

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	251071
Site Address:	5 Erleigh Court Gardens, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 1EH
Expiry Date:	1 July 2025
Site Visit Date:	27 June 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed garage conversion followed by first floor side extension above the garage, single storey rear extension, front porch and changes to fenestration.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Scale and Location of Development Proposals – Major Dev. Location (Earley)
Landscape Character Assessment
SSSI Impact Risk Zone

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 CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC06 – Noise CC07 – Parking
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
N/A	N/A	N/A

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways – No objection subject to conditions.
WBC Built Heritage – No comment.

External

None

REPRESENTATIONS	
Parish/Town Council	Earley Town Council object to this application for the following reasons: - Inappropriate mass, built form and character with particular regard to the relationship of the first-floor side extension to the side boundary which creates a terracing effect. <i>Officer comments: Impacts upon the character of the area will be assessed within the 'Character of the Area' section of the main report.</i> - Impact on the amenity of no. 3 as the ground floor bathroom window would open over their property. <i>Officer comments: Impacts upon neighbouring amenities will be assessed within the 'Neighbouring Amenity' section of the main report.</i> - The rear bay window would overlook no. 7 and should be fitted with an opaque material to prevent overlooking. <i>Officer comments: The rear bay window is an existing window and therefore there will be no requirement to have it fitted with an opaque material.</i>
Ward Member(s)	One Councillor has raised the following points: - The gap to the boundary is less than 1 metre. <i>Officer comments: This is noted and assessed within the main report.</i> - The side extension has the same roofline as the main house, it is not subservient <i>Officer comments: Revised plans were received on 09/07/25 and these show that the roofline of the extension has been lowered.</i> - The side extension should have a sloping hip end, not a vertical gable end. This will result in a significant loss of light. <i>Officer comments: Potential loss of light will be assessed within the 'Neighbouring Amenity' section of the main report.</i>
Neighbours	Four neighbours have commented on this application and have raised the following issues: - The application does not comply with the borough design guide. <i>Officer comments: The content of the Borough Design Guide is merely guidance and does not have to be strictly adhered to.</i> - Given the alterations to the party wall, protection against sound to the adjoining property, in accordance with Building Regs is considered appropriate. <i>Officer comments: Not a material planning consideration.</i>

	• The extension would lead to a terracing effect contrary to the rhythm of the street where there is a clear separation of properties. <i>Officer comments: This will be assessed within the 'Character of the Area' section of the main report.</i> • The extension will detract from the users of the garden at no. 3. <i>Officer comments: This will be assessed within the 'Neighbouring Amenity' section of the main report.</i> • The rear roof of the extension has a gable end which is out of character, and this would cut off sunlight to the garden of no. 3. <i>Officer comments: This will be assessed within the 'Neighbouring Amenity' section of the main report.</i> • Although parking provision meets WBC Parking Standards, the development would be expected to have overspill parking. <i>Officer comments: The Council's Highways Officer has no objection to this proposal, subject to a condition securing the parking provision.</i>
--	--

APPRAISAL

Description of Development:

This application seeks permission for the proposed conversion of the existing garage to create additional habitable accommodation, and the erection of a first-floor side extension above the existing garage. The erection of a part single, part two-storey rear extension following demolition of the existing conservatory. Plus, the erection of a single storey front extension to form a porch.

Revised plans were received on 09/07/2025. These revised plans show that the first-floor side extension has been set down from the main roof, set back from the front building line, and set in further from the boundary. Additionally, the ridge height of the two-storey rear element has been marginally set down.

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. 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.

Character of the Area:**First Floor Side Extension**

Guidance in the Borough Design Guide (BDG) states that “*side extensions should be set back from the building by at least 1m, preferably with a lower roof line and should be set at least 1m from the plot boundary*”. The proposed first-floor side extension is set back from the first-floor front building line by 0.5 metres. Additionally, the ridge height of the first-floor side extension will be set down by approximately 0.2 metres from the ridge height of the existing dwelling. The extension is also set in at first floor level, being set 0.75 metres from the boundary with the neighbouring property, and this avoids a potential terracing impact. Whilst this does not fully comply with guidance in the BDG, the extension would still appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling, and it is not deemed that the side extension poses any significant harm to the character of the area.

