

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



**WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Application Number:	250295
Site Address:	137 London Road, Twyford, Wokingham, RG10 9HA
Expiry Date:	10 April 2025
Site Visit Date:	26 February 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed single-storey front extension, single-storey rear extension, and roof alterations to include hip to gable extensions, one front dormer, one rear dormer and removal of the existing chimney to facilitate a loft conversion. The proposed installation of one air source heat pump and changes to fenestration.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Contaminated Land Consultation Zone

Local Authorities

Affordable Housing Thresholds

Bat Roost Habitat Suitability

Borough Parishes

Scale and Location of Development Proposals

Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone

Ground Water Zones

Nuclear Consultation Zone

Borough Wards

Radon Affected Area

Landscape Character Assessment Area

SSSI Impact Risk Zones

JCEB Mineral Safeguarding Areas

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 CC02 – Development Limits CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC05 – Renewable Energy and Decentralised Energy Networks CC06 – Noise CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage TB21 – Landscape Character

	TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Joint Minerals and Waste Plan (JMWP)	DM1 - Sustainable Development DM2 - Climate Change – Mitigation and Adaptation DM3 - Protection of Habitats and Species DM4 - Protection of Designated Landscape DM10 - Flood Risk DM11 - Water Resources DM14 - Ancillary development DM15 - Site History
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document Ruscombe Village Design Statement

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
19226	Single storey extension to garage to provide hobby/storeroom.	Approved 08/06/1983

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Environmental Health – Further information requested and submitted.
WBC Drainage – No objection, subject to condition.
WBC Highways – Amended parking plan requested.
WBC CIL – Not CIL liable.
WBC Ecology – No comments received.

External

None consulted.

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	No objection raised.
Ward Member(s)	No comments received.
Neighbours	No comments received.

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application site consists of a detached bungalow located on the western side of London Road, Twyford. The road surrounding the application site consists of mainly residential properties that vary in age and design. The host dwelling is part of a row of bungalows, some of which have undergone alterations and extensions which include loft conversions.

The mid-twentieth century bungalow is well set back from the road behind a driveway providing off-street parking, a lawned garden and dense established shrubs and hedging along the front boundary.

Typical materials along the road consist of brick, render, hung tiles, brick detailing, pebble dash and timber cladding.

Proposal:

This application seeks approval for a single-storey rear extension, a single-storey front extension to create an entrance porch, and alterations to the main roof which include hip to gable extensions, one front pitched roof dormer and one flat roof rear dormer. The existing chimney would be removed to facilitate the roof alterations.

Also proposed are three rooflights in the front elevation and other changes to fenestration.

One air source heat pump is proposed to the rear of the existing detached garage.

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 principle of a residential extension in this location is acceptable in principle providing that it complies with the wider policy objectives contained within the Core Strategy and Managing Development Delivery (MDD).

Local Plan Update

The Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update 2023-2040: Proposed Submission Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for examination on 28 February 2025.

Character of the Area:

There is no prevailing character to dwellings within close proximity to the host dwelling. Although the host dwelling is part of a row of bungalows, the properties vary in design, form and appearance with many having been altered and enlarged over time. Part of the application proposal includes a single-storey front extension which would have a flat roof form and would serve an entrance porch.

CP3 of the Core Strategy states that proposals should be of an appropriate scale of mass, built form and character. The Council's Borough Design Guide (BDG) SPD gives advice on residential developments. The front extension would measure approximately 2.3m in width and would protrude approximately 0.41m to enclose the existing inset porch and would not protrude beyond the existing principal building line. The porch would have a flat roof form and would be constructed from slate brickwork. The front extension would be a relatively minor change to the frontage of the dwelling and would hold limited views from the public realm due to the established hedging along the front

boundary. Therefore, this element of the scheme would cause no adverse impact to the character of the host dwelling or local area.

The proposed changes to the main roof include hip to gable extensions to both sides to facilitate a loft conversion. Page 57 of the BDG states that for roof alterations 'The eaves and/or ridge heights of a property should not be raised unless buildings in the local context are significantly higher'. The proposed changes would not alter the existing ridge or eaves height. In addition, there is no established form to the roofs of the surrounding bungalows. Roof types include hipped, pitched, crown and front gables. Therefore, the changes proposed would respond sympathetically to the variation in roof styles within the local context and would not appear obtrusive within the street scene.

There is also one dormer proposed in the front elevation of the main roof. The pitched roof dormer would be subservient to the host dwelling by being set back from the eaves, set in from the sides and set down from the ridge line. In addition, due to the host dwelling being set down from road level and existing mature trees and hedging along the front boundary, there would be limited views of the dormer from the public realm. Furthermore, any views of the dormer would not be out-of-keeping with other front facing dormer windows within close proximity. Examples include nos.90, 94, 96 London Road. Therefore, the introduction of a front dormer would have no adverse impact to the character of the host dwelling or local area.

There are also three rooflights proposed in the front elevation of the main roof. Front facing rooflights are already an established feature along the road as evidenced at adjoining neighbour; no.138 London Road. Therefore, the addition of the rooflights would not be out of character within the street scene and are acceptable.

The proposed flat roof rear dormer would be subordinate to the host dwelling and would comply with BDG guidance which recommends that 'Loft conversions and dormer windows should not project above the existing ridge line'. There would be scant views of the rear dormer from the public realm as the host dwelling and front boundary treatment would largely obscure the development. Therefore, the erection of the rear dormer would have no discernible impact on the character of the local area.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be a relatively minor change to the existing ground floor and would effectively infill space between the kitchen and dining room. The extension would not protrude beyond the existing rear or flank building lines. As with the rear dormer, there would be limited views of this element of the scheme from the public realm, therefore this element of the scheme would have a neutral impact on the street scene and have no adverse impact on the local character.

