

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	243094
Site Address:	32 Rose Close, Woodley, Wokingham, RG5 4UR
Expiry Date:	14 February 2025
Site Visit Date:	31 January 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed two storey side extension and ground floor front extension.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Major Development Location - Woodley
Landscape Character Assessment Area – Woodley-Earley Settled and Farmed Clay
SSSI Impact Risk Zones

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 CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC07 – Parking TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Woodley Design Statement

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
F/2014/2306	Proposed erection of two storey side extension with conversion of garage to habitable accommodation and insertion of bifolding doors to west side elevation.	C/A – 09/12/2014
19124	Detached house & garage	C/A – 31/03/1983

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways: No objection

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Woodley Town Council raised no objections.
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	1 comment received objecting on the following grounds: - Loss of light and overlooking impact on No.11 Scott Close. <i>Officer's Comment: This is discussed within the 'Neighbouring Amenity' section of the report.</i> - Overdevelopment of the plot, a further extension would not be in keeping with the local area. <i>Officer's Comment: This is discussed within the 'Design and Character of the Area' section of the report.</i> - Would result in a 7-bed house, this would cause parking problems. <i>Officer's Comment: The submitted plans indicate that the proposal would result in the creation of 1no. additional bedroom, resulting in a 5-bed house. Parking concerns are discussed within the 'Highway Access and Parking Provision section of the report.</i>

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application site is a detached dwelling on the 1980s Woodley Airfield development. The dwelling sits at the western end of a row of 4no. detached dwellings on a shared access drive off the cul-de-sac (Rose Close) which are similar in style but have a varied appearance due to differing alterations and extensions. The site benefits from previous additions including a two storey side extension on its eastern end which continues the main ridgeline and is sited in close proximity to the site's eastern boundary.

Fronting the site is an area of public amenity space which connects Rose Close with the adjoining cul-de-sac to the west (Scott Close). A public footpath located adjacent to the site's western boundary provides access from the amenity space to the adjoining cul-de-sac to the north (Nimrod Close).

Proposal:

This application proposes the erection of a two storey side extension to the existing dwelling and a single storey front infill extension. The side extension would project beyond the existing flank (west facing) elevation of the dwelling by a total of approximately 3m and would not project beyond the existing rear building line. The side extension would have a partially slanted siting to reflect the shape of the plot and

its relationship with the adjacent footpath.

Following discussions with the applicant, revised plans were submitted which show the extension set back from the principal (front) elevation by approximately 0.5m at first floor level and set down from the main ridgeline by approximately 0.15m. The proposed front extension would be a fairly modest addition to the host dwelling and would not encroach the existing principal (front) building line.

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.

Design and Character of the Area:

Rose Close and the surrounding estate comprises a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced housing which are considerably varied in terms of architectural styles, form and scale. There are numerous examples of later additions including first floor/two storey side extensions visible. Due to the site's location off the cul-de-sac (Rose Close), at the western end of the row and fronting the amenity space, the site appears fairly innocuous from the wider street scene.

Due to the layout of the estate and the intervening public footpath there is a considerable gap between the site and its closest neighbour to the west (No.11 Scott Close). While the proposed extension would be sited in very close proximity to the site's western boundary, contrary to the advice set out in the Borough Design Guide (BDG), due to the existing relationship with No.11 Scott Close and its end-of-row siting the increased bulk would not have an adverse effect on the rhythm of the street scene. The proposal would retain a circa. 5.15m separation distance from No.11 Scott Close which is consistent with the planned gaps on the immediate street scene and the wider estate.

While the proposal would be sited in close proximity to the adjoining public footpath, due to the orientation of the dwelling, the shape of the plot and the intervening amenity strip the extension would retain a minimum separation distance of approximately 1m. It is also noted that No.28 Nimrod Close to the north is sited in very close proximity to the footpath, while there are other examples of first floor/two storey side extensions in close proximity to their respective boundary. Therefore, while a significant change to the existing relationship, the proposal would not be wholly out of character in this respect and would not adversely affect the amenity of the footpath.

Moreover, the intervening amenity strip and the existing relationship with the site's boundary would prevent the proposal from being visually overbearing on users of the footpath. Following discussions with the applicant, the overall bulk of the scheme has been reduced due to the proposal being set in from the front at first floor level and set down from the ridgeline, further mitigating the visual impact of the scheme on the footpath. While the partly slanted flank wall and roof form would be visible from the footpath and would be out of character, due to the reasons discussed above and its restricted width at the rear the proposal would not adversely harm the visual amenity of the surrounding estate. The proposed single storey front extension would respect the principal building line while the proposed mono-pitched roof form would complement the existing frontage and remain in keeping with the mixed character of the area.

While it is acknowledged that the site benefits from previous additions and the proposal would further enlarge the existing floorspace, due to the size of the plot it is not considered that the proposal is synonymous with overdevelopment. The total size of the dwelling following the development would not be out of character with similarly sized dwellings within the surrounding estate. Moreover, the proposed use of matching external materials to the existing would further mitigate the visual impact of the scheme.

Overall, the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the visual amenity of the street scene and local character in accordance with Core Strategy policies CP1 & CP3.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: Concern has been raised regarding potential overlooking impact on No. 11 Scott Close adjacent to the west. All proposed fenestration in the side (west) elevation would be fitted with frosted glazing which would adequately avoid any potential overlooking impact on this neighbour. Nonetheless, due to the orientation of the site, the proposed fenestration on the flank (west side) elevation would face onto the public areas within the cul-de-sac, and across the front garden of 11 Scott Close, views of which are already available from public locations. The 1no. first floor window proposed on the rear elevation would have the same oblique outlook of the neighbourhood as the existing first floor rear fenestration. There are no overlooking concerns in respect of the proposed front extension.

Loss of Light and Overbearing: Concern has been raised regarding potential loss of light impact on No.11 Scott Close adjacent to the west. Due to the existing relationship between the properties, and the retained separation distance of approximately 5.15m from the proposal to the flank (side) elevation of No.11, the proposal would not conflict with the level of light received by No.11 or introduce any potential overbearing impact. Therefore, the proposal would not introduce any adverse harm on the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light or overbearing impact.

Overall, any potential harm on neighbouring amenities has been sufficiently mitigated, prohibiting any additional harm over and above the existing level of amenity. The proposal is therefore compliant with Core Strategy policy CP3.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

The proposal would not impact on the site's existing parking provision for 3no. vehicles on the existing drive, which accords with the Council's Parking Standards. As such, the Council's Highways Officer has raised no objection. The proposal would not directly result in increased pressure on on-street parking provision in accordance with MDD Local Plan policy CC07.

In light of the above assessment and all comments received, no adverse harm has been identified and the application is recommended for **approval**, subject to conditions.

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:	13 February 2025
Earliest date for decision:	3 January 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	14/02/25