

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	241993
Site Address:	12 Dukes Wood, Crowthorne, Wokingham, RG45 6NF
Expiry Date:	22 November 2024
Site Visit Date:	24 September 2024
Proposal: Householder application for proposed two storey side extension along with the extension of the existing dormer and changes to fenestration.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Water Utility Consultation Zones
Local Authorities
Heathrow Aerodrome Consultation Zone
Affordable Housing Thresholds
Bat Roost Habitat Suitability
Borough Parishes
Scale and Location of Development Proposals
Farnborough Aerodrome Consultation Zone
Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone
Nuclear Consultation Zone
Borough Wards
Landscape Character Assessment Area
SSSI Impact Risk Zones
Thames Basin Heaths SPA Mitigation Zones
Archaeological Sites Consultation Zone

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
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 Crowthorne Village Design Statement

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
142/63	Detached chalet and garage	Approved 10/09/63

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways: No objection subject to conditions

WBC Ecology Householder: No objection

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Wokingham Without Parish Council: No objection
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received

APPRAISAL

Site Description: Detached chalet and garage.

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 that *“side extensions should be set back from the building line by at least 1m, preferably with a lower roof line and should be at least 1m from the plot boundary”*. The two-storey pitched roof side extension would be approx. 7.27m in height and built over the existing ground floor plan of the double garage. The side extension would have a higher roof line than the current roof and only 0.87m from the side boundary, thus not complying with the BDG in this respect.

R1 design principle within the Borough Design Guide states that “residential development should be designed to contribute positively toward the historic or underlying character and quality of the local area. This may be achieved through blending in with a strongly positive existing character, responding where relevant to the positive elements of its historic context or, where the site is large enough to allow for a distinctive identity to be created, by establishing a new character that relates well to the existing”.

The street scene in the surrounding area is varied in style and design of properties. The proposal will result in a similar height dwelling to the existing height but also it would be similar in scale to other dwellings in the street scene. Therefore, the proposal does not cause an unacceptable harmful impact to the character or quality of the local area.

R23 design principle within the Borough Design Guide states *“alterations or extensions should be clearly subservient to the form and scale of the original building in most situations, although there may be exceptions where it is more appropriate to design a seamless continuation”*. The two storey side extension is not subservient to the existing dwelling as the proposal includes the creation of additional first floor habitable accommodation (total height approx. 7.27m), however as the proposal is not overly excessive in size or built form and as the neighbouring properties in the surrounding area differ in size and appearance, there will be no unacceptable harmful impact on street scene and character. It is acknowledged there would be an uplift in built form and scale, however this would not result in a development that is detrimentally out of character with the surrounding area.

Furthermore, as stated in the section 23 of BDG *“the roof form of the extension should take its form from the main building”*. The two-storey side extension would keep the same roof form of the main building, thus complying with the BDG.

The proposed two storey side extension would be more than 1m from the northern boundary with sufficient visual separation between houses as neighbouring dwelling is set away from the boundary.

The Borough Design Guide states *“dormer windows should not project above the existing ridge line”* and *“dormer windows should generally be positioned within the main roof, by being set back from both eaves line and the sides of the roof”*. The dormers on the front, side and rear do not project above the existing ridge line and the dormer is situated within the main roof whilst also being set back from both eaves line and the sides of the roof, therefore complying with the BDG.

Flat roof dormers along Dukes Wood are common, such as no.7 having a flat roof dormer to the front which sets a precedence and as such would not look out of place nor harm the street scene.

Even though the continuation of the dormers on the side elevation facing no.10 would result in a longer dormer, it would still be proportionate given the sides of the dormer have been brought in and therefore sits better within the roof, thus not having a negative impact. Whilst located on the side elevation it would be visible from the street scene, but given side dormer are very common along Dukes Wood it would not look out of place.

The dormer to the rear would not be particularly visible from public locations. Hence, the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character of the host property or surrounding area.

