

Agenda Item 97.

Application Number	Expiry Date	Parish	Ward
192280	20/03/20	Twyford	Twyford;

Applicant	Mr Ray Cook
Site Address	Land to the rear of 20 & 22 Station Road, Twyford, Berkshire, RG10 9NT
Proposal	Full application for the erection of a 1No bed two storey dwelling following demolition of the existing workshop.
Type	Full
PS Category	13
Officer	Natalie Jarman
Reason for determination by committee	Listed by Councillor Conway

FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Planning Committee on Wednesday, 12 February 2020
REPORT PREPARED BY	Assistant Director – Place

SUMMARY
<p>This application has been listed by one of the Borough Councillors for Twyford if officers are minded to approve the application. The application has been listed on the grounds that the application site is within a conservation area and the proposal does not fit in design terms with the surrounding housing, on this basis the application is before you.</p> <p>The application site comprises of a single storey workshop and yard.</p> <p>The proposal is for a two storey one bedroom dwelling following demolition of the existing workshop. The proposed dwelling would have an enclosed courtyard and an allocated parking space following reconfiguration of the existing access.</p> <p>The application follows the refusal of planning permission (LPA ref: 181852) for the erection of a one bedroom dwelling, which was refused on five grounds. A subsequent appeal (PINS ref: APP/X0360/W/19/3221229) was dismissed. The main issues were the effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area and the adequacy of proposed private amenity space for occupiers of the proposed dwelling. Whilst the Inspector dismissed the appeal, the Inspector did accept the principle of a dwelling with a contemporary design and that adequate outdoor amenity space was proposed. The reasons for refusal relating to loss of on-street parking, inadequate on-site cycle parking facilities and absence of adequate information to be certain that a pedestrian visibility splay were considered to be overcome by the submission of a revised plan during the course of the appeal.</p> <p>The application proposal is for a contemporary design, mainly glazing on the first floor element and the first floor element is set back, in line with the building line of No. 49 Brook Street seeking to address the comments in the appeal decision.</p>

The report concludes that the current scheme overcomes the previous reasons for refusal and addresses the comments raised by the Planning Inspector. However, it is acknowledged that there continues to be an objection from the Conservation Officer. On balance, the proposal is not considered to have a harmful effect on the Conservation Area based on the previous Planning Inspector's comments, provides adequate private amenity space for future occupiers and would not have a harmful impact on parking or residential amenity. It is recommended that this application is approved as it would accord with the NPPF and Wokingham Development Plan policies.

PLANNING STATUS

- Major development location
- Conservation Area
- Contaminated Land Consultation Zone
- Groundwater Protection Zone
- Heathrow Aerodrome consultation zone
- Affordable Housing
- Bat Roost Habitat Suitability
- Radon Affected Area
- Landscape Character Assessment
- SSSI Risk Zones

RECOMMENDATION

That the committee authorise the GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions and informatives:

Conditions:

Timescale

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In pursuance of s.91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by s.51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

Approved Details

2. This permission is in respect of the submitted application plans and drawings numbered Letter from Woolf Bond Planning dated 27th August 2019 received by the local planning authority on 27th August 2019, Letter from AA Environmental Limited dated 14th November 2019 received by the local planning authority on 18th November 2019, Existing Plan (16.111 PL102 Rev D), Existing Front Elevation (16.111 PL103 Rev D), Existing Side Elevation (16.111 PL104 Rev D), Existing Rear Elevation (16.111 PL105 Rev D), Existing Side Elevation (16.111 PL106 Rev D), Proposed Site Plan (16.111 PL107 Rev D), Proposed Ground Floor Plan (16.111 PL108 Rev D), Proposed First Floor Plan (16.111 PL109 Rev D), Proposed Front Elevation (16.111 PL110 Rev D), Proposed Side Elevation (16.111 PL111 Rev D), Proposed Rear Elevation (16.111 PL112 Rev D), Proposed Side Elevation (16.111 PL113 Rev D) received by the local planning authority on 29th January 2020 and Location and Site Plan (16.111 PL101 Rev E) received on 3rd February 2020. 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.

External materials details

3. No works of development shall be undertaken above the level of footings/foundation footings until details and samples of the external materials (bricks, mortar mix, coping etc.) and finishes for the hereby approved development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall then be undertaken in accordance with the materials and finishes as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory and to ensure highway safety. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3 and CP6.

Brickwork Sample

4. No works of development shall be undertaken above the level of footings/foundation until an onsite brickwork sample panel has been built on site and the brick, brick bond and mortar mix have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The brickwork sample panel shall be no smaller than 1x1 metre in size and is to show the bricks, brick bond and mortar mix to be used for the Brook Street elevation of the hereby approved dwelling. The sample panel shall be maintained on site until completion of building works. The development shall then be undertaken in accordance with the details as approved.

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

Hours of work

5. No work relating to the development hereby approved, including works of demolition or preparation prior to building operations, shall take place other than between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank or National Holidays.

Reason: To protect the occupiers of neighbouring properties from noise and disturbance outside the permitted hours during the construction period. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy CC06.

