

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	251013
Site Address:	19 Tinwell Close, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 3BJ
Expiry Date:	3 July 2025
Site Visit Date:	9 June 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of single-storey extensions to the rear and side, along with part front extensions and the conversion of an existing porch.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Scale and Location of Development Proposals – Major Development Location – Earley
Flood Zones 2 and 3

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 CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC07 – Parking
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
15464	Detached House and Garage	Approve 4 th June 1981

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Drainage – No Objection Subject to Condition
WBC Highways – No Objection
WBC CIL

External

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS	
Parish/Town Council	No objections raised.
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	One objection received: The current building to be replaced is a lean-to glass house. The proposed south elevation would increase overlooking, be overbearing and cause loss of light. It would be detrimental to the trees and the bat population in the area. <i>Officer comment: The proposal does not include the removal of trees, nor are the trees within the application site protected by a Tree Preservation Order. Furthermore, the tall trees adjacent to the site and at the rear of no.15 would not be significantly impacted by the development given that there would be a separation distance of 2m from the proposed single storey rear extension. Also, since the application site has not been identified as suitable for bat roosting, the applicant is not required to submit a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Report. Therefore, the development would not have a detrimental impact on trees and bat roosting.</i> <i>Neighbour amenity in relation to overlooking, loss of light and overbearing is discussed in the main body of the report.</i>

APPRAISAL
Site Description: A 1980's detached dwelling in the residential area of Lower Earley. The property is set at an oblique angle at the end of a small cul-de-sac between no.'s 16 and 17 Tinwell Close. The front garden is triangular with a tarmac driveway for off street parking and a gravel area with shrubs. There is a small garden to the rear of the property enclosed by fencing. 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. Proposal: Erection of single-storey extensions to the rear and side, along with part front extensions and the conversion of an existing porch.

The single-storey rear and side extension will have a part sloping, part flat roof with roof light; a window on the SE and NE facing elevations, and doors to the rear garden. It will facilitate an open plan kitchen dining area and measure approximately 4m in length, 5.5m in width, 2.7m to the top of the eaves and 3.5m to the top of the sloping roof. It will be located 2m from the rear boundary of no. 15 Tinwell Close and 2m from the side boundary of no. 16 Tinwell Close.

The 2-no. two storey front extensions will be either side of the porch and forward of the existing front elevation by approximately 1.1m, each will be approximately 3.8m in width and 5m in height to the top of the eaves. They will have a pitch roof that is subservient to the main roof line. The porch will have a pitch roof and 2 no. steps. It will measure approximately 2.4m in width, 1.2m in depth, 2.5m to the top of the eaves and 3.3m to the top of the pitch. The extensions to the front will enlarge the internal space of 2 no. bedrooms, the living room and kitchen/dining room.

Character of the Area: Core Strategy Policy CP3 states that planning permission will be granted for proposals that are of an appropriate scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character, together with a high quality of design without detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users, including open spaces or occupiers and their quality of life. Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy requires developments to maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment.

The Wokingham Borough Council Design Guide (BDG) provides some guidance on extensions which relate to design and scale. It states the following:

- Maximum eaves height and ridge height should be no more than those of the existing property.
- Side extensions should be set back by 1m, preferably with a lower roof line and should be at least 1m from the plot boundary.
- The rhythm of buildings and gaps between them along the street frontages is often important to the character of the area.
- The eaves and/or ridge height should not be raised in height unless buildings in the local context are significantly taller.
- Front extensions should not project significantly forward of the building line.

The immediate street scene is a small cul de sac of detached and link detached dwellings with double garages and small open plan gardens. The application site sits at right angles and further back than other properties in the cul de sac (Figure 1) and so the rhythm of buildings and gaps between them along the street frontages would not be disrupted. The ridge height of the proposed front two storey extensions would be approximately 1m lower than the existing roof line and the eaves height would be the same as existing. They would be in line with the front wall of the existing porch and garage and would not project significantly forward of the building line. The rear extension roof would be lower than the garage roof and would not be visible from the street. Therefore, while a substantial extension to the host dwelling, the proposal would not cause significant harm the character of the area.

