

**PLANNING STATEMENT
IN RESPECT OF PROPOSED EXTENSIONS
AND ALTERATIONS**

AT

**HERIOTS, WOKINGHAM ROAD, HURST,
WOKINGHAM RG10 0RX**

MLP REF: WR/16/188

NOVEMBER 2024

Mark Leedale Planning
Chartered Town Planning Consultants
20 Hurlands Place,
Farnham,
Surrey GU9 9HX
01252 718855
markleedale@hotmail.com

Contents

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Planning history and land use
- 3.0 Relevant planning policy
- 4.0 Applying planning policy
- 5.0 Summary

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This statement sets out the planning and heritage considerations for identified alterations to the listed building. It is accompanied by a Heritage Statement from a suitably qualified expert. In so doing the following conclusions are reached:

- There have been various extensions and alterations to the dwelling which is a grade II listed building. The substantive part of these were undertaken prior to listing and others by the previous owner of the property. They may properly be considered alongside the more recent alterations and extensions which were undertaken by the applicant.
- In the course of determining planning and listed building application this year, the local authority engaged expertise. In consequence, various recommendations were made following the refusal of these applications. The applicant concurs that the majority of these are ones which can and should be implemented and these are detailed in this application submission.
- The key consideration is the effect of the alterations and extensions on the integrity of the heritage building. The experts for both the applicants and local authority broadly concur on the principles whilst some of the details are points of difference.
- Importantly, the expert analysis and appraisal of the heritage is understood. It is shown that the building was formerly a modest dwelling and the heritage report identifies how this element remains in an identifiable way such that subsequent changes do not materially harm this element of the heritage asset.
- This aside, the more recent extension is proposed to be remodelled in accordance with the consultants recommendation and this is detailed in the submission. Rather than accede to the suggestion of a smaller flue, this will be removed and made good.

- It is shown that in this way the heritage considerations are resolvable in a way which meets with planning policy at both local and national levels.
- The other matters pertaining to flood risk and habitat ecology are detailed in the application.

1.2 In light of the recommendations of the Council's consultant on heritage matters and subject to the mitigation of protected species, further appropriate and sensitive alterations can be undertaken in a manner where there is no prima face conflict with policies.

2.0 Relevant planning history and land use

2.1. Planning and listed building applications were refused in July 2024 under references 241256 and 241257. Subsequent to this the local authority sought recommendations from their heritage consultant and shared these with the owner and applicant. These have been assimilated into the revised applications in the manner shown and detailed in the text of this Statement.

2.2. In September 2022 under reference 222106 planning permission was granted for a revised access to the dwelling and it was considered that the listed building application was not required. As such 22107 was withdrawn. In considering the application the Conservation Officer noted that the brick piers and gates were not authorised and part of the proposal was to remove these and stop up the access. This was welcomed from a heritage perspective.

2.3. This development has been implemented and is due to be completed in due course as part of general enhancement to the property and surrounds.

2.4. Planning permission was granted in May 2016 (160818) for the use of land for the keeping of horses and various equine uses. This use is served from an access to the south of the application site and is separate from the dwelling.

3.0 **Relevant planning policy**

3.1 The relevant aspects of planning policy which apply to consideration of this application are:

- The adopted Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3 and CP11
- The adopted Managing Development Delivery CC01, CC02 and TB24
- The revised NPPF (2023)

3.1. The key development plan policies are as follows:

- CP1 and CC01 pertaining to sustainable development and the presumption in favour of development
- CP3 is a generic policy which relates to design and impact on character, including the landscape.
- CP11, which deals specifically with proposals outside of the development limits. The starting point is that development will not normally be allowed in the countryside unless it falls into various categories.
- TB24 – the effect of development on heritage assets.
- The revised Framework (2023) is relevant in the following ways:
 - 200. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation
 - 205. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
 - 207. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

3.2. The following section applies the relevant planning policies.

4.0 **Applying planning policy**

4.1. In considering planning policy and all other material considerations, we set out the following.

- What are the proposed recommendations and proposals?
- What is the effect of the existing and proposed alterations on the heritage asset?
- Is the visual effect of the development acceptable on the countryside?
- Are there any other material planning considerations?