Obscure Glazing

6. The first floor window in the side elevation facing Number 49 Brook Street and all windows shown as obscure glazed on the approved plans of the development hereby permitted shall be fitted with obscured glass and shall be permanently so-retained. The windows on the first floor side elevations shall be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the finished floor level of the room in which the window is installed and shall be permanently so-retained.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3.

Restriction of permitted development rights - windows

7. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning, (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows or similar openings shall be constructed in the north-east and south-west elevations at first floor level, except for any which may be shown on the approved drawing(s).

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3.

Restriction of permitted development rights

8. Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, B, D, E and G of Part 1 of the Second Schedule the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no buildings, enlargement or alterations permitted shall be carried out without the express permission in writing of the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the area and neighbouring amenities. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy TB21.

Construction Method Statement

9. No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:

- i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors,
- ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials,
- iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development,
- iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate,
- v) wheel washing facilities,
- vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction,
- vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety & convenience and neighbour amenities. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP3 & CP6.

Drainage Details

10. No construction shall take place until details of the drainage system for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The details shall include how the site currently drains and will be drained after proposed development with any consideration to SuDS.

Reason: This is to prevent increased flood risk from surface water run-off. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 10 (Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change), Core Strategy policy CP1 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC09 and CC10.

Noise and Vibration from Railway

11. The applicant shall submit to the local planning authority, for approval, a scheme for protecting the proposed development from noise and vibration from the nearby railway lines. Any works which form part of the approved scheme shall be completed before the development the dwelling is occupied.

Reason: To protect occupiers of the proposed development from noise and vibration from rail traffic. Relevant Policy: Core Strategy Policy CP1 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC06.

Land contamination

12. Before development commences the applicant shall carry out a contamination risk assessment of the application site commencing with a preliminary risk assessment (desk top study and walk-over survey) followed by intrusive sampling if found to be necessary. The applicant shall then, if necessary, prepare and submit to the Local Planning Authority for written approval a remediation scheme that follows the guidelines set out in BS10175 'Code of Practice for the Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites' and CLR11 Model procedures for the management of Land Contamination.

Reason: To protect neighbours and future occupiers of the site from the harmful effects of contamination. Relevant Policy: Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3.

Remediation Works

13. Before buildings on the application site are occupied the remediation works to make the land suitable for its intended use, as set out in the approved remediation scheme submitted to comply with condition 12 above shall be completed and a validation report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that future users of the site are protected from the harmful effects of contamination. Relevant Policy: Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3.

Window and roof light details

14. No works shall be undertaken to install the windows and/or roof lights of the hereby approved dwelling until full details for the windows, the full height glazing /glazed doors of the first floor (including the Juliette balcony feature) and the roof lights, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details will need to specify the materials and finishes to the frames, and include, as appropriate cross-sections, with moulding details. Installation of the windows, first floor glazing and the roof lights shall then be undertaken in accordance with the materials and finishes as approved.

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

Gate / Door Details

15. Notwithstanding the details submitted the Brook Street gate/door is to be of a timber ledge and braced timber fabricated, with a corresponding timber gate/door frame and retained as such.

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

Details of flue, vents, pipework and rainwater goods

16. Notwithstanding the details submitted, there are to be no flues, vents, pipework or rainwater goods to the exterior elevations of development other than those shown on the plans as approved, unless written approval from the Local Planning Authority is obtained before works are undertaken.

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

Utility Service Meter Enclosures

17. Notwithstanding the details submitted there shall be no utility service meter enclosures on the Brook Street elevation of the hereby approved new dwelling and boundary wall.

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

Parking to be provided

18. No part of any building(s) hereby permitted shall be occupied or used until the vehicle parking space has been provided in accordance with the approved plans. The vehicle parking space shall be permanently maintained and remain available for the parking of vehicles at all times

Reason: To ensure adequate on-site parking provision in the interests of highway safety, convenience and amenity. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP3 & CP6 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy CC07.

Cycle parking to be provided

19. No building shall be occupied until secure and covered parking for cycles has been provided in accordance with the approved drawing(s)/details. The cycle parking/ storage shall be permanently so-retained for the parking of bicycles and used for no other purpose.

In order to ensure that secure weather-proof bicycle parking facilities are provided so as to encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 9 (Sustainable Transport) and Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3 & CP6 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy CC07.

Visibility splays

20. Prior to occupation of the access shall be formed as so-approved and the visibility splays shall be cleared of any obstruction exceeding 0.6 metres in height prior to the occupation of the development. The access shall be retained in accordance with the approved details and used for no other purpose and the land within the visibility splays shall be maintained clear of any visual obstruction exceeding 0.6 metres in height at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and convenience. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP3 & CP6.

Informatives:

1. The development hereby permitted is liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy. The Liability Notice issued by Wokingham Borough Council will state the current chargeable amount. A revised Liability Notice will be issued if this amount changes. Anyone can formally assume liability to pay, but if no one does so then liability will rest with the landowner. There are certain legal requirements that must be complied with. For instance, whoever will pay the levy must submit an Assumption of Liability form and a Commencement Notice to Wokingham Borough Council prior to commencement of development. For more information see - <http://www.wokingham.gov.uk/planning/developers/cil/cil-processes/>

2. The Head of Highways at the Council Offices, Shute End, Wokingham [0118 974 6000] should be contacted for the approval of the access construction details before any work is carried out within the highway (including verges and footways). This planning permission does NOT authorise the construction of such an access or works.

