

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	252740
Site Address:	65 Evendons Lane, Wokingham, RG41 4AD
Expiry Date:	2 January 2026
Site Visit Date:	21 November 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a two-storey rear extension, removal of the existing roof and erection of a new taller roof to create first floor habitable accommodation. The installation of a rear Juliet balcony, erection of an attached carport, a front porch, a detached incidental outbuilding, and changes to fenestration.	

PLANNING POLICY	
National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
Core Strategy (CS)	CP1 – Sustainable Development CP3 – General Principles for Development CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC06 – Noise CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update (LPU)	C5 – Parking and electric vehicle charging
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document

PLANNING HISTORY		
Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
19193	Single storey rear extension to enlarge bedroom.	Approved 27/04/1983

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC CIL – CIL liable.
WBC Ecology – Objection

External

None.

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	No comments received.
Ward Member(s)	No comments received.
Neighbours	One objection letter. Concerns relate to: - Overlooking impact to adjoining neighbour (no. 67). - Loss of light impact to adjoining neighbour (no. 67).

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application site consists of a detached bungalow located on the northern side of Evendons Lane, Wokingham which is listed as a Greenway Route.

The road boasts a range of property types including bungalows, chalet-style bungalows, two-storey detached, semi-detached and terraced properties. There is no uniform appearance to the properties along the road which vary in age, size and style.

The application site is set back from the road behind a mature hedgerow along the front boundary and a tarmac driveway providing off-street parking.

Proposal:

This application seeks approval for the removal of the existing roof and the erection of a new taller roof to create first-floor habitable accommodation and one front dormer. A proposed two-storey rear extension with a Juliet balcony, a front porch extension and an attached, open-sided carport to the side of the property. There is also a detached outbuilding proposed along the rear boundary.

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.

Character of the Area:

Properties on Evendons Lane are characterised by a mix of building ages and designs with no single prevailing architectural style. Many of the original bungalows have undergone renovations and extensions, several of which include replacement roofs to create first-floor living accommodation. This application seeks approval to remove the existing roof and to erect of a new, taller roof to create first-floor habitable accommodation.

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.

The proposed new roof would be raised and would comprise a dual pitched roof form. The new roof would have a ridge height of approximately 6.68m, approximately 0.88m taller than the existing roof. R9 of the BDG states that the heights of residential buildings should 'respond to the prevailing heights and degree of variation in height in the local context'. There are two adjoining neighbours; no. 63, a chalet-style bungalow to the east which has a maximum roof height of approximately 6.02m, and no. 67, a detached one and a half storey property to the west with a ridge height approximately 6.9m. The proposal would have a catslide roof to the front with a low eaves and this relates well to the other bungalows and low-level houses in the locality. Therefore, the proposed hipped to pitched roof form would respond sympathetically to the variation in heights of properties within the local context and would not encroach the established roofline of houses along the street.

Furthermore, there are a variety of roof forms within the vicinity which include hipped roofs, pitched roofs and gables. Therefore, the proposed changes to the roof would not appear obtrusive or have an adverse impact on the character of the host dwelling or local area. Additionally, by not extending beyond the existing flank walls of the existing property, the existing between buildings would be retained which would not alter the existing rhythm of built form within along the road.

The new roof would include one front facing pitched dormer window. As road facing dormer windows are an established architectural feature along Evendons Lane, there are no detrimental impacts that would be caused to the local character from the introduction of this feature.

The proposal includes the removal of the existing flat roof carport to the side of the property and the erection of a timber framed mono-pitch carport. The carport would have a similar footprint and location as the existing carport. It is noted that the existing carport is of limited architectural merit and the proposed changes would be of a higher-quality design that would contribute more positively within the context of the street scene.

The proposal also includes the erection of a front porch extension. The timber framed porch would protrude approximately 1m forward of the principal building line. Page 57 of the BDG states that 'Porches (ie not fully enclosed extensions) should generally project less than 2m forward of the building line'. The proposed porch would comply with this guidance and would also be in-keeping with other similar porch designs along the road. Examples include nos. 71, 83 and adjoining neighbour; no. 67.

