

Application Number	Expiry Date	Parish	Ward
261414	11 th August 2026	Earley CP	Maiden Erlegh & Whitegates;

Applicant	Mr Farhad Binava
Site Address	28 Milton Road, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 1EL
Proposal	Householder application for the proposed two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, 2 no. rear dormers to facilitate loft conversion, garage conversion and changes to fenestration to include 1 no. Juliet balcony (part retrospective).
Type	Householder
Officer	Annabelle Jones
Reason for determination by committee	Listed by Councillor Stephen Newton

FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Planning Committee on Wednesday, 9 September 2026
REPORT PREPARED BY	Assistant Director – Place and Growth
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL subject to conditions and informatives

SUMMARY
The application seeks planning permission for a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, two rear dormers to facilitate a loft conversion, garage conversion and associated alterations including a Juliet balcony. The site comprises a semi-detached dwelling within an established residential area on Milton Road, Earley, characterised by similar suburban dwellings and a strong semi-detached building pattern. Planning permission was previously granted under application 241588 for a broadly similar form of development. Following an enforcement investigation, it became apparent that the development had not been carried out in accordance with the approved plans and a subsequent part-retrospective application (252476) was refused due to concerns regarding the impact of the design and materials on the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair and wider area. The current application seeks permission for the development as built, with amendments to the external appearance of the dwelling intended to address the concerns that formed the basis of the previous refusal. The proposal retains the side and rear extensions, dormers, loft conversion and garage conversion, whilst introducing revisions to the front elevation treatment, materials and architectural detailing to provide a more cohesive relationship with the adjoining property. The application has been listed for Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Stephen Newton. Whilst objections have been received from local residents, Earley Town Council and the Ward Member, it is considered that the revised appearance of the dwelling has sufficiently addressed the previous refusal reason and that the development would not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, neighbouring residential amenity or highway safety. Accordingly, the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

241588- Householder application for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension, first floor two storey side extension with 1 no. rear facing dormer, loft conversion to create additional habitable accommodation with 2 no. rear facing dormers, plus conversion of the garage to create additional habitable accommodation, along with changes to fenestration. (Approved 20th September 2024)

252476- Householder application for the proposed erection of a two-storey side extension, a single storey rear extension, 2no rear dormers to facilitate loft conversion plus garage conversion to create habitable accommodation, changes to fenestration to include 1no Juliet balcony (part-retrospective) (Refused 23rd January 2026)

CONSTRAINTS

Major Development Location
Mineral Safeguarding Area
Risk of Flooding from Surface Water
SSSI Impact Risk Zones
Potentially Contaminated Land Zone
Water Utility Consultation Zone

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None- No internal consultations were undertaken for this application as no material planning issues were identified that would warrant input from specialist consultees.

REPRESENTATIONS

Town/Parish Council:

- Failure to maintain the subservient character of the side extension of the original approval, by failing to step down the ridge line, to the detriment of the character of the area, contrary to Section R23 of the Borough Design Guide, as supported by Policy CP3
- The closing of the already sub-standard gap to the boundary with the adjacent property, creating a "terracing" effect, to the detriment of the character of the area, contrary to Section R23 of the Borough Design Guide, as supported by Policy CP3
- The roof tiles are contrary to condition 3, External Materials, attached to 241588, in not being of "similar appearance to those used on the "existing building" and at variance with those on the adjoining house, causing harm to the character of the area, being of an inappropriate material and character, contrary to Policy CP3 and failing to maintain the quality of the environment, contrary to Policy CP1
- The conversion of the originally approved two small dormers on the rear of the main roof to one large dormer, being visually prominent, to the detriment of the character of the area, and increasing the risk of overlooking of neighbouring properties, contrary to Policy CP3
- Inadequate parking, in that the space shown parallel to the road would be difficult to access, especially when the second space is occupied, and the parking space at right angles to the road, appears to be less than 4m long, and will not accommodate a car without severely overhanging the public footway, to the detriment of pedestrian safety and amenity contrary to Policies CC07 and CP3.

- The part retrospective development would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the semidetached dwellings as a whole and the character and appearance of the area by reason of the design and materials that creates a jarring and discordant relationship with the attached property. The proposed development is contrary to Core Strategy Policy CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy, Section 4 of the Borough Design Guide and Section 12 of the NPPF

Officer Note: The concerns regarding design, subservience, spacing to boundaries, roof form, materials, parking provision and character impacts are acknowledged. These matters are considered in detail within the assessment section of this report. The application has been assessed on its own planning merits, having regard to the existing built form on site, the submitted plans, the previous planning history and relevant development plan policies. Any impacts on character and appearance, residential amenity and parking are assessed below.

