings. Removal of concrete hardstanding. Erection of new house and barn and conversion of agricultural buildings to office, store, garage and staff accommodation including part change of use from vehicle storage and commercial to residential and office.	Approve 25 th January 2002
022052	Proposed erection of 1 replacement dwelling and demolition of existing dwelling. Removal of mobile home and erection of outbuilding. Conversion of barn from agricultural to 1 grooms dwelling. Erection of new stables and indoor dressage arena. Formation of new entry road and lake/balance pond.	Approve 18 th February 2004
110295	Proposed installation of roof mounted solar array on existing indoor riding arena.	Approve 26 th May 2011
153191	Householder application for the proposed erection of an annex store basement to create habitable accommodation.	Approve 17 th March 2016
232152	Prior approval submission for the proposed installation of solar panels on a non-domestic building.	Prior Approval Not Required 31 st October 2023

CONSULTATION RESPONSES
Internal
N/A
External

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Wargrave Parish Council objects to the application on the grounds that it lacks adequate volume data to evaluate the scale of development within the Green Belt. <i>Officer comment: Volume calculations have been estimated based on information in historical officer reports and is discussed in detail in the main body of the report.</i>
Ward Member(s)	No comments received.
Neighbours	No comments received.

APPRAISAL

Site Description: A large, detached dwelling of contemporary design in Wargrave that is in designated Countryside and Green Belt. Vehicular access is via Blakes Lane and a private gated driveway approximately 250m in length. The residential curtilage is approximately 1 hectare, and the property has direct access to the adjacent equestrian centre and surrounding land comprising approximately 22 hectares. The ground level of the dwelling is lower than that of driveway and land to the west, and trees provide screening from the bridleway.

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 outside settlement limits, within the countryside where Core Strategy Policy CP11 applies, and is also situated in the Green Belt where Core Strategy Policy CP12 is relevant. Furthermore, Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy states that development must be appropriate in terms of its scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character to the area in which it is located and must be of high-quality design without detriment to the amenities of adjoining land uses and occupiers.

Proposal: Erection of a single-storey extension to facilitate a dayroom. It would have a flat green roof; the south and west elevations will comprise glazed doors; and it would measure approximately 3m in height, 5.3m in depth and 10.5m in length.

Location within the Green Belt: The application site is located within designated Green Belt and outside of settlement limits in the Countryside. The government attaches great importance to Green Belts with national policies for the protection of Green Belt land covered by Chapter 13 of the NPPF. Paragraph 142 of the NPPF states that, "The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence". Paragraph 143 of the NPPF states that the Green Belt serves 5 purposes, the one most relevant to this proposal is, "(c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment".

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF states that, "Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special

circumstances.” When considering any planning application, LPAs must ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Paragraph 153 further states that, “Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of its inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.” In this case, no very special circumstances have been identified.

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF states that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of eight exceptions applies:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use), including buildings, for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments;
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e) limited infilling in villages;
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
- h) Other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

In this case, the most relevant exception is “the extension or alteration of a building provided that does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.”

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that, “The development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where:

- a) The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.
- b) There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed.
- c) The development would be in a sustainable location.
- d) Where applicable the development proposed meets the ‘Golden Rules’ requirements”

In this case, it is considered that the proposal, comprising a single storey extension would not fall within the exceptions set out in paragraph 155 and therefore they are not relevant to this proposal.

In returning to the assessment of paragraph 154, similar principles over proportionate increases are reflected in Core Strategy policy CP12 and MDD Local Plan policy TB01. The NPPF does not define what can be considered a “disproportionate addition” in size. Policy TB01 defines a “limited” addition as one that is cumulatively 35% or less in volume compared to the original building, and as such could be viewed as not “disproportionate” in size. Although the supporting text to Policy TB01 is specifically directed towards proposals for residential extensions, it remains a useful comparative tool to assist in assessing harm to the Green Belt. Policy TB01 further clarifies that with regard to the construction,

alteration or extension of buildings ancillary to a dwelling, changes should not result in disproportionate additions to the original building(s) or cause a detrimental to the scale of the dwelling or to the scale of development on the site.

The NPPF definition in the Glossary defines an 'original building' as a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally. In this case, when considering what constitutes the 'original building', Green Belt policy in the NPPF seeks to ensure that "the extension or alteration of a building provided does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Nevertheless, a common sense approach is needed when defining what constitutes the 'original dwelling', and whether it refers to the existing building before any extension, i.e., to the replacement dwelling; or to an earlier dwelling that no longer exists (as outlined in the case of *Sevenoaks DC v SoS & Clarke 1997*). Hence, in this instance, it is the replacement dwelling (as indicated in Table 1) that represents the starting point for calculating any cumulative volume increase for this proposal.

Historical volume calculations have not been submitted as part of this application. The following calculations are an estimate and based on information obtained from previous Officer Reports:

- Permission F/2001/4652 (ref 010001), records the original dwelling as having a floor area of 162m² and a volume of 1629m³.
- Permission F/2002/8243 (Ref 022052) states the existing volume of the dwelling was 510m³ and the volume of the proposed dwelling would be 1,629m³. In the permission it is noted that the proposed increase would be significantly greater than 35% but the extant permission F2001/4652 with a volume of 1633m³ was a material consideration. However, the established business use was considered to justify the larger dwelling.
- Permission Ref 153191 was granted in 2015 for the erection of a single storey annex to the west of the dwelling to create habitable accommodation for an elderly relative. The determining officer concluded that the proposal constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, special circumstances existed that were deemed sufficient to outweigh the harm associated with inappropriate development.

