

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	250578
Site Address:	31 Skylark Way, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9AD
Expiry Date:	13 May 2025
Site Visit Date:	14 April 2025
Proposal: Householder application for proposed erection of a rear conservatory.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Bat Roost Habitat Suitability
Scale and Location of Development Proposals – Modest Development Location (Shinfield)
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
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document Shinfield Neighbourhood Plan

PLANNING HISTORY

None.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC CIL - No comments received.
WBC Ecology – No objection.

External

None.

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Wished to not comment
Ward Member(s)	No comments received

Neighbours	No comments received
------------	----------------------

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application site is a south facing three-storey terrace in Shinfield and falls within a modest development location. The surrounding area is a mix of semi-detached, detached and terrace properties with similar design and character centred around a green space. The house is in a fairly new estate.

The dwelling is built of red brick, has a tiled roof and a front bay window. The property has a garden.

Proposal:

The proposed development is for the erection of a rear conservatory.

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 settlement limits and as such the development should be acceptable providing that it complies with the principles stated in the Core Strategy.

Design/Character of the Area:

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.

In terms of the Borough Design Guide, it states that single storey rear extensions should not project more than four metres from the main rear wall where they are close to a side boundary. In this case the rear extension is 3.8m in length and therefore complies with this aspect of the Borough Design Guide.

The Borough Design Guide also states that maximum eaves and ridge height should be no more than those of the existing property. The height from ground level to the maximum eaves is 2.20m and is no more than the height of the existing property which is 9.07m. The height from ground level to the ridge height is 3.55m and is less than those of the height of the existing property.

It also states that the eaves height of a single storey extension should not exceed 3m within 2m of a side boundary. The eaves height of the conservatory would be 2.20m which is acceptable under the Borough Design Guide. Furthermore, owing to there being a fence on the side boundaries, this will obscure the visual impact of the development further from neighbouring properties.

In terms of design and character the proposed conservatory will be the same depth of the conservatory at 33 Skylark Way. The property at 33 Skylark Way had an application for a single storey rear extension to form a conservatory which was approved and implemented (WBC ref. 050959).

Overall, in terms of design, it complies with the criteria of the Borough Design Guide in a number of respects. As the proposal is for a rear extension, it would not have any detrimental effect on the existing street scene. 33 and 35 Skylark Way have also both constructed similar rear extensions. The proposed windows are of a similar appearance to the existing rear windows of the property and the extension does not project any higher than the trim of the facing brick. In terms of materials, these are to be brick and uPVC fenestration and this would be secured via a condition. The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of design and character.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Policy CP3 states that development should not have a detrimental effect on the amenities of adjoining land users.

Overlooking:

The Borough Design Guide states that the side walls of extensions must not contain windows especially at first floor level, to minimise any potential impact upon the privacy of neighbours. The conservatory would have windows on its side elevations, however because it is only single storey, it will not have long reaching views across adjoining neighbouring gardens.

Loss of Light:

A 45-degree horizontal line was taken from the centre of both adjoining neighbour's closest habitable rooms. This line was not breached and as such it should not result in a substantial loss of light to either neighbouring dwelling.

Overbearing:

The proposed conservatory would have the same building line as the neighbour at 33 Skylark Way and so would not have any overbearing effects on this neighbour. However, the extension would project past the rear elevation of no. 29. However, owing to the conservatory being single storey, having a pitched roof sloping away from this neighbour, and the boundary fencing, the proposal would have limited overbearing impacts.

Amenity Space:

The existing rear garden is 12.7m long and the conservatory will be 3.8m in depth. Therefore, the remaining amenity space will be 8.9m. This is sufficient amenity space when comparing to other properties in the immediate vicinity; it is more than found at no. 35 Skylark Way and the same as 33 Skylark Way.

Ecology:

Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy and TB23 of the MDD seek to protect biodiversity.

The site has been identified to be located within an area that could host potential bats. However, as the proposed development is for an erection of a rear conservatory and

does not involve works to the main roof or any demolition works, a bat survey is not needed in this instance.

Conclusion:

Taking all the above into consideration, the proposal is deemed acceptable in relation to national and local policy and therefore recommended for approval.

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, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief. 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 subject to the following conditions: 1. Time Limit 2. Approved Plans 3. Materials and specified
Date:	22 April 2025
Earliest date for decision:	8 April 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	22/04/25