The new windows would be similar to the existing in size and proportions of current

first floor window along Dukes Wood, meaning that the proposal would not negatively harm the street scene.

The proposed materials are to match that of the existing, thus in keeping with the current characteristics of the dwelling.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: As part of the first-floor extension, two dormer window will be added to the front. Whilst the proposed window would face another property, it is noted that Dukes Wood, a public road, is located adjacent to the site. As such, the proposal would not result in a greater overlooking impact into residential properties than is currently present as the window at the front of the extension would overlook the street scene and therefore no harmful impact would occur.

As part of the continuation dormer on the side elevation facing no.14, one new windows will be added. At current the side dormer window is for a bedroom and the new window will be for an en-suite and obscured glazed, therefore not resulting in harmful overlooking.

The proposed rear rooflights would not result in harmful overlooking and are an amendment to a dormer window that was original proposed. The roof lights serve non habitable rooms and are high level. Whilst there are no section drawings showing how high the rear roof lights would be from internal floor level, a condition has been added to ensure there is no loss of privacy to the dwelling the roof lights face.

The rear bedroom 3 & 4 window will overlook onto the rear of application site and given it's a small high-level window it will not result in harmful overlooking.

The separation distance from the side of no.12 to boundary of no.14 is over 2m, thus complying with the BDG. On the other hand, the separation distance from the side of no.12 to boundary of no.10 is approx. 0.87m, thus not complying with the BDG. However, the separation distance from the side of no.12 to the side of no.10 is over 2m. It is considered sufficient visual separation between houses as the two- storey section of the neighbouring dwelling is set away from the boundary. Also, there are no first-floor windows proposed on this side elevation.

Overbearing: 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. It is considered sufficient visual separation between houses as the two- storey section of the neighbouring dwelling is set away from the boundary. The proposal would not result in harmful loss of light to neighbours.

Loss of Light: Given the separation distance between 8 & 12 Dukes Wood, the proposal would not result in harmful loss of light.

Amenity Space: The proposal reduces the amount of amenity space available to the property but it would still be roughly rectangular in shape, receive sunlight for part of the day and be able to accommodate typical garden activities as set out in the

Borough Design Guide. Therefore, the reduction in amenity space is not considered to have a harmful impact on the amenity of the occupier.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: The proposal will result in additional habitable rooms and removal of the existing double garage. The submitted drawing indicates an additional driveway parking space to be provided. The level of parking is therefore considered acceptable.

The widened driveway shall be surfaced with hard bound material. There is an existing dropped crossing and this is considered acceptable in this instance to provide access to the extended driveway.

Ecology: All species of British bat are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended. Under this legislation it is an offence to deliberately or recklessly to destroy or damage their roosts, or to disturb, kill or injure them without first having obtained the relevant licence for derogation from the regulations from Natural England in England. A bat roost is interpreted as “any structure or place used for shelter or protection” whether or not bats are present at the time.

The bat roost assessment has not been carried out fully in line with Bat Survey for Professional Ecologist Good Practice Guidelines and the ecologist has failed to undertake a desktop search for European Protected Species Licences or local planning history. Consideration therefore hasn’t been given to local records for bat roosts in similar properties in the local area. The Ecologist does not state what equipment they used. The letter fails to inform the applicant on the legislation which protects all bats in the UK. The officer however is satisfied that the survey effort is adequate in this instance for the Ecologist to conclude that currently there is negligible bat roost suitability and further surveys are not required to confirm that bats are currently absent. In accordance with Local Plan policy and the NPPF, the officer would encourage the applicant to include proposals to provide enhancements for bats and install an integrated bat tube or box on the southern elevation to provide compensation for the wooden vertical cladding which could provide future potential roosting features for crevice dwelling bats.

Provided informative I17 is included in the decision notice there are no objections to the development as proposed.

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:	21 November 2024
Earliest date for decision:	4 October 2024

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>MC</i>
Date:	21.11.2024