

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	242280
Site Address:	10 Tinwell Close, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 3BJ
Expiry Date:	1 November 2024
Site Visit Date:	11 September 2024
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed front porch extension with a two-storey front/side extension in addition to a single storey rear/side extension following a garage conversion to facilitate an office.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

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
Borough Wards
Landscape Character Assessment Area
SSSI Impact Risk Zones
JCEB Mineral Safeguarding Areas
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
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC07 – Parking
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

PLANNING HISTORY- No relevant planning history

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Drainage: No objection subject to conditions

WBC Highways: No objection

WBC Ecology Householder: No objection subject to conditions
External
None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS	
Parish/Town Council	Earley Town Council: No objection
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received
Other	Mr William Luck: Can the applicant confirm the parking provision, as they show two spaces across the frontage of the house, yet on site only one car is able to be accommodated. A second car would obstruct the parking space to the side, in front of the garage. However, it is noted that only 2 spaces are likely to be required on curtilage. Officer response: WBC Highways raised no objections, see highways section of report.

APPRAISAL
Site Description: Two storey semi-detached dwelling attached via the 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 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: The Borough Design Guide states that <i>“porches should generally project less than 2m forward of the building line”</i>. The porch would project less than 2m, thus complying with the BDG. The height of the porch would remain at approx. 3.40m. The alteration to the existing porch is that its width is increasing from approx. 2.35m to 3.07m. Whilst the porch would be bigger it is still considered to be modest in size and scale which would not harm the street scene. The garage conversion would differ the current street scene and slightly alter the characteristics of the street. However, the new window would be similar to the existing in size and proportions of current ground floor window along Tinwell Close, meaning that the proposal would not negatively harm the street scene. The proposal meets the recommendations of the Borough Design Guide and is line with policy CP1

and CP3 of the Core Strategy. Furthermore, given the orientation of the dwelling, the new window would be blocked by main dwelling so would not be particularly visible from the street scene.

The Borough Design Guide states that *“for properties in formal suburbia, whether detached, semi-detached or short terraces, the rhythm of buildings and the gaps between them along the street frontage is often important to the character of the area. The side extension 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 boundary plot”*. The two-storey side extension would be over 10m from 12 Tinwell Close but would not be set back or have a lower roof line.

Whilst continuing the ridge line of dwellings is discouraged, the proposal would be match the existing building line and separation distance from the north-east site boundary (no.12) sufficiently mitigates any terracing effect concerns. The extension is clearly subservient to the host dwelling and would not adversely impact the character of the area. The proposed side extension would be a complimentary design to the host dwelling and would not be an incongruent or dominant feature to the host dwelling.

The new windows for the two-storey side extension would be similar to the existing in size and proportions of current ground and first floor window along Tinwell Close, meaning that the proposal would not negatively harm the street scene. The proposal meets the recommendations of the Borough Design Guide and is in line with policy CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy.

The flat roofed single storey side/rear extension exceeds the recommended 4m depth for extensions advocated within the Borough Design Guide. However, the host property has the space to accommodate for such modest addition. Moreover, being located at the rear it wouldn't be visible from public locations. Hence, the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character of the host property or surrounding area.

The proposed material would match that of the existing, thus in keeping with the current characteristics of the dwelling.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: As part of the garage conversion, the scheme would add additional window at the front of the property due to the garage being converted into habitable accommodation. Whilst the proposed window would face another property, it is noted that Tinwell Close, a public road, is located adjacent to the site. As such, the proposal would not result in a greater overlooking impact into residential properties than is currently present as the window at the side of the extension would overlook the street scene and therefore no harmful impact would occur. Furthermore, the separation distance from the new window to no.6 is over 14m.

The new windows as part of the two-storey side extension would face another property, it is noted that Tinwell Close, a public road, is located adjacent to the site. As such, the proposal would not result in a greater overlooking impact into residential

properties than is currently present as the window at the side of the extension would overlook the street scene and therefore no harmful impact would occur. According to the agent there are *“no plans to remove the brick wall at this point as wanted to preserve privacy”*.

The new office windows and bi-folding doors would be screened by the boundary preventing overlooking.

Given the property already has one first floor side window for a bedroom, whilst closer to the boundary of no.12 the outlook would be the same and would not result in harmful overlooking. No.12 does have 2 first floor windows which overlook onto the garden of no.10, however both are obscured glazed thus no overlooking concerns.

Loss of Light: The front porch, garage conversion and single storey side/rear extension would not result in harmful loss of light. The two-storey front/side extension would not result in harmful overlooking.

Overbearing: The two-storey side extension would be set off from the boundary and neighbouring dwelling (no.8) is set further back beyond their rear and stops in line with their house, thus not considered to be overbearing.

The proposal would be of similar height to the other two storey dwellings in the surrounding area, the proposal would not appear physically overbearing or oppressive to neighbours such that it would be significantly detrimental to their amenities.

Given the single storey side extension would have a flat roof, the majority of it would be screened by the fence along no.8, thus not considered to be overbearing.

The front porch and garage conversion would not be overbearing.

Amenity Space: The proposal reduces the amount of amenity space available to the property but it would still be roughly rectangular in shape, receive sunlight for part of the day and be able to accommodate typical garden activities as set out in the Borough Design Guide. Therefore, the reduction in amenity space is not considered to have a harmful impact on the amenity of the occupier.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: As shown on plan 2 & 3, there will be a total of 3 parking spaces. Whilst one car parking space would obstruct the parking space to the side, in front of the garage. There would be space for a car to manoeuvre out whilst not impacting upon the other parked cars.

The proposal will result in an additional habitable room and conversion of the garage. The remaining level of parking is considered acceptable in this instance and the Council's Highway Officer raises no objection.

Flooding and Drainage: The existing dwelling is within flood zone 2, where more vulnerable development is allowed.

WBC Drainage would have no objection to the principle of the development, as

described in Flood Plan level 2 flood risk assessment report 00431 dated 26/07/2024, together with its appendices.

As represented by proposed floor plans drawing 7 dated 24/06/2024, the footprint of the development increases.

The comments from drainage have been taken into consideration, however due to the scale of the scheme the provision of a surface water run off strategy is not required.

Ecology: All species of bats receive special protection under UK law. It is a criminal offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (The Habitat Regulations) to deliberately or recklessly destroy or damage their roosts, or to disturb, kill or injure them without first having obtained the relevant licence for derogation from the regulations from Natural England.

The officer is satisfied that the inspection and activity bat survey methodology and effort are adequate for Ecologist Garry Smith to conclude bats are not currently using the building. The officer supports the recommendation that mitigation set out in Emergence Survey Report Appendix 1 must be implemented during development to prevent disturbance as populations of bats were observed to be using the site and surrounding habitats for commuting or feeding. The officer has requested that informative I17 is included in the decision notice. The condition recommended isn't necessary.

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 October 2024
Earliest date for	27 September 2024

decision:	
------------------	--

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>MC</i>
Date:	31.10.2024