

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	243045
Site Address:	4 Ramsbury Drive, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 7RT
Expiry Date:	29 January 2025
Site Visit Date:	9 January 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension, two storey side/rear extension and a loft conversion into a storage room, with installation of Velux windows and changes to fenestration.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Scale and Location of Development Proposals – Major Development Location (Earley)
Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone – Green Zone
Nuclear Consultation Zone
Landscape Character Assessment Area
SSSI Impact Risk Zones
JCEB Mineral Safeguarding Areas

PLANNING POLICY

National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
Core Strategy (CS)	CP1 – Sustainable Development CP2 – Inclusive Communities CP3 – General Principles for Development CP7 – Biodiversity 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 CC07 – Parking
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
062031	Proposed erection of a first floor rear extension to dwelling and pitched roof to existing single storey rear extension. Single storey front extension to garage and front porch canopy.	Approved 05/09/2006

CONSULTATION RESPONSES	
Internal	
WBC Highways – No objection subject to condition WBC CIL – No comments received	
External	
None.	

REPRESENTATIONS	
Parish/Town Council	No objection subject to a condition that the window to the rear of the first floor extension is obscurely glazed and to protect privacy of the adjoining dwelling Officer comment: <i>This is noted and will be discussed in the report</i>
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	1 objection from no. 6 Ramsbury Drive received relating to the following points: • The property already has two extensions (side and rear) so this would result in an overdevelopment of the site • There would be a window that would overlook the patio Officer comment: <i>The above are noted and will be discussed in the report.</i> • Should the application be approved, conditions relating to hours of work should be included and workers' radios should be banned. The condition to obscurely glaze the rear facing window (as recommended by Earley Town Council) should also be upheld Officer comment: <i>Given this application relates to a householder development, it would not be reasonable to attach an hours of work condition. As standard, this is only attached to larger schemes. Notwithstanding this, a harmful level of noise from any activity can be reported to and investigated by WBC Environmental Health department. The banning of workers radios cannot be conditioned as this is not a planning matter and does not meet the relevant tests for imposing a condition, as outlined in para 57 of the NPPF. The obscure glazing to the rear window will be discussed in the report.</i>

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application site relates to an extended semi-detached property located on the western side of Ramsbury Drive. The property is of a 1960/70s design with two front projecting bay windows with a porch canopy and integral garage. The adjoining dwelling is of a similar original design, with mirroring architectural features such as the bay windows however it has been extended with two storey and single storey elements. Consequently, the duality between the semis is reduced

In the vicinity are numerous pairs of other semi-detached properties but they do have some variation in design. There are also numerous chalet bungalows and the host property's immediate neighbour – to the south – no. 6 – is a chalet bungalow.

Ramsbury Drive is a tree lined road.

Proposal:

Planning permission is sought for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension, two storey side/rear extension and a loft conversion into a storage room, with installation of Velux windows and changes to fenestration.

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:

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 Wokingham Borough Design Guide (BDG) provides guidance on general principles for rear extensions.

- Rear extension should not project more than 4m beyond the rear wall
- Maximum eaves and ridge height should be no more than those of the existing property
- Side walls of extensions must not contain windows, especially at first floor level, to minimise potential privacy impacts on neighbours

Whilst the development is described as a 'side extension' this is only at the rear of the property. From the front elevation, the side extension is not visible. As such, the primary considerations for side extensions, as outlined in the BDG, are not of particular relevance as this focuses on impact on the street scene and character of the area.

There would be minimal impact in that respect in terms of the side extension. However, the BDG does state that a gap should be retained between the building and the site boundary of 1m.

The proposed two storey side/ rear extension would have a maximum depth of approx. 7m. This would replace single storey development which currently exists on this side elevation (to a depth of 6m). As such, in terms of built footprint, the proposed two storey extension would not extend to a substantially greater depth than the existing single storey extension (uplift of approx. 1m), however it will be a two storey development and so a fundamental difference to the existing situation. The two storey extension, and the single storey element, would not project substantially past the rear building line of either neighbour. The two-storey projection would have a matching roof form, coming to a hipped point when viewed from the rear elevation. There would also be a 1m gap between the extension and the site boundary with no.6.