The proposal also includes replacing the existing red brick facades and extensions with render. The change would unify the dwelling to create a seamless finish which would be in-keeping with other properties within close proximity which also boast rendered finishes. These include the two bungalows directly east of the host dwelling. Therefore, the proposed change of material palette would contribute positively towards the underlying character and quality of the local area.

The proposed air source heat pump (ASHP) would be located to the rear of the existing detached garage located in the rear garden. There would be no views of the unit from the public realm. Therefore, the installation of the ASHP would have no detrimental impact on the character or quality of the public realm.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking:

The proposed front dormer would serve a bedroom. The window would be road facing and would be more than 66m from the front fenestration of no.96 London Road. This distance well exceeds the minimum 10m front-to-front separation distance outlined on page 47 of the BDG to maintain privacy. Therefore, the introduction of the front dormer would not generate any detrimental loss of privacy to neighbouring amenity.

There is one first-floor window proposed in the western flank elevation to serve a bedroom. The window would face towards the eastern flank wall of no.135 London Road which has one ground floor window. As the neighbouring window is at ground floor level and more than 7m away, no direct overlooking would be generated.

The proposed rear dormer would include three first-floor windows to serve a bathroom and two bedrooms. To the rear of the host site is the flank wall of no.19 St Michaels Court which would be more than 34m away. This well exceeds the BDG recommended minimum 12m separation distance to be retained between back-to-flank elevations to maintain privacy and limit a sense of enclosure.

The two rear facing windows at first-floor level would face directly into the garden of the host dwelling. Whilst it is acknowledged the proposed fenestration would provide oblique views into the rear garden of no.135, the existing detached garage along the shared boundary would provide a level of screening to maintain privacy to the neighbouring amenity space. The adjoining neighbour to the west; no.139, is sited approximately 11m further back than the host dwelling and set at an angle. Therefore, any views of the neighbouring property from the proposed fenestration would be of the flank wall of the adjoining neighbour. It was noted during the site visit that the established hedging along the shared boundary would provide a level of screening of the adjoining property from the proposed rear fenestration.

Loss of Light & Overbearing:

The proposed changes to the main roof include the erection of hip to gable extensions to each flank elevation. The additional built form would be restricted to above the existing ground-floor footprint and would retain the existing separation distances to the adjoining neighbouring properties to each side. For side extensions, the BDG recommends that a minimum 1m gap should be retained between the building and site boundary. The proposed hip to gable extensions would maintain a separation distance of between 2.4m and 3.1m from the western shared boundary and between 1m and 1.46m from the eastern shared boundary.

Due to the principal building line of no.139 being set back approximately 11m from the host dwelling, the adjacent land to the proposed hip to gable extension at no.139 comprises the driveway area, rather than private amenity space. Therefore, the

additional built form would have no detrimental loss of light or overbearing impact to the adjoining residential amenity.

The hip to gable extension on the western side of the host property would retain the existing ridge height. The separation distance between the proposed development and the flank wall of no.135 would be between approximately 6m and 8.5m which complies with BDG guidance. Therefore, the proposed changes to the roof form would have no detrimental overbearing or overshadowing impact to neighbouring properties.

The proposed single-storey extension to the rear of the property would effectively infill space between the existing kitchen and dining room. A separation distance of approximately 3m would be retained between the proposed flank wall of the extension and the western site boundary. The extension would protrude approximately 3.72m from the rear and would not extend beyond the existing rear and flank building lines of the main house. The extension would also be compliant with BDG guidance which outlines that the 'Maximum eaves and ridge height should be no more than those of the existing property'. Therefore, it is considered that the erection of the single-storey rear extension would cause no adverse overbearing or loss of light impacts to adjoining neighbours.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

The proposed development would increase the number of habitable rooms in the property. The Council's Highways officer was consulted and requested an amended parking plan to show three on-site driveway parking spaces. A revised plan was submitted which satisfies the Highways officer's parking concerns.

Environmental Health:

The proposal includes the installation of one ASHP to the rear of the existing detached garage.

The Government through DEFRA has prescribed a scheme to inform the installation of ASHP and other micro generation units called the Microgeneration Certified Scheme (MCS). The Council's Environmental Health (EH) officer was consulted and requested an MCS assessment which complies with planning standards. An MCS assessment was submitted but not in full accordance with the prescribed process. However, upon further review and calculations carried out by the EH officer, based on the proposed position of the ASHP, the officer has concluded that the install location has been well chosen and will meet guidelines.

Flooding and Drainage:

WBC Drainage raised no objection to the principle of development, however they have requested additional drainage details prior to the commencement of the development. The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is at low risk from surface water flooding according to the EA mapping. Therefore, it is considered unreasonable to request further details when compared with the relatively small addition to the ground-floor footprint, plus the site would retain sufficient permeable ground. Accordingly, the condition is not attached.

Ecology:

The application site is located in an area suitable for bat roosts. A preliminary bat roost assessment was submitted and the Ecologist concluded that the property has negligible suitability for crevice-dwelling bats. The findings demonstrate that the proposals are considered unlikely to result in the death, injury or disturbance of bats, the damage or destruction of a bat roost or the obstruction of access to a bat roost.

Conclusion:

For the reasons set out above, the proposal is acceptable as it accords with local plan policy and guidance, subject to conditions.

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
Date:	31 March 2025
Earliest date for decision:	6 March 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	16.4.25