The proposals and their impact on the heritage asset

4.2. The table below details the recommendations of the local authority consultant on heritage matters and how the applicants responds through this submission.

Requirement of the historic building consultant	Response and notes
The reinstatement of the partition within the sitting room. It is said that this partition should be rebuilt using traditional methods, which include the construction of wattle and daub panels within existing timber framing.	The partition was erected by the current owner to safeguard the privacy of an elderly person who had to sleep in this room due to infirmity. However, it is agreed that this has an effect on the historic fabric of the building, in part, and it is this element of the building which the experts agree is the core of the heritage asset. However, there is no evidence of wattle and daub in the property and it is considered that this should be infilled and covered in a lime based plaster painted white, to reflect the other elements in this part of the building. In so doing it is noted that there are no parts of the timber frame which show elements of other timber inserts and this would have to be altered to satisfactorily accommodate a wattle and daub approach
The bottom of main the stairs should be reinstated to their former position and details are contained in the report as to how this should be undertaken for the last 3 steps.	This is agreed although there is a difficulty with the practical aspects of furniture removal should be it implemented
The new staircase on the first floor landing should be removed being careful not to damage the historic wall behind the stairs.	This has been removed and the process of making good has/is taking place

The French Doors on the east elevation should be returned to a window in the manner described as well as the making good internally and externally.	This is agreed and there is an old window which will be used and matches those on this elevation
The black cladding on the western gable should be removed and the surfaces behind should be made good and returned to their original condition of painted brick or render. Details of the materials to be used are set out in the report and will be revealed on removal of the timber cladding. The timber-framing detail to the eastern end of the house should be reinstated.	This is agreed in so far as it relates to the gable and once revealed the surfaces will be made good using appropriate finishes. This does not extend to the part where the dormer structure is present as this is of light weight construction and removal of the cladding will reveal the insulation behind the black weatherboarding.
On the garden room the consultant suggests that ridge tiles should be replaced with those similar to the main roof.	This is agreed and reclaimed roll tiles will be sourced
The eastern elevation of the two-storey rear extension has been timber-clad to eaves height and this should be removed with rendered or brick surfaces which are revealed being repaired and retained.	This is agreed and once revealed the surfaces will be made good to match the existing
The wood-burner flue on the eastern side of the extension should be replaced with a smaller and more discreet alternative.	The flue will be removed as there is no longer a wood burner

- 4.3. Planning policy at both national and local levels seeks to safeguard the value of heritage assets in terms of their historic importance. This increases with the level of designation and it is advised that appropriate expertise should be engaged to assess these matters.
- 4.4. The policy framework does not preclude the possibilities of alteration and extension and this is certainly a common practice with Grade II listed buildings as compared to I and II* levels where conservation is paramount.
- 4.5. The expert reports of both the applicants expert and the Consultant employed by the local authority, start by identifying that which is historically important so that an understanding of this and the effect of alterations can be gained. This

is fundamental to assessing the effect of change and putting right the unacceptable elements which require change to effect a positive impact on the heritage asset.

- 4.6. Both of the expert reports identify three levels of built form. They are:
 1. The 17th century modest dwelling
 2. The mid-20th century extension
 3. The 21st century addition
- 4.7. The statutory listing is noted as being made in 1984 and is as follows:

6/15 Heriots

- II

Cottage. Early C17, 3 timber framed bays, colour washed brick infilling, tile roof. Large chimney with bread oven on east gable. 2 storeys. C20 casement windows irregular and entrance door under gabled porch on south front. Large C20 extension on north. Interior: most original timbers visible, with braces, and chamfered joists with stopped ends.
- 4.8. The list is not exhaustive as a record of the heritage value although it does identify the phases of the building which is consistent with the expert reports.
- 4.9. Previously, the local authority identified a number of aspects which it considered require assessment and where necessary remedial work to safeguard heritage. There are now two expert reports which consider all of these matters and whilst there is some disagreement, they broadly set out:
 1. Where no further action is required
 2. Assessment following the submission of an application and where no further action is required
 3. Elements which whilst a material change are of reversible and need not be resisted
 4. Elements where the form is in appropriate and should be altered.
- 4.10. Save to say that much of that detailed by the local authority falls into the remit of identification on an application or no further action is required. Where there is concern and which the applicant acknowledges is identified by the Council's expert and is shown on the submitted drawings and in this Statement.