3. Any works / events carried out by or on behalf of the developer affecting either a public highway or a prospectively maintainable highway (as defined under s.87 New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA), shall be co-ordinated and licensed as required under NRSWA and the Traffic Management Act 2004 in order to minimise disruption to both pedestrian and vehicular users of the highway.

Any such works or events, and particularly those involving the connection of any utility to the site must be co-ordinated by the developer in liaison with the Borough's Street Works team (0118 974 6302). This must take place AT LEAST three months in advance of the intended works to ensure effective co-ordination with other works so as to minimise disruption.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY		
Application Number	Proposal	Decision
181852	Full application for the proposed erection of a 1 no. bedroom dwelling, following demolition of existing workshop building.	Refused 08/08/18 and Appeal Dismissed 30/05/19
180533	Full planning application for the erection of two storey 1 bedroom dwelling following the demolition of the existing workshop.	Refused 26/04/18
172695	Full application for proposed erection of a two storey dwelling following the demolition of the existing storage building.	Refused 13/11/17
CLE/2011/2668	Application for certificate of lawful existing use for 2 shops, 1 industrial building and 1 residential flat above the 2 shops.	Withdrawn 18/07/12
31111	Motorcycle shop at 20 Station Road, Twyford	Approval 03/08/88
31110	Motorcycle store at 20 Station Road, Twyford	Approval 03/08/88
30252	Extension to office and store	Refusal 23/03/88
2745	Retail to motor cycles shop / renewal consent	Approval 05/04/84

20603	Shoe shop to sale and restoration of vintage motor cycles	Temporary approval 15/12/83
12826	'C' - Replacement two storey workshop	Refused 10/04/80
12825	'B' - Replacement two storey workshop	Refused 10/04/80
12824	'A' - Replacement two storey workshop	Refused 10/04/80

SUMMARY INFORMATION	
Site Area	125 square metres (0.01 hectares)
Existing units	0
Proposed units	1
Existing density – dwellings/hectare	0
Proposed density - dwellings/hectare	100
Number of affordable units proposed	0
Previous land use	Workshop
Existing parking spaces	1
Proposed parking spaces	1

CONSULTATION RESPONSES	
Thames Water	No comments received
South East Water	No comments received
WBC Biodiversity	Recommend approval, no conditions
WBC Economic Prosperity and Place (Community Infrastructure)	No comments received
WBC Drainage	Recommend approval, subject to conditions
WBC Education (School Place Planning)	No comments received
WBC Environmental Health	Recommend approval, subject to conditions
WBC Highways	Recommend approval, subject to conditions
WBC Tree & Landscape	Recommend approval, subject to conditions
WBC Cleaner & Greener (Waste Services)	Recommend approval, subject to conditions
WBC Conservation	Objection

REPRESENTATIONS
<p>Twyford Parish Council: Update to be provided following their meeting on 3rd March 2020. No comment to original consultation.</p> <p>Local Members: Councillor Conway requested that the application be listed if officers are minded to approve the application on the grounds that the application site is within a conservation area and the proposal does not fit in design terms with the surrounding housing.</p>

Neighbours: 17 objections

- Misleading plans. Telecoms box restricting access where access for two cars is proposed. Is there sufficient space with proposed amenity space. Not showing chimneys from 20-22 Station Road are bricks from these chimneys to be used in the proposed building.
Officer Comment: The proposal is for the communications box to remain, a small section of wall to the east would be removed and a lower wall erected. The application proposals only relate to land to the rear of 20-22 Station Road.
- Out of character (See paragraphs 20-36)
- Unnecessary building (Not a material planning consideration)
- Overcrowding (See paragraph 58 and 20-36)
- Loss of privacy (See paragraph 41-42)
- Overshadowing (See paragraph 45)
- Parking impact (See paragraphs 46-51)
- Impact on water and sewerage system (See paragraph 52)
- Impact on Conservation Area (See paragraphs 20-36)
- Block open skyline (Not a material planning consideration)
- Outlook (Not a material planning consideration)
- Overlooking (See paragraph 41-42)
- Loss of light (See paragraph 45)
- Design (See paragraphs 20-36)
- Visual Impact (See paragraphs 20-36)
- Set a precedent (Not a material planning consideration)
- Inappropriate site (See paragraphs 20-36)
- Height (See paragraphs 20-36)
- Reference to approach at 29a and 29b Brook Street (Aware from previous appeal)
- Noise (Refer to proposed Construction Method Statement condition)
- Light Pollution (use of glass creating a reflective box) (See paragraph 29)
- Contemporary Nature of the proposals particularly in relation to Conservation Area (See paragraphs 20-36)
- Impact on parking space to the rear of No. 24-28 (even) Station Road impacting on right of way and block access(See paragraphs 46-51)
- Brook Street narrow Highway safety (See paragraphs 46-51)
- Currently a parking problem (See paragraphs 46-51)
- Loss of on-street parking spaces (See paragraphs 46-51)
- Parking requirements from 20-22 Station Road include a flat above. Tattoo shop currently use two spaces. (See paragraphs 46-51)
- Viability (Not a material planning consideration)
- Dropped kerb forbid vehicle access. (See paragraphs 46-51)
- Refuse collection (Cleaner and Greener comments)
- Overbearing (See paragraphs 20-36)
- Privacy for occupier (See paragraph 37 and obscure glazing is recommended)
- Lack of Natural Light to ground floor (The ground floor is served by windows)
- Proposed Materials (See paragraphs 20-36)
- Noise and disturbance (Refer to proposed Construction Method Statement condition)

