

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	250383
Site Address:	40 Shepherds House Lane, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 1AD
Expiry Date:	17 October 2025
Site Visit Date:	21 February 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a part single part two storey front, side and rear extensions to include a new porch, a rear dormer and roof light, loft conversion to create habitable accommodation following demolition of existing detached garage.	

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

PLANNING HISTORY- No relevant planning history

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways: No objection

WBC CIL: CIL liable

WBC Ecology: No objection

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Earley Town Council: No objection
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received
Other	32 Easby Way: The revised front elevation suggests a

	dormer window in a sloping pitched roof, whereas the revised side elevation and the revised first floor plan indicate the window to the "playroom" is in a brick wall, which is correct, can the applicant clarify their drawings? Officer response: Revised proposed side elevation 1 and revised proposed first floor plan have been provided to clarify the new porch and family rooms roof.
ACER The Whitegates Residents Association	Intrusive overlooking and the lack of soft landscaping in the front garden this application should be refused. Should it be minded to approve this Application, then a condition for landscaping is requested in order to retain the character of the street scene. Officer response: Overlooking addressed in neighbouring amenities section of report. Along Shepherds House Lane there are examples of properties which has none to very minimal soft landscaping in front gardens, therefore having no soft landscaping would not have a detrimental negative impact upon the character of the area and such condition would seem excessive.

APPRAISAL

Site Description: Two storey semi-detached dwelling. The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising predominantly of two storey semi-detached properties.

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 "*porches should generally project less than 2m forward of the building line*". The front porch would project approx. 1.50m forward of the building line, thus complying with the BDG. The front porch would be a modest addition which would not harm the street scene. Furthermore, along Shepherds House Lane there is a variety of different style of front porches and therefore would not look out of place.

The BDG states “*side extensions should not generally project forward of the building line on the street frontage(s)*” and “*side extensions should be set back from the building line by at least 1m, preferably with a lower roof line and should be set at least 1m from the plot boundary*”. The side extension is set back from the building line and with a lower roof line but up to the side boundary. However, it would be on the building line and not set 1m from the side boundary, thus not fully compliant with the BDG. 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. Furthermore, there are examples of similar type of development within the road including no.10, 26 & 44 Shepherd House Lane, thus the first-floor side extension would not look out of place (see examples below).



Property at no. 10 Shepherd House Lane



Property at no. 26 Shepherd House Lane



Property at no. 44 Shepherd House Lane

The property is linked to the neighbouring property via a single storey side extension and first floor element would cause an unbalancing effect. However, it would be considered acceptable given the variety of housing designs found along Shepherd House Lane. There are examples of similar extensions along the road including 10, 26 & 44 Shepherd House Lane. There is no symmetry to the existing outline of the semi-detached dwelling and therefore felt that the proposal would not detract too much to its character. The proposed extension is considered to be sympathetic to the host building and of an appropriate scale for the surrounding neighbourhood. The first-floor side extension roof form would be a hipped roof which matches that of the existing dwelling and is visually less prominent.

Whilst the side extension would be up to the boundary of 42 Shepherd House Lane, there would be sufficient visual separation between houses as the two- storey section of the neighbouring dwelling is set approx. 2.25m away from the boundary.

The Borough Design Guide states *“loft conversion and dormer windows should not project above the existing ridge line”, “dormer windows should generally be positioned within the main roof, by being set back from both eaves lines and the sides of the roof” and “dormer windows should relate to the design of the existing building in terms of roof form, materials, positioning and window proportions”*. The proposed loft conversion and dormer would not project above the existing ridge line, with the dormer window positioned within the main roof being set back from both eaves lines and the sides of the roof. The proposed dormer does not relate well to the existing building in terms of roof form, materials and positioning. However, given it's located to the rear it would not be visible from the public realm it would not have a negative impact upon the character of the area, thus considered acceptable in this instance.

The single storey rear extension would be approx. 2.72m in depth, which complies with the BDG. 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.

As part of the side extension, two windows would be added to the front. The new window would be similar to the existing in size and proportions of current ground and first floor windows along Shepherd House Lane, meaning that the proposal would not negatively harm the street scene. The proposal also includes adding windows to the rear. Whilst not visible from the street scene, it would be similar to the existing in size and proportions of current first floor window along Shepherd House Lane.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: The windows to the front window would not overlook onto any houses opposite but instead greenery, therefore no overlooking concerns.

Most rear gardens are overlooked at an oblique angle from the upper floor windows in the neighbouring property. This is no different as a result of the loft conversion and dormer window. Thus, the addition would not cause any significant harm with regards to no.38 & no.42 neighbouring amenities and the relationship with the neighbouring house would be orthodox for dwellings in a suburban area.

There are no neighbours to the rear and would look onto the road of Trout Close, therefore no overlooking concerns.

Loss of Light: The rear building line of no.40 would project forward of the rear building line by approx. 1.65m ahead of no.42. The closet ground floor rear window would be a utility room and given this would be classified as a non-habitable room there would no loss of light concern.

The rear building line of no.40 would project forward of the rear building line by approx. 4.45m ahead of no.38. As a result of the rear extension, there is a potential loss of light to the rear windows of no.38. The line of 45* degrees would be breached

as a result of the extension. However, more than 50% of available daylight would still reach the affected window, with the purpose of the guideline is to prevent significant loss of daylight rather than to prohibit any reduction at all. Therefore, it is not considered to be a reasonable reason to refuse the scheme given its compliance with local policy in other respects and given the neighbouring property would still have adequate access to natural light.

Also, it's important to note that no objections were raised by no.38 or no.42.

Whilst 42 Shepherd House Lane does have two side first floor window, these windows would be for non-habitable rooms.

Overbearing: Whilst the side extension would be up to the boundary of 42 Shepherd House Lane, which does not comply with the BDG (1m minimum). However, there would be sufficient visual separation between houses as the two- storey section of the neighbouring dwelling is set approx. 2.25m away from the boundary preventing any terracing effect.

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.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: The proposal will result in additional habitable rooms. In accordance with WBC parking standards, a dwelling of this size should accommodate up to three driveway parking spaces, each with dimensions of 5.0m x 2.5m. Although the submitted drawing indicates two parking spaces, Highways consider that the existing frontage could provide up to three spaces. Works to the driveway and access have already taken place and on that basis, the level of parking is therefore considered acceptable in this instance.

The officer has requested information regarding cycle storage and refuse and recycling

Storage, however, given the nature of the scheme it would be considered unnecessary.

Amenity Space: The remaining garden space would be over 25m long, which exceeds the council's minimum garden length of 11 metres, as the garden space is greater than 11 meters, so the loss of amenity space isn't harmful because the remaining space would still exceed borough design guide recommendations. Therefore, the reduction in amenity space is not considered to have a harmful impact on the amenity of the occupier.

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:	15 October 2025
--------------	-----------------

Earliest date for decision:	13 March 2025
------------------------------------	---------------

Recommendation agreed by:	
----------------------------------	--

(Authorised Officer)	
-----------------------------	--

Date:	16 October 2025
--------------	------------------------