

MEMORANDUM

From:	Built Heritage Officer		
Service	Green Infrastructure	App No:	252055
Address:	Lindisfarne, Wargrave Road, Remenham, Wokingham, RG10 8PE		
Proposal:	Full application for erection of 1no. five-bedroom detached dwelling, pool house and open-sided car port following demolition of existing dwelling with associated landscaping and car parking.		
Heritage Asset:	<i>Setting of:</i> Ivy Cottage – Grade II since 1983 Ford House – Grade II since 1967 Former Boathouse/Bathing House of Hennerton House – Grade II since 1967 Park Place and Temple Combe Registered Park and Garden – Grade II* since 1987		
Site Visit Made:	No, but familiar with area and neighbouring buildings		

Summary Of Recommendations

Objection

Comments On Proposal

The application proposes the demolition of Lindisfarne, a dwelling house of the late 1940s set on the bank of the Hennerton backwater of the Thames, with the subsequent erection of a replacement dwelling.

The site lies with the setting of the Grade II listed Ivy Cottage, a Romantic Georgian sham ruin, Ford House (also known as Old Ford House) which is understood to be formed from the Tea House for Hennerton House along the separately listed associated boathouse/bathing house. The site also lies within the setting of the Grade II* Registered Park & Garden of Park Place and Temple Combe – however, more specifically, the site, whilst outside the boundary of the RPG likely had associated with Temple Combe due to the proximity of Ivy Cottage (Lodge) which formed an eye-catcher for the estate.

Lindisfarne's original design, whilst relatively plain and simple, is – or more specifically was – uncontentious, a fairly typical post-war villa, modest in proportion and appearance. It had a relatively recessive character resulting in a pococurante

contribution to the setting of the neighbouring heritage assets and the overall area's character.

By contrast, the proposed replacement building is considerably larger resulting in a significantly increased bulk and massing. The proposed design could be considered, politely, as 'neo-traditional' or 'Edwardian inspired', in a vague attempt to reflect the architectural vernacular of the vicinity. It is, however, a poor facsimile of a true historic building, which not only lacks merit in itself but is entirely out of scale resulting a structure more akin to a commercial or flatted development as opposed to a riverside single dwelling house. The central, and basic, rules of classical design – which should inform any traditional building – have been ignored with the resulting in ungainly proportions which are fundamentally academically incorrect and thus indecorous.

As Historic England's *The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition)* advises: "*Setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced, and may therefore be more extensive than its curtilage. All heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not.*" And that: "*The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.*"

Setting, therefore, is not just the visual link between buildings and environments, but in part the way in which they are experienced. Detachment through vegetation and trees, either extant or proposed, can provide a visual distinction between environments, however a landscaped boundary, or buffer, cannot always shield against non-visual atmospheric characteristics, such as noise and presence. Landscaping can also easily be subject to future change. Trees can be felled, hedges lost and thus there may not always be such detachment between buildings. As such, whilst the visual aspect plays a part of the character of the setting, it is the encompassing environment which truly defines how the assets are experienced. In the case of this proposal, the construction of a substantial new dwelling and ancillary pool house along with the increased domestic paraphernalia within the setting of the identified assets - would alter this setting to a negative degree. The aggrandized appearance and increased built form of the vicinity would seek to erode the sensitive special character and thus cause harm to the established attributes of the assets.

Whilst there is no central objection to a replacement dwelling house on the site, any new structure should be an appropriately refined designed, that of the 'Thames Vernacular' or neo-classical, as has been accepted on a close-by site at Temple Combe – works by members of the Traditional Architecture Group (TAG) such as ADAM Architecture, Ben Pentreath, Purcell, Francis Terry & Associates, and others should be used a point of inspiration. There is, in fact, an opportunity to enhance the setting of the designated heritage assets that surround the site, through appropriate and skilled design, a new dwelling could be read as part of the

historic development of the area, as opposed to, an entirely inappropriate hulk of a building in this sensitive landscape.

As such, the proposals would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the identified heritage assets. This harm would arise through the fundamental change to the character and appearance of the setting of the listed buildings via the unsympathetic proposals and thus erosion to the architectural quality of the area. (Section 16, NPPF).

Through the sub-standard architectural form and detailing, the increased scale and massing and resultant diminishment to the legibility to the historic setting through the suburbanisation of the area, the proposed development would fail to preserve the setting and thus special interest of the listed buildings (S66, P(LBCA)A 90).

Given the identified harm, the proposed development would conflict with Policy CP3 of the Wokingham Borough Council Core Strategy and Policy TB24 of the Managing Development Delivery local plan.

As such, an objection is raised to the application due to the arising harm to the heritage assets.

Conditions			
N/A			
Date:	19/09/2025	Signed:	Roderick McDonald Built Heritage Officer