Local Members:

Councillor Stephen Newton:

The side extension roofline is straight and too high compared to the approved plans.

No. 19 opposite is a good example of how this can be done within the guidelines.

Guidance states that the distance to neighbouring properties should be at least 1m. This was reduced to 800mm (20%) in application 241588 but is now further reduced to just 400mm (60% below the required distance in the Borough Design Guide).

The roof dormers have been changed significantly and now includes a substantial dormer with floor to ceiling windows (allowing significant overlooking of the neighbouring area) compared to the approved more modest 3 dormers that were more recessed into the roof.

Loss of light into the garden of No. 26 due to the increase height of the sidewall (nearly 20% taller than stated in the Borough Design Guide).

Encroachment onto the public highway where the new driveway has been extended to partly cover the pavement.

The construction of the side extension exceeds the site boundary of No. 28 as recorded by Land Registry. Historically applications that exceeded boundaries have been refused and if approved, this could create an extremely challenging precedent when it comes to other applications that exceed boundaries.

Officer Note: The concerns relating to scale, design, relationship with neighbouring properties, overlooking, loss of light, parking arrangements and the physical extent of the development have been considered as part of the assessment of the application. The planning assessment focuses on the acceptability of the development in planning terms, including its impact on the character of the area and neighbouring amenity. Boundary ownership disputes are private legal matters and are not determinative planning considerations.

Neighbours:

Three neighbours have commented on this application, and their comments are summarised and responded to below:

- Insufficient on-site parking provision for a six-bedroom dwelling.
- Vehicles associated with the property causing parking and highway safety issues in the surrounding area.
- Hard surfacing of the front garden resulting in a loss of soft landscaping.
- Alleged encroachment onto neighbouring land and public land.
- Alterations to the pavement associated with the driveway.

- Excessive scale of dormers and Juliet balcony.
- Overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers.
- The proposal being largely unchanged from previously refused application 252476.
- Concerns that the parking spaces shown do not meet required dimensions and may overhang the public footway, affecting pedestrian safety

Officer Note: The application has been assessed with regard to the impact of the development on residential amenity, character and appearance, landscaping and parking provision. Matters relating to overlooking, scale, design, parking and highway safety are considered in the relevant sections of this report. Alleged encroachment onto neighbouring land or disputes regarding ownership boundaries constitute civil matters and do not in themselves determine the planning merits of the proposal. The previous refusal under application 252476 is acknowledged and is a material consideration; however, the application must be assessed on the basis of the current submission and all relevant material considerations

PLANNING POLICY

National Planning Policy Framework

National Design Guide

National Planning Practice Guidance

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

CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction

CC06 – Noise

CC07 – Parking

TB06 – Development of Private Residential Gardens

Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update (LPU)

SS1 – Sustainable development principles

SS2 – Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy

SS3 – Development within or adjacent to major and modest settlements

CE1 – Design principles for efficient buildings

CE3 – Environmental standards for residential development

C5 – Parking and electric vehicle charging

FD1 – Development and flood risk

FD2 – Sustainable drainage

NE5 – Landscape and design

DH1 – Place making and quality design

DH2 – Safeguarding amenity

Other

Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

CIL Guidance + 123 List

Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document

PLANNING ISSUES

Site Description and Proposed Development:

1. The application site relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the southern side of Milton Road, within the settlement of Earley. Many dwellings are semi-detached with similar character and design. They have consistent design features that include pebbledash, ground floor facing brick, brick quoin detailing, bow windows, timber gable detailing and red/brown clay/concrete roof tiles. While properties have been personalised, there is still a degree of consistency between pairs of the semi-detached dwellings which adds to the overall character of the area.
2. Planning permission is sought for the proposed two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, 2 no. rear dormers to facilitate loft conversion, garage conversion and changes to fenestration to include 1 no. Juliet balcony (part retrospective).

Principle Of Development:

3. 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.
4. 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:

5. Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy states that planning permission will be granted for proposals that maintain and enhance the high quality of the environment. Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy emphasises 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.
6. Section 4 of the Council's Borough Design Guide SPD states that any alteration and extension to an existing building should be well-designed, respond positively to the original building, contribute positively to the local character and street scene, and relate well to the neighbouring properties.
7. The application site forms part of a pair of semi-detached dwellings located within an established residential area characterised predominantly by semi-detached and

detached properties of a similar scale and appearance. The site benefits from planning permission under application 241588 for a broadly similar form of development, including a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension, loft conversion and garage conversion. Following an enforcement investigation, it became apparent that the development had not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans and a subsequent part-retrospective application (252476) was refused due to concerns relating to the design and materials, which were considered to create a jarring and discordant relationship with the adjoining property.

