

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	251107
Site Address:	3 Rosedale Crescent, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 1AS
Expiry Date:	4 July 2025
Site Visit Date:	29 May 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a single-storey rear extension and patio, alongside the conversion of the existing garage to habitable space, the addition of two roof lights and the erection of an outbuilding, including fenestration.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Contaminated Land Consultation Zone
Local Authorities
Affordable Housing Thresholds
Bat Roost Habitat Suitability
Borough Parishes
Scale and Location of Development Proposals
Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone
Nuclear Consultation Zone
Public Open Space
Borough Wards
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 CP3 – General Principles for Development
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC07 – Parking
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY- No relevant planning history

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways: No objection
External
None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS	
Parish/Town Council	Earley Town Council: Raises objection to this application and recommends that WBC refuses the application as the proposed outbuilding, when considered cumulatively with the extended dwelling, is overdevelopment, and of inappropriate built form and mass and inappropriate materials contrary to the character of the area, and the amenity of neighbouring properties, contrary to Policy CP3. If WBC are minded to approve this application the following condition is requested that the outbuilding hereby approved shall only be used incidental to the host dwelling, and shall not be let as a separate unit of accommodation, without prior approval by WBC, to ensure adequate parking is provided and to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties, pursuant to Policies CP3 and CC07. Officer response: Addressed in report A similar worded condition will be part of the decision notice
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received
Other	The ACER The Whitegates Residents Association: Object Proposed materials of outbuilding Prominent location in the centre of the garden, clearly visible to neighbours. The size of the outbuilding compounds the visual impact and degradation of the benefits of a suburban garden vista for all the neighbours. Appeal case with a similar outbuilding proposal Officer response: The proposed materials would be fair faced red brick to match the exiting main dwelling, thus in keeping with the characteristics of the site. Whilst the size and location of the outbuilding is substantial. The height of the proposed outbuilding would be approx. 2.73m. If the height of the outbuilding would be lowered to 2.50m, then it would not require planning permission and

	could be erected under permitted development. A 23cm difference in height is minimal change in planning terms and would not justify refusal on its own. Whilst the fence line is low, the neighbour could build a 2m high fence under permitted development without planning permission which would help screen the outbuilding. Every application is assessed on a case-by-case basis, on its own merit
--	---

APPRAISAL

Site Description: Two storey semi-detached dwelling.

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 garage conversion to habitable space includes a store, utility and WC room and the increased width of the kitchen. The garage conversion to habitable space would not harm the street scene, given the garage door and side door is kept thus no change externally. The mono-pitch roof with the flat element of the garage would not look out of place given no.5 garage has the same roof form.

The flat roof rear extension marginally exceeds the recommended 4m depth for extensions advocated within the Borough Design Guide (depth approx. 4.10m). However, the host property has a very spacious garden and there are similar sized extensions in the surrounding area. Moreover, being located at the rear it wouldn't be visible from public locations. Hence, the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character of the host property or surrounding area.

The patio area would be approx. 0.40m in height, 2m in length and 8m in width. Given it would be at the rear it wouldn't be visible from public locations the patio would not have an adverse impact on the character of the host property or surrounding area.

In this context, the outbuilding serves as an additional amenity or feature of the main house, providing supplementary space for a gym and study, with a shower and

storeroom.

Given the floor plans show that outbuilding will be used for a gym and study room, WC and storage. The structure does not contain all the facilities required for day-to-day living and thus could not be occupied as a separate dwelling. Furthermore, it can only be accessed via the dwelling itself. Thus, the circumstances indicate that the proposal would be ancillary to no.3. The proposed usage of the structure would not result in a material change of use or the formation of an independent residential planning unit.

The following condition will be included within the decision notice to condition, the outbuildings use: *"The outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be occupied or used at any time other than incidental to the enjoyment of the residential dwelling located on the site and shall not be used, sold or sub- let as separate dwelling"*.