There would be limited views of the rear extension from the public realm, as the front hipped section of the proposed roof would be wider than the rear section. Therefore, the massing of built form at the front would screen the rear development. Therefore, the proposed rear extension would cause no detrimental impact to the character of the host dwelling or local area.

Proposed materials include light render on the external walls and roof tiles to match the existing dwelling. The proposed materials are sufficiently in-keeping with the established material palette along Evendons Lane and are acceptable.

The proposal includes the erection of a detached L-shaped outbuilding along the rear boundary of the site. The outbuilding would serve a games room and store area and would have a hipped roof form and would have a ridge height of 4m. The outbuilding would be surrounded by mature vegetation along the rear boundary and as such, it would have a limited visible impact upon the landscape. It is also noted through aerial photography, that there are similar sized outbuildings associated with other properties within the vicinity. Given this, and the scale of the proposed outbuilding, it is considered the scheme would not detrimentally impact the character of the local area.

The proposal also includes the installation of timber entrance gates. Whilst these are acceptable in terms of character, a condition would be required with any grant of permission for details to be submitted prior to their installation, as the siting of the gates would need to comply with Highway safety requirements and ensure a waiting vehicle would cause no obstruction to the highway or footway.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking:

The proposal would create first-floor living accommodation with two first-floor windows in the front elevation to serve bedrooms. Page 47 of the BDG recommends that a 10m minimum separation distance should be retained between front-to-front elevations in to maintain privacy. The proposed front windows would be more than 29m from the front fenestration of nos. 60 and 62 opposite the site, this is acceptable.

There is one first-floor side facing window in the eastern elevation to serve a bathroom. To mitigate any potential harmful overlooking impacts, it will be conditioned that the window is obscurely glazed and limiting in opening height to protect the amenity of the occupants at no. 63.

There is also one rooflight proposed at first-floor level in the eastern elevation to serve an en-suite bathroom. To mitigate any potential harmful overlooking impacts, it will be conditioned that the window is obscurely glazed to protect the amenity of the occupants at no. 63.

There is one Juliet balcony proposed at first-floor level in the rear elevation to serve a bedroom. One third party raised concern that this fenestration would cause a loss of privacy to the occupants of no. 67, particularly onto the neighbouring patio. However, the balcony would be sited further to the rear than the majority of the neighbouring patio and would align with the first-floor rear extension of the adjoining property (no. 67). The

doors would face centrally towards the rear garden of the host dwelling and would inflict oblique views of the neighbouring garden. It is noted that a large proportion of the neighbouring garden would be screened from view by the existing pitched roof garage that is to the rear of the neighbouring property along the western shared boundary.

In addition, it is normally accepted that some overlooking of gardens by neighbouring properties is inevitable in most medium to high density situations. In summary, due to the setback position of the proposed siting of the Juliet balcony, it is considered that the proposed Juliet balcony would not cause any detrimental loss of privacy impact to the residential amenity of adjoining neighbours.

Loss of Light & Overbearing:

A third party has raised concern regarding the proposed development generating a loss of light impact to no. 67. No. 67 would be directly west of the proposed rear extensions and roof alterations. The proposed taller roof and rear extension would extend approximately 3.75m from the rear of the existing rear bedroom. The BDG states that 'Rear extensions should not project more than four metres from the main rear wall where they are close to a side boundary'. The proposed extensions to the rear would retain a separation distance of approximately 0.7m from the western shared boundary and 2.8m from the eastern shared boundary.

The BDG advises that a gap should be retained between the building and site boundary and this should be a minimum of 1m in width. Whilst it is acknowledged that the separation distance to the western side boundary falls marginally short of the recommend distance, it is noted that directly to the west of the proposed development is the driveway of no. 67 which opens onto the patio area which would be more than 5m away. The tallest part of the proposed rear roof would be approximately 9m from the flank wall and patio area of no. 67.