APPLICANTS POINTS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed parking provision and widening considered acceptable by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) during the appeal process with appropriate pedestrian and cycle facilities. Therefore, no revisions in this respect. • Refers to Inspectors comments that the site would be able to accommodate a reasonable level of sitting out space and outdoor storage space • Amount of amenity space remains the same and proposal continues to propose a one bedroom dwelling. LPA should not sustain objection to the scheme in respect of private amenity space provision. • Reference to paragraph 9 and of the same Inspector’s appeal decision, including negative impact of existing building, contemporary appearance better than pastiche and highly sustainable location. • Reference to paragraphs 12 to 14 of the same Inspector’s appeal decision relating to the Inspector’s concern regarding timber cladding at first floor level and replacement with predominantly glass. • Reference to paragraphs 15 and 16 of the same Inspector’s appeal decision relating to building line. The current proposal is for the first floor element to be set back such that it sits just behind the established building line. • Current proposal switches living accommodation to the ground floor and bedroom on the first floor to overcome previous concerns. • Obscure glazing is proposed on some of the glass frontage to ensure privacy for the future occupier and ensure that there is no undue amenity impacts upon neighbouring properties. • Inspector supported contemporary development on the site. 	

PLANNING POLICY		
National Policy	NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
	NPPG	National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
Adopted Core Strategy DPD 2010	CP1	Sustainable Development
	CP3	General Principles for Development
	CP5	Housing mix, density and affordability
	CP6	Managing Travel Demand
	CP7	Biodiversity
	CP9	Scale and Location of Development Proposals
Adopted Managing Development Delivery Local Plan 2014	CC01	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
	CC02	Development Limits
	CC03	Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping
	CC04	Sustainable Design and Construction
	CC05	Renewable energy and decentralised energy networks

	CC06	Noise
	CC07	Parking
	CC09	Development and Flood Risk (from all sources)
	TB05	Housing Mix
	TB07	Internal Space standards
	TB21	Landscape Character
	TB23	Biodiversity and Development
	TB24	Designated Heritage Assets
Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)	BDG	Borough Design Guide
		DCLG – Nationally described space standard

PLANNING ISSUES

Site and Surroundings:

1. The existing built form is a single storey brick workshop constructed from mainly of red stock brick similar to that of other buildings in the locality. The rest of the building is made up of exposed blockwork, partial white painted timber garage and access doors and a corrugated and felt mono-pitched roof.
2. Behind the building, accessed via a track off Brook Street and outside of the application site are a set of covered car-ports mainly timber and partial brick. The existing use of the building has been stated is that of a workshop. The structure is accessed from the yard of 20 and 22 Station Road.
3. The site is within 150 metres of Twyford mainline railway station and it is situated within the Twyford Station Conservation Area. Whilst the overall makeup of the area is residential, there is an existing Police Station (which appears to no longer be in operation) with rear parking on the opposite side of the road to the application site. The ground floor of two former residential houses are now a Tattoo Parlour at 20 Station Road (to the side of the application site) and a Dog Groomers at 31 Station Road, a property on the opposite side of Station Road. Residential uses along Brook Street and Station Road mainly take the form of Victorian terraced housing.
4. Parking provision within the street is unallocated and is not controlled within any parking permits, although daytime parking restrictions do exist along Station Road. There is an existing access drive adjacent to the workshop.

Description of Development:

5. Planning permission is sought to demolish the existing building on site and to replace it with a two storey one bedroom dwelling, with a courtyard including bike store and an allocated parking space to the proposed dwelling. To provide access to the car parking space demolition of a wall is proposed and a new 1.05m high wall is proposed.

6. During the course of the planning application the proposals have been amended to provide clarification that the boundary wall is to be retained, to show the existing shed in the adjacent garden and the communications box, the coping detail on northern elevation has been omitted and replaced with a brick on edge detail instead and further information added.

The proposed dwelling has a gross internal floor area of the ground floor of 36 square metres incorporating an open plan lounge, kitchen and dining space and wc. The proposed gross internal floor area for the first floor is 26 square metres, providing space for a bedroom and en-suite bathroom. The building would have a total internal area of 62 square metres overall. The existing workshop would be demolished which has a floor area of 60 square metres.

8. A new external courtyard of 27 square metres is also proposed, which includes space for a bike store. Beyond the enclosed courtyard is an allocated parking space for the proposed dwelling and an area for bin storage.
9. The proposed height of the dwelling is 5.6 metres, the proposed width is 8 metres and depth is 5.75 metres. The first floor element is proposed to be set in from the north-west and north-east frontages by 1.2 metres to 1.5 metres. Within the recessed space two roof lights are proposed.
10. In terms of its appearance, the proposed building would be built from brick on the ground floor and a largely glazed first floor element with brick surround with a flat roof form with a metal coping detail.