The proposed outbuilding would be approx. 9.04m in width, 5.04m in length and 2.78m in height. Whilst the size and location of the outbuilding is notable. The height of the proposed outbuilding would be approx. 2.73m. If the height of the outbuilding could be lowered to 2.50m and erected without the requirement for planning permission and could be done under permitted development. A 23cm difference should therefore be assessed, this difference in height is minimal change in planning terms and would not justify refusal on its own as this would have a limited impact on the character and appearance of the area and remains subservient to the dwellinghouse. Hence, the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character of the host property or surrounding area.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: The bi-folding doors as part of the rear extension would overlook onto the rear garden a similar outlook to the existing windows to the rear, thus no overlooking concerns.

The outbuilding has two bi-folding doors and a single door on the front elevation, which overlook onto no.1 garden. A window on the side elevation for the study room, which would look onto the rear of the application site and has oblique views of the garden of no.5. A window on the side elevation for the gym room, would look onto the application site and oblique views of the garden of no.1 and no.5. The most of the openings outlook would be onto rear part of the gardens, not impacting upon the most private part of the garden or dwellings themselves. Moreover, being located at the rear of the property away from the main patio areas of the neighbouring properties. It is usually accepted that the garden area adjoining the dwelling is the most commonly used area of garden for recreational purposes. s Also, whilst the fence line is low, the neighbour could build a 2m high fence without the need for planning permission which would screen their properties.. Furthermore, no adjoining neighbours have objected.

Loss of Light: Given the close proximity of the flank wall of the rear extension to no.1, there is potential concern with regards to loss of light to the rear lounge window. However, given the extension is only single storey and in this instance, the rear facing window of no.5 would be of a southwest orientation and thus would benefit from

daylight throughout the course of the day due to the sun path. It is a double full length patio door and more than 50% of available daylight would still reach the affected window, with the purpose of the guideline is to prevent significant loss of daylight rather than to prohibit any reduction at all. Therefore, it is not considered to be a reasonable reason to refuse the scheme given its compliance with local policy in other respects and given the neighbouring property would still have adequate access to natural light.

The rear extension would not result in harmful loss of light to no.5, as it would only slightly project forwards of no.5 rear building line.

Overbearing: The single storey rear extension would project of the rear building line of no.5 by approx. 1.20m and 2.25m from no.1. However, given the rear extension is only single storey and the overall scale and massing of the extension is proportionate to the host property and consistent with typical residential extensions in the surrounding area. It does not introduce an excessive height, depth, or bulk that would dominate neighbouring outlooks, thus not considered to be overbearing.

The height of the proposed outbuilding would be approx. 2.73m. If the height of the outbuilding would be lowered to 2.50m, then it would not require planning permission and could be done under permitted development. A 23cm difference in height is minimal change in planning terms and would not normally justify refusal on its own. Therefore, the proposed outbuilding is not considered to be overbearing or result in harmful loss of light. Also, no neighbours have objected.

The patio would be 0.40m in height and would not have an adverse impact upon neighbouring amenities given the existing side boundaries would act as screening.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: The proposal will not have a significant impact in respect of the overall number of habitable rooms. The existing garage internal dimensions do not meet the councils current standards for parking and as such there is no significant loss of parking. The existing level of driveway parking will be retained and this is considered acceptable in this instance.

The officer requested a revised plan which increases the internal length of the store to a minimum 2.0m and relocates the door to the opposite side (or provide full width garage door).

Revised plan A-L-001B has minimum internal depth of 2m and also the garage door is shown as a full width opening as per the existing. Following the revised plan, the scheme is now considered acceptable, and highways has no objection in principle to the proposed outbuilding on the basis that this is to remain ancillary to the main dwelling.

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.

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:	1 July 2025
--------------	-------------

Earliest date for decision:	3 June 2025
------------------------------------	-------------

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
---	---

Date:	1 July 2025
--------------	--------------------