Furthermore, the proposed rear bedroom would be contained within the roof which creates a lower eaves and overall height than a full two-storey dwelling. The proposed roof form would be less intrusive and would reduce the amount of shadow cast onto the neighbouring property, as well as reducing the perceived and actual bulk of the built form. The design of the roof helps to maintain a more open feel and allow more daylight to reach the adjacent neighbouring windows and patio. Due to the orientation and siting of the host dwelling and no. 67, any additional overshadowing would be confined to the early mornings and the neighbouring property would receive adequate levels of light for the majority of the day.

There would be no overbearing or loss of light impact to the occupants of no. 63 by virtue of the approximate 2.8m separation distance from the shared boundary.

The proposed outbuilding would have a hipped roof form and would be set away from the rear boundary by approximately 1m. To the rear of the site is the flank wall of no. 2 Tanners Row. The neighbouring property would be more than 2m away. There is one ground floor window that serves a non-habitable room. In conclusion, due to the single-storey nature of the outbuilding and there being no adjacent neighbouring windows to habitable rooms, there are no detrimental overshadowing or overbearing impacts that would be generated to neighbouring amenity.

In summary, the impact of adjoining neighbours has been considered in detail. Based on this assessment and the site-specific circumstances, it is concluded that the proposal would not cause any significant harm to the amenities of adjoining occupiers in accordance with CS policies CP1 and CP3.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

The proposed level of on-site parking would meet the Council's parking requirements and are acceptable, subject to the approval of the proposed siting of the entrance gates.

Ecology:

NPPF paragraph 187 (d) states planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by '*minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs*'.

Core Strategy policy CP7 states that development which may harm habitats or species of principle importance in England for nature conservation, whether directly or indirectly will only be permitted if it has been clearly demonstrated that - i) Mitigation measures can be put in place to prevent damaging impacts; or ii) Appropriate compensation measures to offset the scale and kind of losses are provided.

Policy CP3 sets out that development should c) have no detrimental impact upon important ecological features and d) maintain or enhance the ability of the site to support fauna and flora including protected species.

MDD Local Plan Policy states that planning permission for development proposals will only be granted where they comply with policy CP7 and also demonstrate how they provide opportunities, including through design, layout and landscaping to incorporate new biodiversity features or enhance existing.

The application site is in an area known for bat roosts. It is identified within the submitted Preliminary Roost Assessment (Arbtech, October 2025) that there are existing features within the building that have moderate value for roosting bats. The Preliminary Roost Assessment therefore recommends two additional emergence surveys are required to be undertaken between May and August (these have not been carried out) and that works cannot be carried out until these additional surveys have been completed.

The council's Ecology officer agrees with the Preliminary Roost Assessment and objected due to the absence of the required emergence surveys. They have advised why the additional surveys cannot be secured by planning condition and stated:

"Government Circular 06/05: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation states that: "It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision. The need to ensure ecological surveys are carried out should therefore only be left to coverage under planning conditions in

exceptional circumstances, with the result that the surveys are carried out after planning permission has been granted.” In this case the extent to which bats would be affected by the proposals has not been established, and there appear to be no “exceptional circumstances”. Approval of the application would not be in accordance with the Local Plan Cores Strategy or the above guidance”.

Bats are protected by law. Permission cannot be granted for works without the full knowledge that bats would not be impacted. Without establishing this baseline, it is also unclear whether any compensatory works or mitigation needs to be implemented into the proposed development, or whether the proposal needs to be amended to avoid roosting bats.

The application is therefore contrary to Core Strategy policies CP3 and CP7, Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy TB23 and section 15 of the NPPF. It is for this reason that the application is being recommended for refusal.

Conclusion:

For the reasons set out in this report, the proposal is unacceptable as insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that bats would not be impacted by the proposed development.

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 reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation. 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:	Refused
Date:	11 December 2025
Earliest date for decision:	3 December 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>MC</i>
Date:	16.12.2025

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Major Development Location

Bat Roost Habitat Suitability

Evendons Ward

Wokingham Parish