Planning History:

11. There have been previous submissions on the application site, the most recent application was dismissed at planning appeal in May 2019. The refused scheme featured a combined bedroom with dressing room on the ground floor (19.7 square metres) and bathroom, the ground floor measured 36.5 square metres. The first floor was proposed as a combined kitchen and living area (24 square metres). A total of 60.5 square metres. The proposed height was 5.5 metres high, 11.2 metres wide and depth 5.84 metres. The first floor element was also proposed to be recessed and clad with timber with a sliding Juliette balcony with a flat roof form.
12. The application was refused for five reasons, the first reason for refusal was the proposed development by reason of its isolated form, siting and discordant design within the street scene was considered an overdevelopment of the site and by virtue of its cramped presence, would result in significant harmful impact on the character and appearance of area, failing to preserve or enhance the special architectural and historic character or appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area. The second reason for refusal related to inadequate level of private amenity for future occupiers. This report considers in detail whether these reasons for refusal have been overcome.

13. The third reason for refusal related to the net loss of one on-street parking space with unrestricted use, due to the proposed demolition of part of the existing boundary wall and widening of the access in order to gain access to the space, to the detriment of local residents and to the detriment of highway safety. The fourth reason for refusal related to absence of adequate information to be certain that a pedestrian visibility splay of 2m x 2m could be provided at the access and to the impact of this on highway safety. The fifth and final reason for refusal related to the proposal not providing adequate on-site cycle parking facilities. Within the appeal a revised ground floor plan was submitted, which demonstrated pedestrian visibility, cycle storage and provision of two parking spaces on site. Accordingly these reasons for refusal were withdrawn from the appeal.
14. A copy of the Inspectors appeal decision is appended to this report. The Inspector determined the main issues were the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the conservation area and the adequacy of the private amenity space for occupiers of the proposed dwelling.
15. The appeal concluded that there was support for the principle of contemporary development on the site, however, the appeal proposal was harmful on the street scene and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and therefore conflict with Development Plan policies. The Inspector concluded (paragraph 18 of the appeal decision) that there was potential for an alternative option that would enable the development without harm resulting from the current scheme. The appeal Inspector's decision is a material consideration that carries significant weight.
16. Prior to that, planning permission (LPA ref: 172695) was refused in November 2017 for the erection of a two storey, two bedroom dwelling. The application was refused due to the harmful impact upon the character of the conservation area, by reason of the contemporary design and materials of the proposed dwelling.
17. A further application was refused in April 2018 (LPA ref: 180533) for a two storey, one bedroom dwelling following demolition of the existing workshop. The application was refused on the grounds that it was considered harmful upon the character of the conservation area by reason of its stark form, siting and discordant design, not being an allocated housing siting, unsatisfactory provision of adequate living environment for future occupiers, loss of on-street parking, inadequate on site cycle parking and unsatisfactory provision of a method of surface water and foul water disposal.

Principle of Development:

18. 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 (MDD) 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.

19. The site is located within a major settlement category within settlement limits. The principle of development has previously been found to be acceptable by the appeal Inspector. As such the development should be acceptable providing that it complies with the principles stated in the Core Strategy and the material considerations identified within the body of this report.

Character of the Area and Impact on Heritage Assets:

20. 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.
21. The application site forms part of Twyford Station Conservation Area. Brook Street is an attractive no-through street and its relatively unaltered late nineteenth century character makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. Its character of a consistent architectural style and detailing, typical of the late 19th century period. This part of Twyford was developed in response to the introduction of the railway to the area and the terrace cottages and shops built up over a relatively short period, providing accommodation and facilities for workers associated with the Great Western Railway mainline, giving the area its distinctive character. The street is notable for its consistent architectural style and detailing in terms of bay windows, recessed front entrances, pitched roofs, which is typical of this period and which gives the area its distinctive character and synergy. This is further demonstrated with the fact that the predominant building typologies are of terraced Victorian two storey dwellings; in terms of urban form as part of the morphology of the urban structure that has developed in the area. It is important to note that the dwellings are made up of predominantly long terraces of 10-12 dwellings at maximum and with occasional Victorian semi-detached dwellings providing relief within the street scene which breaks up the overall massing of the existing dwellings. Many original features are retained in the area such as tiled paths and detailing around doors and windows.
22. The existing heavily altered workshop structure of the application site holds only limited interest, and in its present condition the workshop is considered overall to negatively contribute to its surroundings. Therefore from a heritage stance the removal of the workshop is supported but only on the basis that whatever was to replace it would at a minimum preserve the conservation area's character and appearance if not enhance it. The site is of a heavily constrained nature and the site has a relatively high level of visual prominence within the street.
23. The application site is occupied by a dilapidated workshop, positioned within an open area between the terraces and the junction with Station Road where there is a mixture of rear elevations, outbuildings, garages and parking areas. The space to the rear of No. 20 and 22 Station Road on Brook Street provides visual relief in the street scene between the existing property and the remainder of the street on Brook Street. This pattern is replicated on the opposite side of the street to the street behind the Police Station, providing openness to the existing grain of development. The Inspector's comments regarding the need to give weight to the existing negative contrast of the site and its surroundings with the wider conservation area. The Inspector concluded that the existing site compromised the quality of the townscape.