Part Single Part Two Storey Rear Extension

The single storey element of the rear extension would extend 4 metres from the rear of the dwelling and is set 0.2 metres from the neighbouring boundary on either side. This element is to the rear of the dwelling where it would only be partially visible from the public domain, and with the proposed brickwork to match the existing dwelling, it is deemed that the single storey element of the extension poses no harm to the character of the area.

The two-storey element of the rear extension would extend 3 metres from the rear of the dwelling and is set 0.75 metres from the boundary with the neighbouring property no. 3. The ridgeline of this element is set down by 1.1 metres from the ridge height of the main roof and this ensures that the extension appears subservient and not overly dominant. The two-storey element would be visible from the public domain, but with brickwork and tiles to match the existing dwelling, it is deemed that the two-storey element poses no significant harm to the character of the area.

Single Storey Front Extension

The proposed single storey front extension would have a pitched roof joining to the host dwelling. The front extension would comply with guidance in the BDG as the building is set well back from the street frontage and the extension would only project forward approximately 0.8 metres. As such, it is deemed that the front extension poses no harm to the character of the area.

Garage Conversion

The proposed conversion of the existing garage poses no harm to the character of the area.

Neighbouring Amenity:**First Floor Side Extension**

The proposed first-floor side extension above the garage is set 0.75 metres from the boundary with the neighbouring property. The element above the garage is aligned with the side of the neighbouring property no. 3 and therefore there are no significant overbearing or loss of light impacts. In terms of overlooking, there is a proposed first-floor side window serving the new bathroom. This is indicated on the submitted proposed floor plans and elevations as being obscure glazed. A condition is recommended to secure this.

Part Single Part Two Storey Rear Extension

The single storey element of the proposed rear extension would extend 4 metres from the rear of the dwelling. There are no windows proposed on the side of the extension and therefore there are no concerns on neighbouring amenity grounds relating to overlooking or loss of light. To avoid being overbearing, guidance in the BDG states that the eaves height of single storey extensions should not exceed 3 metres within 2 metres of a side boundary. The proposed development is set 0.2 metres from the boundaries with the neighbouring properties, but an eaves height of 2.5 metres shows compliance with this guidance.

The two-storey element of the proposed rear extension would extend 3 metres from the rear of the dwelling. There are no windows proposed on the side of this element, and therefore there are no concerns on neighbouring amenity grounds relating to overlooking. With regards to loss of light, it has been demonstrated on the submitted proposed block plan that the two-storey element would comply with the 45-degree horizontal test as advocated within the BDG and the British Research Establishment (BRE) publication "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice". Therefore, it is not deemed that this element of the proposal would cause a significant loss of light to the neighbouring property. The two-storey element would be aligned with the alleyway down the side of the neighbouring property no. 3, and it does not extend beyond the single storey rear extension of no. 3. Therefore, it is not deemed that the extension would have a significant overbearing impact on the neighbouring property that would warrant a reason for refusal of the application.

Single Storey Front Extension

The proposed single storey front extension would extend 0.8 metres from the front of the dwelling, and it is single storey in nature. There are no windows on the side of the extension and therefore there are no concerns on overlooking or loss of light grounds. In terms of overbearing, the proposed front extension only extends 0.7 metres in front of the building line of the neighbouring property, and additionally, it is aligned with their driveway and parking area. Therefore, it is deemed that there would be no significant overbearing impacts.

Garage Conversion

The proposed garage conversion poses no harm to neighbouring amenities with regards to loss of light or overbearing. With regards to overlooking, a high-level window is proposed in the side elevation of the converted garage space facing the neighbouring property no. 3. As this window is right on the boundary, a condition is recommended to ensure that this window is of opaque glazing and is fixed shut (this is also indicated on the submitted proposed floor plans and elevations).

Residential Amenity Space:

The proposals would not adversely harm the usability of the site's rear amenity space for current or future occupiers.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

The Council's Highways Officer was consulted on this application, they are satisfied that there is no significant loss of parking through the conversion of the garage, as the existing garage does not meet the council's current standards. Two parking spaces are indicated on the submitted drawings and this is considered acceptable. The driveway

may need to be widened slightly in order to accommodate this and therefore a condition is recommended to ensure the parking spaces are provided in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion:

For the reasons stated above, the proposal is acceptable in local plan policy terms and therefore is 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, 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.

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.

RECOMMENDATION

Conditions agreed:	Not required
Recommendation:	Approve
Date:	15 July 2025
Earliest date for decision:	28 May 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	15/07/25

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Insert where relevant