

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	250740
Site Address:	2 Carina Drive, Wokingham, Wokingham, RG40 1EF
Expiry Date:	12 June 2025
Site Visit Date:	29 May 2025
Proposal: Householder application for proposed loft conversion and installation of 2No. dormers to create habitable accommodation, along with roof lights and changes to fenestration.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Water Utility Consultation Zones
Local Authorities
Affordable Housing Thresholds
Bat Roost Habitat Suitability
Borough Parishes
Scale and Location of Development Proposals
Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone
Nuclear Consultation Zone
Strategic Development Location
Borough Wards
Landscape Character Assessment Area
SSSI Impact Risk Zones
Thames Basin Heaths SPA Mitigation Zones
Historic Flooding Points Consultation Zone
Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone Householder
Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone Minor

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 – Major development location CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC07 – Parking TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance

PLANNING HISTORY – None relevant

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways - No objection
WBC Ecology Newts - No objection
WBC Ecology - No objection

External

Natural England

REPRESENTATIONS

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

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

This application relates to a two-storey dwelling in the major development location of Wokingham.

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:

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. R23 of the Council's Borough Design Guide (BDG) stipulates that "alterations and extension to buildings should: be well designed, respond positively to the original building, contribute positively to the local character and relate well to neighbouring properties" (4.11).

Para 131 of the NPPF states “good design is a key aspect of sustainable development”. Para 139 adds “development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.”

This proposal seeks to convert the loft into habitable accommodation and install a large front dormer window, including two gable sections on either end and a box dormer connecting the two.

Carina Drive has a relatively uniform street scene, typical of recently built estates. There are some variations from dwelling to dwelling, especially across the immediate neighbours to the application site, but generally dwellings have a uniform design, size and a consistent roofscape.

The shape and form of the dormer window would result in a contrived design that does not relate well to the simple roof form and design of the dwelling and neighbouring houses. The dormer windows would be a mishmash of two gable dormer windows with a flat roof extension connecting them and this would appear as an overly complicated and contrived extension to the roof of this dwelling.

The Borough Design Guide (BDG) states that, “dormer windows should generally be positioned within the main roof, by being set back from both eaves line and the sides of the roof. Dormers should relate to the design of the existing building in terms of roof form, materials, positioning and window proportions”. The proposed dormer window would conflict with this guidance and continue up directly from the front elevation of the main dwelling, without being set back from the eaves of the roof. This positioning makes the dormer window appear cramped to the bottom section of the roof, rather than being middled on the roof slope.

The proposed windows in the gable sections do not relate well to the existing windows in the property, being of a different style and proportion. The larger size of the windows contributes to a top heavy and jarring appearance when viewed in the context of the dwelling as a whole. Traditionally window proportions diminish in upper storeys and the increase size of the windows in this context would appear incongruous. For this reason, the proposal would also conflict with the Borough Design Guide extract set out above.

The large size of the overall roof extension to the main front elevation would result in a top-heavy appearance and would not be a subservient addition to the roof that maintains the buildings overall character and appearance. Given the design concerns outlined above, it would become an incongruous focal point to the dwelling.

The proposed extension would be on the front of the dwelling and therefore the poor design and resulting harmful impact would be prominent in the public realm. The prominence of the extension is also exacerbated by the fact the dwelling sits on a corner plot opposite and area of public open space with public footpaths.

Therefore, the size, siting and form of the proposal is of a convoluted design which fails to respond positively to the original building and as highlighted by its visibility

from the street scene, would subsequently have an adverse visual impact on the character of the area contrary to Core Strategy policy CP1 and CP3, guidance within Section 4 of the Borough Design Guide SPD and section 12 of the NPPF.

The NPPF makes clear that development of poor design which fails to adhere to local guidance should be refused.

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.

As the proposals will only overlook the public realm in the shape of public green space, there are no overlooking concerns. The dwelling is set well away from other dwellings and hence there are no concerns regarding overbearing and loss of light.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

The WBC Highways Officer has reviewed this site and has no objections, the existing parking provision is suitable to serve the proposed development.

Ecology:

The WBC Ecology Officer has reviewed this application and is satisfied with the submitted PRAs conclusion that the proposals are unlikely to harm the protected species.

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.

Conclusion:

To conclude, the proposal is of a convoluted design which would appear at odds with the existing roof form and would therefore detract from the appearance of the original

building. The overly large, proposed dormer windows and connecting box dormer fail to respond positively to the original building and as highlighted by its visibility from within the public street scene would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This is contrary to Core Strategy policy CP1 and CP3, Section 4 of the Borough Design Guide SPD and Section 12 of the NPPF

RECOMMENDATION	
Conditions agreed:	Not required
Recommendation:	Refuse
Date:	9/6/25
Earliest date for decision:	14 May 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>MC</i>
Date:	10.06.2025