24. The proposal seeks to occupy the space with a contemporary two storey detached dwelling. The previous proposal was considered to be a discordant addition in the pattern of the street scene by virtue of its lateral urban form. The proposal was considered to intensify and be harmful to the established pattern and grain of development. However, the Inspector took the view that the Council was overly critical of the contemporary design (paragraphs 7 and 8 of the appeal decision). The Inspector acknowledged the sharp contrast between an overtly contemporary design and the Victorian terraces of Brook Street. The appeal proposal was considered to provide a building and curtilage with a high quality design and layout of appropriate scale in a highly accessible and sustainable location and considered to be far better than a pastiche of the existing nearby buildings.
25. Within the appeal, the Council acknowledged the use of contemporary design within historic contexts. The appeal proposal sought the introduction of a contemporary, flat-roofed, detached building which was considered to be of stand-alone appearance and to be at odds with the neighbouring terraces and prevailing pattern of development. The Council argued within the appeal that the existing building is single storey and relatively low in height and visually did not stand out nor compete with surrounding historic buildings. The Inspector acknowledged that a contrast in materials is needed to support the contemporary design. The Inspector questioned whether timber cladding was appropriate within the urban setting and conservation area. The Inspector went on to state that alternatively, or in addition, the much greater glazing of the building than proposed within the appeal would have a more neutral impact on the conservation area (paragraphs 12 and 14 of the appeal decision). The submitted scheme addresses the points raised by the Inspector.
26. There continues to be concern from the Council's Conservation Officer, by virtue of the design of the proposed dwelling, the proposal would result in a dwelling of form that starkly contrasts with the predominant architectural form of the surrounding residential buildings, such that the dwelling would be overtly conspicuous within the historic street-scene of Brook Street, at its junction with Station Road. The stark alien form of the proposal is thought to result in a development that visually jars with its surroundings than the present structure on the site. The Conservation Officer concludes that the proposal neither preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area and would therefore be contrary to TB24 of the Councils Managing Development Delivery Document (2014). In terms of the level of harm the proposal would cause to the conservation area this harm is defined within the NPPF and would amount to 'less than substantial harm' to the conservation area, as a designated asset and as such the expectation is for 'this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The Inspector also concluded that the previous scheme would cause 'less than substantial' harm.
27. In considering the appeal the Inspector highlighted areas of concern, this current proposal seeks to revise the proposals in accordance with those changes to its design and materials advocated by the Inspector. The Inspector was supportive of the principle of a 'contemporary development on the site' over pastiche design and stated they 'consider there is the potential for an alternative option that would enable the development without the harm resulting from the current issues' (paragraph 18 of the Appeal Decision).

28. The changes advocated by the Planning Inspector were:
- The need for a ‘contrast in material is needed to support the contemporary design’ (paragraph12), a suggested greater use of glazing to first floor as an alternative means of intruding a contrasting appearance to this element (paragraph 14),
 - The first floor being set back, aligning with the building line of the adjacent Victorian terrace (paragraph16).
29. With respect to the amended scheme, whilst it is believed the greater extent of glazing to the first floor storey, when compared to more limited fenestration form of the previous scheme could make this element of the new dwelling less visually dominant. The Conservation Officer has raised concern about the proposal being an atypical architectural feature and the amount of light at night time from the first floor element. The applicants have specifically responded to paragraph 14 of the appeal decision and so on balance this element of the proposal is considered to be acceptable. The Conservation Officer does conclude, whilst it is thought this amended fenestration form of the first floor creates something with a greater architectural cohesion to it compared to the previous proposal.
30. The Conservation Officer raises the extensive use of brick on the rear elevation creating a large unbroken expanse of brick walling and suggested an alternative. The previous proposal was for reclaimed bricks on the ground floor and vertical timber cladding on the first floor, which would also have been a large expanse. On balance, this element of the proposal is considered to be acceptable.
31. The Conservation Officer concludes that whilst it is thought the amended fenestration form of the first floor creates something with a greater architectural cohesion to it compared to the previous proposal, such that as a standalone building this present has some degree of merit to its design. The Conservation Officer maintains concern over the standalone appearance, particularly of the first floor of the proposal and that the proposed development would have a greater impact on the character of the area than the presently poor quality building does. The conclusions of the Inspector are a material consideration and the current scheme reflects what the Inspector suggested.
32. The comments of the Conservation Officer need to be balanced with the appeal decision, which is a material planning consideration. In considering the appeal proposal, the Inspector supported the principle of a contemporary design on the site but the form of development within the appeal proposal was considered to have a harmful effect on the street scene and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the street scene. However, the Inspector provided comments on how the proposal could be amended. The Inspector was specific in the appeal decision at paragraph 14 stating that “the much greater glazing of the building than proposed would be neutral in relation to the character of the conservation area.” The applicant has introduced “much greater glazing” as stated in the appeal decision and whilst this may result in an expanse of brickwork and a “light box”, there is not considered to be harm from these elements and the proposals address the concerns raised by the Inspector.