8. It is acknowledged that elements of the current proposal remain as constructed and therefore do not fully replicate the development approved under application 241588. In particular, the side extension retains a ridge height aligned with the principal roof and remains closer to the side boundary than the separation distances advocated within the Borough Design Guide. Objections have been received from Earley Town Council, the Ward Member and neighbouring occupiers who consider that these elements continue to result in a terracing effect and a lack of subservience.
9. Notwithstanding the above, the current application includes amendments to the external appearance of the dwelling which seek to address the concerns raised within the refusal of application 252476. The previous refusal was principally concerned with the overall design approach and materials, which were considered to result in a visually discordant relationship between the application property and the adjoining dwelling. The current submission reintroduces a more traditional elevational treatment through the use of facing brickwork, render and additional architectural detailing, creating a more cohesive relationship with the adjoining semi-detached property.
10. Whilst anthracite roof tiles and anthracite fenestration are proposed, it is considered that these materials, when viewed as part of the wider amended design approach, would result in the same level of visual harm identified under application 252476. The revised frontage better reflects the character of the semi-detached pair and improves the relationship between the two dwellings when viewed from the public realm.
11. The proposed rear dormers and Juliet balcony differ from those approved under application 241588. However, these elements are located on the rear elevation and would have limited visibility from the wider street scene. Given their siting and relationship to the host dwelling, they are not considered to cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
12. Significant weight is afforded to the planning history of the site. However, whilst the development has not been constructed in accordance with application 241588, it is considered that the amendments proposed under the current application have materially improved the appearance of the dwelling and have adequately addressed the concerns which formed the basis of the refusal under application 252476. Therefore, the proposal is not considered to result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair or the wider street scene.

13. Overall, whilst it is acknowledged that the development has not been carried out in accordance with the plans approved under application 241588, the current application has introduced amendments to the external appearance of the dwelling which have sought to address the concerns that formed the basis of the refusal under application 252476. Having regard to the revised materials, elevational treatment and the relationship of the development with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, it is considered that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair or the wider street scene. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy, Policies DH1, DH2 and NE5 of the Local Plan Update, and the guidance contained within the Borough Design Guide SPD. Accordingly, the application is recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out below.

Neighbouring Amenity:

14. 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.

Overlooking:

15. The proposal includes a loft conversion incorporating 2 no. rear dormers and a Juliet balcony. Concerns have been raised that the dormer arrangement differs from that approved under application 241588 and would result in unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring properties.

16. The dormers and Juliet balcony were previously assessed under application 252476, where it was concluded that they would not result in unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers. The current application does not propose any material changes to these elements. Whilst occupants would obtain views across neighbouring rear gardens, this relationship is typical within a suburban residential environment and would not result in a materially greater degree of overlooking than is commonly experienced within the surrounding area

17. Furthermore, no first-floor side facing habitable room windows are proposed that would directly overlook neighbouring properties. Taking into account the siting of the development, the orientation of neighbouring dwellings and the established pattern of mutual overlooking within the locality, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring privacy.

Loss of Light:

18. Concerns have been raised that the extension, particularly the side extension, results in a loss of light to No. 26 Milton Road due to the increased height and proximity to the shared boundary.

19. It is acknowledged that the development has not been constructed in accordance with the plans approved under application 241588 and that the side extension projects closer to the boundary than originally approved. However, the impact of

the development must be assessed having regard to its actual relationship with neighbouring properties and the planning merits of the current submission.

20. It is considered that the development would not result in a significant loss of light to neighbouring habitable room windows or private amenity areas. The relationship between the application property and No. 26 was assessed during the site visit and, whilst some additional shadowing may occur at certain times of the day, this is not considered to be so significant as to warrant refusal of the application. In reaching this conclusion, significant weight is afforded to the previous assessment undertaken under application 252476, which concluded that there would be no unacceptable loss of light arising from the development.

