

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	242658
Site Address:	21 Springfield Park, Twyford, Wokingham, RG10 9JG
Expiry Date:	17 December 2024
Site Visit Date:	5 November 2024
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed first floor rear extension, single storey side extension and single storey front extension plus fenestration changes.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Major Development Location - Twyford

Landscape Character Assessment Area – Wargrave-Twyford Arable Chalk Lowlands

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 CC07 – Parking TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Twyford Neighbourhood Plan

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
02299	Two storey rear extension	C/A – 17/05/1975
221/58	Detached house & garage	C/A – 09/12/1958

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

None consulted

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Twyford Parish Council – “No comment”
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application site is a link detached dwellinghouse within a 1960s residential development in Twyford. The site forms part of a row of 4no. link detached dwellings which share a broadly uniform frontage in terms of form and design, although this has been altered slightly by differing examples of later additions.

Proposal:

This application proposes the erection of a first floor rear extension, a single storey side extension and single storey front infill extension plus fenestration changes. At first floor level, the proposal would effectively project the original rear elevation forward in line with the later extension, with a depth of approximately 1.55m its ridge height which match the main ridgeline.

At ground floor level, the proposal would infill an existing an existing gap between the main dwelling and the attached garage and replace the footprint of the existing garage, with a flat roof form approximately 2.8m in total height there no encroachment beyond the existing rear building line. The proposed single storey front extension is relatively modest in terms of its size and scale, with a width of approximately 1.4m, length of 2.2m and total ridge height of 2.7m it would not project beyond the existing principal (front) building line.

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.

Design and Character of the Area:

While solely comprising two storey detached dwellinghouses, this part of Springfield Park has a relatively varied character with differing architectural styles, forms and a varied material palette visible. There are several neighbouring examples of later

extensions and alterations including side extensions and first floor/two storey rear extensions.

While the proposed first floor rear extension would not be set down from the main ridgeline and would not appear as a clearly subservient addition to the host dwelling in this respect, due to its relatively modest width and depth it would not add significant bulk at the rear. Its gable roof form would also complement the existing roofline while the proposed external materials would match the existing, further mitigating the visual impact of the scheme. Moreover, the extension would not be visible from the street scene.

The proposed single storey front extension would be set back from the existing principal (front) building line and would appear as a relatively modest addition to the host dwelling due to its proportionate width and height. Moreover, it would be in keeping with a similar development carried out at No.23 Springfield Park adjacent. The proposed side extension would not have an unduly visual impact on the street scene due to its set in from the existing flank elevation of the garage, while the raised flat roof would not be out of character with other visible side extensions and garage alterations.

Overall, the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the visual amenity of the street scene and local character in accordance with Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: The proposal would introduce 1no. first floor window on the existing flank (side) elevation facing No.19 Springfield Park adjacent. This would serve a non-habitable room (en-suite) and therefore not introduce an adverse overlooking opportunity. However, to protect the amenity of the neighbouring property a condition is recommended which requires the window to be obscure glazed and top opening only and retained as such. An additional condition is recommended to restrict the insertion of any additional first floor windows on the flank elevation to prevent any additional overlooking opportunities.

The proposal would retain a separation distance of approximately 38m to neighbouring properties to the rear on Orchard Estate which well exceeds the Borough Design Guide SPD's recommended minimum of 22m for back to back relationships. As such, there are no concerns relating to the proposed rear facing fenestration.

Loss of Light: On the site visit it was observed that No.19 Springfield Park adjacent benefits from 1no. first floor side window which would directly face the proposed first floor rear extension. The most recent planning history for the adjacent neighbour (consent ref 161771) indicates that the window serves as a secondary outlook for a bedroom, with the room also benefiting from a rear facing window which serves as its primary outlook.

The proposed development is likely to result in a loss of daylight received by this window, albeit to a very small degree. The separation distance between the proposed

development and this existing fenestration, approximately 6m, would allow a sufficient level of daylight to be retained. Moreover, the proposal would not effect the level of light received by the primary window serving this bedroom due to the proposal not encroaching the first floor rear building line of No.19, while the side window effectively borrows its outlook from the application site.

Measurements taken on the submitted drawings, and the approved drawings for consent ref 161711, from the closest rear facing windows to the proposed development demonstrates that the proposal complies with the 45 degree test (horizontal) under BRE Guidance, meaning that the development would not directly conflict with the level of light received by any rear facing windows. Due to the proposal respecting the existing rear building line at first floor level, there would be no loss of light impact on No.23 Springfield Park adjacent.

While the proposal would result in relatively small loss of light impact on the immediate adjacent neighbours, in this instance it is not considered that the resultant level of harm on amenity would be significant enough to warrant a reason for refusal.

Overbearing: While the proposed rear extension would be sited in close proximity to the shared side boundary with No.19 adjacent, due to the proposal being set back from the rear building line of the adjacent dwelling and the existing flank to flank separation distance being retained the proposal would not result in any adverse overbearing impact.

Other:

The proposal would not impact on the site's existing parking provision or on any existing soft landscape features.

Subject to conditions, the application is acceptable and is therefore recommended for **approval**.

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:	11 December 2024
Earliest date for decision:	13 November 2024

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	12/12/24