Overall, the proposal would comply with policy CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy in relation to the character of the area.



Figure 1: 19 Tinwell Close (Google Street view 2023)

Neighbouring Amenity: Core Strategy Policy CP3 states that development proposals should not result in a detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users including open spaces or occupiers and their quality of life. The Wokingham Borough Council Design Guide (BDG) provides some guidance on extensions which relate to protecting residential amenity. It states the following:

- Rear extensions should not project more than 4 meters from the main rear wall where they are close to a boundary.
- The eaves height of single storey extensions should not exceed 3m within 2m of a side boundary.

Overlooking: The front extensions would not overlook habitable rooms in neighbouring properties, except at very oblique angles which would be similar to existing relationships. The single storey rear extension would have a window on each of the side elevations; the small window on the north facing wall would not overlook neighbouring habitable rooms given it would be a ground floor level. The south aspect facing window would look towards the boundary fence with no. 15 and would be further screened by the tall trees behind the boundary fence. The patio doors would not create the potential for any significant additional overlooking to neighbouring habitable room windows. Therefore, the proposal would not significantly increase overlooking in relation to neighbour amenity.

Loss of Light: The test advocated within the British Research Establishment's (BRE) publication *Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to good practice*, has been used to assess impact on daylight and sunlight levels to neighbours potentially impacted upon by adjacent development. In this case, both the vertical and horizontal 45-degree angle test are complied with in relation to the nearest habitable room of neighbouring properties at 15, 16 and 17 Tinwell Close.

Overbearing: The rear extension would be single storey and have a part sloping/part flat roof with a maximum height of 3.5m which is 0.5m taller than what the Borough Design Guide (BDG) recommends for extensions within 2m of the boundary. However, the advice in the BDG is guidance, not strict planning policy, and each application must be considered on its merits. The boundary fence with no 15 Tinwell Close (Figure 2) is approximately 1.8m in height and the tall trees behind the fence would obscure the

view of the proposed rear extension from habitable rooms at no.15 Tinwell Close. Furthermore, the extension would not face onto habitable rooms at nos. 16 or 17 Tinwell Close. Therefore, given the height is a marginal breach of BDG guidelines and would not have a significant impact on neighbouring amenity in relation to being overbearing, it would not be reasonable to refuse the application on this basis.



Figure 2 Boundary of 19 Tinwell with nos. 15 and 17 (facing NE)

Highway Access and Parking Provision: The Highway Officer has raised no objection and commented: *“The proposal will not result in any additional habitable rooms and the proposed front extension will not have a significant impact on the existing parking arrangements. The existing level of parking will be retained, and this is considered acceptable to serve the development.”*

Flooding and Drainage: The Drainage Officer has raised no objection subject to condition and commented: *“The existing dwelling is within flood zone 2 and in an area that experiences low risk of surface water flooding. We would have no objection to the principle of the extension, as represented by plans and elevations drawing P1635-02 dated April 2025. As neither existing nor proposed drainage details have been provided, we would recommend the condition below:*

Suggested Condition

No construction shall take place until details of the existing drainage system have been provided, as well as details of how the proposed extension feeds into the existing drainage system, (or details of a completely new drainage system), demonstrating that flood risk will not increase on or off site. This should be represented on a drainage strategy drawing.

The above details shall be approved in writing by the LPA. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development and shall be maintained in the approved form for as long as the development remains on the site. This is to prevent increased flood risk from surface water run-off."

However, the increase in hard surfaces would be limited to approximately 4m² either side of the proposed porch and the remainder of the development will be on an existing hard surface. Hence, as the proposal does not significantly increase the risk of surface water runoff, it would not be reasonable or necessary in planning terms to impose an approved drainage strategy should this application be approved.

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:	Yes
Recommendation:	Approve
Date:	20 June 2025
Earliest date for decision:	22 May 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	20/06/25