33. It is acknowledged that the existing structure is considered to be somewhat detrimental to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area although the high brick boundary wall maybe considered to hold a degree of significance both visually and historically however any such significance the walling may hold is diminished by the fact that it has clearly been altered and partially rebuilt. As such the removal of this existing building provides the opportunity to see the area enhanced.
34. The proposals within the appeal were for the first floor element to protrude forward of No. 49 Brook Street by 0.5 metres. The Council argued that one of the main elements within the street, which provides homogeneity is the consistent building line, along both sides of Brook Street. The Council were not convinced that the proposals would provide an active street frontage and would not have a positive impact. The juliet balcony and bi-folding doors were highlighted as not being features within the street scene or surrounding area and present as a horizontal element against the characteristic verticality of the conservation area, reinforced by the flat roof and glazed materials. It was concluded that the proposed scheme would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.
35. The Inspector also raised concern that there was an infringement of the adjoining terrace's building line through the half metre projection of the first floor in front of the flank of No. 49 Brook Street, which would have a disappointing jarring effect and considered that lining-in with the frontage of the terrace could be acceptable, noting that the bedroom could be on the first floor. The current proposed first floor plan shows the first floor element set back a further 0.5 metres from the appeal proposal and in line with the prevailing building line in Brook Street. The Conservation Officer welcomes the change but challenges whether the change is sufficient enough. The applicants have amended the scheme to reflect the Inspectors comments. The building line of the existing ground floor has been retained and the first floor element which has been introduced seeks to reflect the prevailing building line. The Borough Design Guide (page 38) states that this is particularly important for infill schemes to reflect the existing pattern of building lines where this creates a positive street character. The current scheme is considered to address the comments raised by the Inspector in the appeal decision and the set-back is considered to be appropriate. On balance, taking into consideration both the comments of the Council's Conservation Officer and the appeal decision the proposed dwelling is considered to have been sufficiently revised from the refused scheme to overcome the Inspectors concern and to meet the issues raised and would not have a harmful effect on the street scene and would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Amenity of future occupiers:

36. Within the refused scheme, concern was raised regarding the usability of the proposed amenity space due to the cramped nature of the space, 4.25 metres deep, and whether privacy could be provided, directly adjacent to a footpath and with direct views from the street and neighbouring properties. The space would have also been enclosed by walls and included a canopy. The Council concluded that the proposed private amenity space was considered to be inappropriate in terms of size and scale and it emphasised the cramped nature of the proposals. There were also concerns regarding whether the space would provide a reasonable degree of light. It was therefore concluded that the proposed development failed to provide adequate private amenity space.

37. In considering the appeal, the Inspector concluded at paragraph 6 that the proposed courtyard provided an adequate sitting out area with the potential for sunlight and some outdoor storage space and no harmful conflict with policy.
38. The Borough Design Guide states that new dwellings should aim to provide an amenity space of 11 metres in length. The proposal makes the provision for some amenity space within the proposed courtyard.
39. Whilst Officers were of the opinion that this was considered to be inadequate. The Inspector concluded in paragraph 6 of the appeal decision that the proposed space, the same proposed within the current application provided for adequate sitting out area with the potential for sunlight and some outdoor storage space and no harmful conflict with policy. On this basis, no objection is raised on this basis.

Residential Amenities:

40. *Overlooking:* The Borough Design Guide states that a flank to rear relationship should be a minimum of 12 metres for single and two storey developments as advised in section 4.25 of the Guide. However, due to the angled nature of the site and how no. 20-22 Station Road is set within its plot, the proposed development achieves a separation distance of 11.7 metres remain as per the refused scheme at appeal. It was concluded at that time that whilst not achieving the separation distance by 0.3 metres is not significant in its own right, the cumulative impact, the proposed development was considered to erode the natural break in the street scene. The current proposal does introduce additional windows in the side elevation adjacent to 20-22 Station Road but does incorporate obscure glazing. On balance, this element of the proposal is considered to be acceptable
41. The proposal seeks for glazing on the north-east elevation and north-west elevation and a window on the side elevation facing 49 Brook Street to serve a shower room. On the opposite side of Brook Street the majority of the application site faces the parking area associated with the Police Station. Number 1 Brook Street is 12.5 metres between the first floor element of the proposed dwelling. Over the 10 metre separation distance set out in the Borough Design Guide for front to front separation distance. The proposal would also introduce windows on the side elevation adjacent to the rear of 20-22 Station Road, as noted above the separation distance is just below the guidance set out in the Borough Design Guide. Although on balance this is considered to be acceptable.
42. On the elevation facing Number 49 Brook Street at first floor a en-suite shower room is proposed, if approved it is recommended that this window be obscure glazed. On the ground floor two windows are proposed in the elevation adjacent to Number 49 Brook Street. There is a first window in the side elevation of Number 49. In the previous proposal a dressing room and bathroom window were proposed. There is some concern that these windows would be immediately adjacent to a side access but on balance this is considered to be acceptable. Finally, a ground floor window on the elevation facing the rear of 20-22 Station Road is proposed, this would overlook the enclosed courtyard and the proposed brick wall would partially screen. The proposal also includes two roof lights.
43. *Overbearing:* The current proposals are of a similar scale to proposals considered at appeal and those were not concluded to be overbearing.