- 4.11. In respect of the garden room, it is accepted on the basis of expert advice and from the position adopted by the local authority, that the detailing is not acceptable and requires remodelling. In its present form it is said to be “incongruous” and the Council’s expert agrees and suggests a way forwards. This is detailed in this application.
- 4.12. Thus the elements which are considered to be harmful to the integrity of the heritage asset are shown to be changed in the manner recommended by the Consultant. As they stand, the various elements are considered to be harmful and contrary to the approach endorsed in relevant planning policy.
- 4.13. In this way the heritage asset will be safeguarded and appropriate measures can be undertaken so as to resolve the issues which have arisen. The joint objective of the owner as the guardian of the listed building and the local authority is to achieve an acceptable way forwards. This approach will accord with planning policies.

Visual effect

- 4.14. The other aspect of planning policy is that this property lies in the open countryside where an approach of general restraint applies. CP11 details this approach and residential extensions should not be disproportionate as an increase over the original building.
- 4.15. In this case, the larger part of the extensions are mid-20th Century as described above and in the Heritage Statement. This aside, the matters at issue may be summarised as:
- The garden room (variously described as a garden room)
 - The link between the outbuilding and the dwelling
 - The extension above the kitchen as an enlargement and alteration to that which previously existed with the box dormer.
 - To a lesser extent the steel flue.
- 4.16. Together the resultant floorspace is in the order of 25 sq. m which is relatively small when compared to the dwelling as a whole which is circa 208 sq. m with the linked outbuilding being 35 sq. m.. On the planning balance and having regard to CP11 this is planning policy complaint.

Other material considerations

- 4.17. The other material considerations which have been raised in the determination of the 2024 applications are:
1. Flood risk
 2. Ecology and specifically the presence of bats.
- 4.18. The application site now lies in flood zone 2 following the 100 year climate change allowance. Whilst not objecting per se, the local authority engineers require a basic FRA to detail how the development would not result in flood risk elsewhere either from pluvial or fluvial sources. This report is provided with this application and if there are any matters arising, the applicant would be pleased to assess them
- 4.19. Although there is no formal response from the Council's Ecologist the Officer report details the proximity to a bat roost area and the refusal is based, in part, on the perception that there might be resultant harm. The precautionary approach is noted irrespective of the works which have been undertaken by previous owners.
- 4.20. In response a provisional Bat Survey and report is submitted and given the requirements expressed by the local authority, emergence surveys will be required. These cannot be undertaken at this time and will need to form part of the process of heritage restoration and, if necessary, the provision of displaced habitats.
- 4.21. In summary, it is demonstrated that the proposal is not in conflict with the relevant planning policies and there are no other material considerations which would justify a departure or exception to these policies.

5.0 Summary and planning balance

- 5.1 By way of summary, the following points are submitted:

- There have been various extensions and alterations to the dwelling which is a grade II listed building. Many of these were undertaken by previous owners and the applicant seeks to resolve outstanding issues in a manner suggested by the local authority and their consultant.
- The proposed works may properly be considered alongside the more recent alterations and extensions which were undertaken by the applicant and the outstanding matters will be resolved.

- The applicants has acknowledged and responded to the views expressed by the local authorities Heritage Consultant. It is shown that the recommendations made by the Consultant have been addressed in the submitted applications.
- It is noted that the baseline position is broadly similar to the applicant's expert although the recommendations vary. In broad terms the owner concurs with the Council's expert and has adjusted their expectations accordingly.
- It is shown that in this way the heritage considerations are resolvable in a way which meets with planning policy at both local and national levels.
- The other matters pertaining to flood risk and habitat ecology are detailed in the application and are addressed in a satisfactory way. They will be a requirement for emergence survey work when the season permits for this work.

5.2. In light of the recommendations of the Council's consultant on heritage matters and subject to the mitigation of protected species, further appropriate and sensitive alterations can be undertaken in a manner where there is no prima face conflict with policies.