In volumetric terms, Table 1 below shows that when using the replacement dwelling as a starting point for volumetric calculations, the proposal would not amount to 'inappropriate' development in the Green Belt when assessed under Policy TB01 and Paragraph 153 of the NPPF and would result in an approximate volume increase of 29.4% compared to the existing (replacement) dwelling.

Table 1 – Approximate comparison of original and proposed volumes and Area

Description	Total Volume (m ³)	Cumulative Increase (m ³)	Cumulative Increase %
Farmhouse Building	510	-	-

Replacement Dwelling (as approved under 022052)	1629	-	-
+ Self-contained Annex (2016)	1799	+170	10.4%
+ Proposed Development	1939	+310	19%

Therefore, the proposal constitutes a cumulative 29.4% volume increase compared to the replacement building and does not amount to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Furthermore, the proposal would not result in material visual harm to the Green Belt or countryside, would not adversely affect the character of the area, and would not give rise to an identifiable spatial erosion of openness given the host property's spacious setting and the relatively limited nature of the proposed extension.

Accordingly, the proposal complies with national Green Belt policy.

Location within Countryside:

The site is in Countryside and Core Strategy Policy CP11 states that to protect the separate identity of settlements and maintain the quality of the environment, proposals outside of development limits will not normally be permitted except where:

- 1) It contributes to diverse and sustainable rural enterprises within the borough, or in the case of other countryside-based enterprises and activities, it contributes and/or promotes recreation in, and enjoyment of, the countryside; and
- 2) It does not lead to excessive encroachment or expansion of development away from the original buildings; and
- 3) It is contained within suitably located buildings which are appropriate for conversion, or in the case of replacement buildings would bring about environmental improvement; or
- 4) In the case of residential extensions, does not result in inappropriate increases in the scale, form or footprint of the original building.
- 5) In the case of replacement dwellings, the proposal must: i) Bring about environmental improvements; or ii) Not result in inappropriate increases in the scale, form or footprint of the original building.
- 6) Essential community facilities cannot be accommodated within development limits or through the re-use/replacement of an existing building.
- 7) Affordable housing on rural exception sites in line with CP9.

In this case, the proposal would not promote recreation or facilitate the increase of rural enterprises. However, it would not lead to excessive encroachment or expansion away from the original building and would not result in inappropriate increases in the scale, form or footprint of the original building. Therefore, the scheme would comply with CP11, and would not cause significant harm to the Countryside.

Character of the Area: Core Strategy Policy CP3 states that planning permission will be granted for proposals that are of an appropriate scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character, together with a high quality of design without detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users, including open spaces or occupiers and their quality of life. Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy requires developments to maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment.

In this case, the proposed garden room would be a single storey infill extension to the dwelling house where the ground level is lower than the surrounding land to the west. It would be constructed on the footprint of an existing patio and located 250m from the public realm in Blakes Lane and 50m from the bridleway to the west. Furthermore, there are trees adjacent to the highway and bridleway that provide screening. Therefore, the proposal would not be visible from the public realm and would not harm the character of the area.

Overall, the proposal would comply with CP1 and CP3 in relation to the character of the area.

Neighbouring Amenity: Core Strategy Policy CP3 states that development proposals should not result in a detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users including open spaces or occupiers and their quality of life.

In this case, the proposal would not be visible to the occupants of Yeldall Manor (located approximately 300m to the north of the site), or Wentworth House (located approximately 350m) to the south. Furthermore, the proposed flat green roof and glazed outer walls would mitigate any harm due to the increase in bulk and scale compared to the existing house. Therefore, the proposed garden room would not increase overlooking, loss of Light or overbearing appearance to neighbour amenity.

Overall, the proposal would comply with Policy CP3 in relation to neighbour amenity.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: Policy CC07 of the Adopted Local Plan states that planning permission will only be granted where the proposal demonstrates that the new scheme retains an appropriate level of off-street parking. The WBC adopted parking standards after development (Appendix 2 MDD Local Plan) states that 3 or more parking spaces are required following development for a 4 or more-bedroom dwelling. In this case the proposal will result in 1 no. additional room, and the site has ample parking for more than 3 cars which is acceptable.

Ecology: The site is in an area designated as a suitable habitat for bat roosting. However, the proposal would not involve works to the main roof of the house. Therefore, a Preliminary Bat Survey is not required in this instance.

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.

Conclusion:

By reason of the scale of the proposed extension, it would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the existing building and would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt or harmful to its openness. The proposal therefore complies with policy CP12 of the Core Strategy (2010), and TB01 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (2014) and section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

This application is therefore recommended for **approval**.

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:	Not required
Recommendation:	Approve
Date:	13 May 2026
Earliest date for decision:	12 February 2026

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	14/05/26