44. *Loss of Light:* The proposed new dwelling will not cause any loss of daylight or overshadow any habitable windows of neighbouring properties. This was not raised as a concern within the previous refusal.

Access and Movement:

45. Policy CP6 of the Core Strategy seeks to manage travel demand with sustainable travel modes, appropriate vehicle parking and minimisation of traffic impacts. Policy CC07 and Appendix 2 of the MDD stipulates minimum off street parking standards, including provision for charging facilities.
46. The proposed development seeks to create access for an additional parking space over and above that which already exists to the rear of 20-22 Station Road, in order to seek to comply with the Borough Council's adopted parking standards for new dwellings. The application has been reviewed by the Council's Highway Officer who has recommended approval subject to conditions.
47. Objection was made within the refused proposals that widening the access to provide space for an off-street parking space would reduce the amount of available on-street parking spaces. Within the appeal this reason for refusal was considered to be overcome.
48. Pedestrian visibility splays have been provided which are acceptable due to the low (0.6m) wall. A condition on visibility splays being retained is proposed.
49. An area for cycle parking is shown, further information is requested via a recommended condition.
50. Due to its location, a construction method statement will be required. This will need to be secured by planning condition.

Flooding and Drainage:

51. Policy CC10 of the Managing Development Delivery requires sustainable drainage methods and the minimisation of surface water flow, via a Flood Risk Assessment or Surface Water Drainage Strategy. It includes the incorporation of SuDS, no impact to the sewer and the reproduction of greenfield runoff characteristics. The proposed development is in Flood zone 1 according to the Environment Agency mapping. There may be a small increase in impermeable area. The application has been reviewed by the Council's Drainage Engineer who has no objection to the principle of the development but as drainage details have not been provided and the existing drainage has not been mentioned, it is recommended that further information is submitted via a condition.

Landscape and Trees:

52. The Council's Landscape and Tree Officer was consulted on the application, who has no objection subject to a landscaping plan condition. The proposals include a courtyard space 5 metres x 6 metres. The addition of the courtyard with a tree helps to soften the view between the built form but there are other opportunities to provide contrast and soften the walls with well managed plants. In order to be compliant with policies CC03 and CP3, subtle planting proposals should be optimised in a

Landscape Design to include hard and soft landscaping as appropriate, the submitted information shows details of a Courtyard, whilst recommended by the Tree and Landscape Officer, a hard and soft landscaping condition is considered unnecessary given the nature of the site.

Ecology:

53. The application site comprises a single-storey flat- roofed workshop located in habitat which matches that where bat roosts have previously been found in the borough. It is proposed to demolish the workshop and replace it with a dwelling. The application is supported by a bat survey report (AA Environmental, November 2019). The application has been considered by the Council's Ecologist who considers the bat report to have been undertaken to an appropriate standard, the report concludes that the building is unlikely to host roosting bats. A second bat survey report (Nathan Ofsthun, September 2019) concurs with this assessment. As such, since bats (and other protected species) are unlikely to be affected by the proposals, there are no objections to this application on ecological grounds.

Environmental Health:

54. Noise and dust during construction activities: The proposed development is located within close proximity to residential premises. Nearby residents must be protected from noise and dust during construction activities. Environmental Health recommend a condition on minimising dust, this would form part of a Construction Method Statement.
55. Noise and vibrations: There is a railway line within 91 metres from the proposed development. Future occupants of the proposed development must be protected from noise and vibration from railway lines. Accordingly, a condition is recommended that a scheme for protecting the proposed development from noise and vibration from the nearby railway lines be submitted and agreed prior to completion.
56. Land contamination: The application site has been used as a workshop and this land use may have caused contamination. As the proposed residential use is sensitive, in accordance with the NPPF, the applicant will be required to carry out a contamination risk assessment of the site followed by remediation works if found to be necessary.
57. On this basis, conditions relating to construction hours, minimising the effects of dust, noise and vibration from the railway and contamination are recommended.

Internal Space Standards:

58. The National Space Standards for a two storey one bedroom dwelling is 58 square metres, the proposed dwelling is 62 square metres.

Summary:

The current scheme overcomes the previous reasons for refusal and addresses the comments raised by the Planning Inspector. It is acknowledged that there continues to be an objection from the Conservation Officer. On balance, the proposal is not considered to have a harmful effect on the Conservation Area based on the previous Planning Inspector's comments, provides adequate private amenity space for future occupiers and would not have a harmful impact on parking or residential amenity. It is recommended that this application is approved as it would accord with the NPPF and Wokingham Development Plan policies.

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.

CONCLUSION

The proposal for a one bedroom two storey dwelling within a conservation area and is considered to be acceptable in principle. The proposal for a contemporary design was considered by the Planning Inspector to be an appropriate approach and is a material consideration to this application. The applicant has sought to address the Planning Inspector's comments with the introduction of glazing on the first floor element and the setting back the first floor element in line with No. 49 Brook Street. The proposals include the provision of private amenity space and an off-street parking space. It is therefore recommended that this application is approved as it would accord with the NPPF and development plan policies for Wokingham Borough.