

PLANNING REF : 252055  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 1  
: Henderson Close, Reading, Berkshire  
: RG5 4TW  
SUBMITTED BY : Mr James Horseman  
DATE SUBMITTED : 25/09/2025

COMMENTS:

FAO Stephen Hedges  
The Pavilion  
Recreation Road  
Wargrave  
RG10 8BG

17th September 2025

Dear Members of Wargrave Parish Council,  
I am writing in relation to our planning application (252055) for the replacement dwelling at Lindisfarne, Henley Road, Wargrave, RG10 8PE. Having reviewed the Parish Council's meeting recording (15th September 2025), I understand that the Parish Council has indicated an intention to object on the basis that the proposed dwelling represents a 40.8% uplift in volume compared to the existing dwelling, which is considered to conflict with the Council's Policy of a 35% volume uplift. Unfortunately, parts of the recording were inaudible, and I can't establish whether the Councilors perceived this application to be an extension/alteration, or whether it was known to be a replacement dwelling. If our application was viewed to be an extension/alteration, I would like to confirm that it is for a replacement dwelling and respectfully draw attention to the current National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) attached, which sets out the Government's policy position on development within the Green Belt.

Specifically, paragraph 154(d) states that:  
"the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces" is not considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

I wish to highlight that this policy applies to replacement dwellings, where the benchmark is whether the new dwelling is materially larger than the one it replaces. As we understand, the 35% threshold referenced relates to extensions and alterations, rather than replacement dwellings.

On 09th May 2025, we received feedback from Wokingham Borough Council's Planning Officer in response to a formal pre-application submission. The Planning Officer stated:  
"The important assessment here is whether the replacement dwelling is 'materially' larger

than the existing. What is considered material is not defined by local or national policy and it

is ultimately assessed based on the context of the relevant site." In our case, the uplift is 40.8% in volume, but the proposed design consolidates built form, reduces spread across the site, and places the new dwelling broadly within the footprint of

the existing.

May I respectfully request that the Parish Council reconsider its objection in light of NPPF paragraph 154 d) and the advice already provided by Wokingham Borough Council's planning officer.

I would be pleased to provide further information, or attend a Parish meeting if that would assist, to explain how the proposal accords with national and local policy.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

James & Katrina Horseman

Lindisfarne