Overbearing:

21. Concerns have been raised that the development appears overly large, dominant and overbearing when viewed from No. 26 Milton Road and that the reduced side separation creates an unacceptable relationship between the properties
22. It is recognised that the side extension does not fully accord with the design approved under application 241588 and that the extension sits closer to the side boundary than previously approved. However, whilst the development increases the overall built form of the dwelling, the extension remains read as part of a domestic residential property and does not introduce an undue sense of enclosure when viewed from neighbouring land.
23. The side extension largely occupies the position of the former garage and remains set back from the principal elevation. The rear extension and dormers similarly form part of a pattern of domestic alterations commonly found within established residential areas. Although the development is larger than that approved under application 241588, it is considered that the relationship with neighbouring occupiers is so harmful as to justify withholding planning permission.
24. Significant weight is also afforded to the assessment undertaken under application 252476 which concluded that the development would not result in unacceptable overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impacts. The current application principally seeks to address the design and material concerns which formed the basis of that refusal and does not materially alter the relationship between the development and neighbouring properties.
25. Overall, whilst the objections received from neighbouring occupiers, Earley Town Council and the Ward Member are noted, it is considered that the proposal would not result in unacceptable overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impacts upon neighbouring occupiers. The development is therefore considered to accord with Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy, Policy DH2 of the Local Plan Update and the guidance contained within the Borough Design Guide SPD.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

26. Policy CC07 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan and Policy C5 of the Local Plan Update seek to ensure that development proposals provide an appropriate level of parking and do not adversely affect highway safety.

27. The site benefits from an existing hard surfaced frontage capable of accommodating off-street parking. Whilst objectors consider that the parking arrangement is inadequate for a dwelling of this size, the proposal does not result in the creation of an additional dwelling and the block plan shows two spaces both (5x 2.5) which meet the Council's parking standards and therefore does not fundamentally alter the lawful residential use of the site. The submitted plans demonstrate that off-street parking can continue to be provided within the site curtilage and it is considered that parking provision would remain available for the occupiers of the dwelling.
28. Concerns have also been raised regarding vehicles allegedly parking on the highway close to the junction with Byron Road and the presence of larger vehicles associated with the property. Whilst these concerns are noted, the parking of vehicles on the public highway and the day-to-day behaviour of occupiers are not matters that can reasonably be controlled through the determination of this planning application. The assessment must focus on whether the development itself would give rise to unacceptable highway safety impacts.
29. Allegations that works have extended beyond the site boundary or onto the public highway are similarly noted. However, matters relating to land ownership, boundary disputes and any potential encroachment onto third-party land are private legal matters and do not form part of the planning assessment of the application.
30. Significant weight is afforded to the planning history of the site. Application 241588 was considered acceptable in highway and parking terms, and application 252476 was similarly assessed as providing adequate parking provision with no objection raised on highway safety grounds. The current application principally seeks to address the design and material concerns that formed the basis of the refusal under application 252476 and does not introduce material changes which would not result in a significantly different parking or highway impact.
31. Overall, having regard to the submitted plans and the existing site circumstances, it is considered that the proposal would not result in unacceptable highway safety impacts or inadequate parking provision. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Policy CC07 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan, Policy C5 of the Local Plan Update and Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy.

Conclusion:

32. In undertaking the planning balance required by Section 38(6), the proposal has been assessed against the development plan as a whole. Whilst objections have been received in respect of the design of the proposal, its impact upon neighbouring amenity and the adequacy of parking provision, these matters have been carefully considered and are not judged to result in unacceptable planning harm.
33. The proposed extensions are considered to be appropriately designed and would appear as subordinate additions to the host dwelling. The development would not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, neighbouring residential amenity or highway safety. The proposal therefore accords with Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy, Policies CC07 and CC01

of the Managing Development Delivery DPD, Policies C5, DH1 and DH2 of the Local Plan Update, and the guidance contained within the Borough Design Guide SPD.

34. Accordingly, having regard to the provisions of the development plan and all other material considerations, the application is considered acceptable and planning permission should be granted subject to the conditions set out below.

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 the protected groups 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 upon protected groups as a result of the development.

Conditions

APPROVAL subject to the following conditions;

1. Approved details This permission is in respect of the submitted application plans and drawings numbered (2026-03-PA-08 Proposed First Floor Layout), (2026-03-PA-07 Proposed Ground Floor Plan), (2026-03-PA-04 Existing Roof Plan), (2026-03-PA-02 Proposed Block Plan), (2026-03-PA-06 Existing Side Elevations), (2026-03-PA-14 Proposed Rear Perspective Views), (2026-03-PA-11 Proposed Front and Rear Elevations), (2026-03-PA-10 Proposed Roof Plan), (2026-03-PA-01 Location Plan), (2024-05-PA-05 Existing Front and Rear Elevations), (2026-03-PA-12 Proposed Side Elevations), (2026-03-PA-17 Proposed Parking Arrangement) , (2026-03-PA-09 Proposed Loft Plan), (2026-03-PA-16 Existing and as Built Photos), (2026-03-PA-13 Proposed Front Perspective Views), (2026-03-PA-03 Existing Ground and First Floor Layout) received by the local planning authority on 16/06/26. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless other minor variations are agreed in writing after the date of this permission and before implementation with the Local Planning Authority

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the application form and associated details hereby approved.