The single storey element would project to a depth of 4m, compliant with the BDG and would have the same building line as the two-storey extension.

The two-storey element of the extension will be facilitated by a build-up on the floor. The roof would still retain its hipped design, the same as the adjoining terrace, however it would no longer see a step down when viewed from the front elevation. Given the extension/ build up to the roof would not exceed the ridge height of the roof, and given the various extensions on the adjoining dwelling, it would not result in a harmful unbalancing or loss of duality of the pair of semis. It is also not considered that the build-up would adversely subservience, given there would still be some variation in the roof form (a slight step down at its point furthest west) which creates some visual break and relief rather than a relenting development. The roof extension would also facilitate a loft conversion which other than the installation of 3 x rooflights, would all be internal works. The rooflights would be on the rear roofscape only and so would have limited visibility in the general surrounding area.

In terms of materials, these are generally proposed to match the host dwelling (brickwork, tiles) with string courses and coreten surround to the new 'picture window' at ground floor.

Overall, the development displays a number of points of compliance with the BDG and would not have a substantially harmful impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area due to the development being primarily concentrated at the rear of the property. Concern has been raised that the property has already been extended and this would result in an overdevelopment of the site, however, as discussed above, the proposal is deemed acceptable in the context of the site and in design terms. There would not be sufficient grounds or reason to suggest that this would be an overdevelopment when looking at the pattern of built form of both immediate neighbours and the design of the proposal in its own right.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Policy CP3 states that development should not have a detrimental effect on the amenities of adjoining land users.

The neighbours to the rear of the site (at Aldbourne Avenue) would be located a substantial distance from the site (approx 55m back-to-back distance between dwellings). There would be a rear window that would face in the direction of these properties, however rear facing windows already exist on the host property facing the same direction and so would not be a new relationship, coupled with the substantial separation distance, there would not be any envisaged concerns regarding overlooking, loss of light or overbearing.

As such, the primary neighbour considerations are in relation to the adjacent neighbours, no 2 and 6 to the north and south respectively.

Overlooking:

Concern from the Town Council and the objecting neighbour related to a first floor side window that would result in overlooking. Having consulted the plans, there is not a side window shown on the two storey extension. Had there been, it would have been conditioned that this would be obscurely glazed. A condition will be applied to state that no side windows shall be installed on either side elevation of the two story extension to ensure privacy of neighbours is retained, particularly the patio of no. 6.

Overlooking from the proposed rear facing window is discussed above, and would not result in a substantially more harmful level of overlooking to nos. 2 and 6 than the existing situation.

Loss of Light:

Due to the extensions not projecting substantially past the rear building line/ elevation of either adjacent neighbours, there would not be a substantial loss of light from those neighbouring ground floor windows. In terms of the two-storey element of the extension, this has been set off the boundary with n. 2 so that a 45 degree light angle is not breached from those first floor windows. No 6 is a chalet bungalow with no side windows facing the application site.

Overbearing:

There would not be substantial overbearing effects due to the development not extending substantially past the rear building line of either adjacent neighbour. Furthermore, no side windows can be seen at 6 Ramsbury Drive, or at least any that are above the fence line. As such, there would not be substantial overbearing effects. It is acknowledged that no. 6 is a chalet bungalow and the development would be a greater height than this neighbouring dwelling, but it cannot be seen that this would result in any sufficient overbearing effects to occupiers or their amenity space (the extension would not extend to the depth of the patio area at no. 6)

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

Policy CP6 states that development should not cause highway problems. Policy CC07 states that sufficient parking should be provided on site as a result of development.

WBC Highways have reviewed the proposal. The development would result in an additional habitable room. The submitted plans indicate parking for three vehicles and

the proposed level of parking meets WBC parking standards. The existing access will be retained and this is considered acceptable.

Amenity Space:

The proposal would see the retention of a substantial level of amenity space.

Conclusion:

The application is deemed acceptable in relation to material considerations and recommended for approval.

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:	Approved subject to the following conditions: 1. Time Limit 2. Approved Plans 3. Materials as specified 4. No side windows to be installed
Date:	20 January 2025
Earliest date for decision:	27 December 2024

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	21/01/25