2. External Materials

The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall be of a similar appearance to those used in the existing building unless other minor variations are agreed in writing after the date of this permission and before implementation with the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3

Informatives:

Within Curtilage

Whilst it would appear from the application that the proposed development is to be entirely within the curtilage of the application site, the granting of planning permission does not authorise you to gain access or carry out any works on, over or under your neighbour's land or property without first obtaining their consent, and does not obviate the need for compliance with the requirements of the Party Wall etc. Act 1996

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF

APPENDIX 1 - Conditions / informatives or Reasons for refusal

APPROVAL subject to the following conditions and informatives:

1. Approved details This permission is in respect of the submitted application plans and drawings numbered (2026-03-PA-08 Proposed First Floor Layout), (2026-03-PA-07 Proposed Ground Floor Plan), (2026-03-PA-04 Existing Roof Plan), (2026-03-PA-02 Proposed Block Plan), (2026-03-PA-06 Existing Side Elevations), (2026-03-PA-14 Proposed Rear Perspective Views), (2026-03-PA-11 Proposed Front and Rear Elevations), (2026-03-PA-10 Proposed Roof Plan), (2026-03-PA-01 Location Plan), (2024-05-PA-05 Existing Front and Rear Elevations), (2026-03-PA-12 Proposed Side Elevations), (2026-03-PA-17 Proposed Parking Arrangement) , (2026-03-PA-09 Proposed Loft Plan), (2026-03-PA-16 Existing and as Built Photos), (2026-03-PA-13 Proposed Front Perspective Views), (2026-03-PA-03 Existing Ground and First Floor Layout) received by the local planning authority on 16/06/26. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless other minor variations are agreed in writing after the date of this permission and before implementation with the Local Planning Authority
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the application form and associated details hereby approved.
2. External Materials
The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall be of a similar appearance to those used in the existing building unless other minor variations are agreed in writing after the date of this permission and before implementation with the Local Planning Authority
Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory.
Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3

Infomatives

1. Within Curtilage

Whilst it would appear from the application that the proposed development is to be entirely within the curtilage of the application site, the granting of planning permission does not authorise you to gain access or carry out any works on, over or under your neighbour's land or property without first obtaining their consent, and does not obviate the need for compliance with the requirements of the Party Wall etc. Act 1996

2. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF

APPENDIX 2 - Parish Council Comments (Where relevant)

ETC raises objection to this application and recommends that WBC refuses the application for the following reasons, as the application appears to be almost identical to the refused 252476, ETC would repeat its reasons for refusal: 1: Failure to maintain the subservient character of the side extension of the original approval, by failing to step down the ridge line, to the detriment of the character of the area, contrary to Section R23 of the Borough Design Guide, as supported by Policy CP3. 2: The closing of the already sub-standard gap to the boundary with the adjacent property, creating a "terracing" effect, to the detriment of the character of the area, contrary to Section R23 of the Borough Design Guide, as supported by Policy CP3. 3: The roof tiles are contrary to condition 3, External Materials, attached to 241588, in not being of "similar appearance to those used on the "existing building" and at variance with those on the adjoining house, causing harm to the character of the area, being of an inappropriate material and character, contrary to Policy CP3 and failing to maintain the quality of the environment, contrary to Policy CP1. 4: The conversion of the originally approved two small dormers on the rear of the main roof to one large dormer, being visually prominent, to the detriment of the character of the area, and increasing the risk of overlooking of neighbouring properties, contrary to Policy CP3. 5: Inadequate parking, in that the space shown parallel to the road would be difficult to access, especially when the second space is occupied, and the parking space at right angles to the road, appears to be less than 4m long, and will not accommodate a car without severely overhanging the public footway, to the detriment of pedestrian safety and amenity contrary to Policies CC07 and CP3. In addition as the application appears to be the same as the refused 252476, ETC would also propose WBC original reason for refusal: 1. The part retrospective development would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the semidetached dwellings as a whole and the character and appearance of the area by reason of the design and materials that creates a jarring and discordant relationship with the attached property. The proposed development is contrary to Core Strategy Policy CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy, Section 4 of the Borough Design Guide and Section 12 of the NPPF