

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	242241
Site Address:	93 Redhatch Drive, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 5QN
Expiry Date:	28 October 2024
Site Visit Date:	15/10/2024
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a two-storey rear extension and a single-storey side extension, and the conversion of the existing garage to habitable accommodation.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Major development location – Earley
Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone
Nuclear Consultation Zone
Tree Preservation Orders

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 CP4 – Infrastructure Requirements CP6 – Managing Travel Demand 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 CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC06 – Noise CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage TB21 – Landscape Character
Joint Minerals and Waste Plan (JMWP)	DM1 - Sustainable Development DM2 - Climate Change – Mitigation and Adaptation
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
140518	Proposed first floor rear extension to dwelling.	Approved 19/03/2014

CONSULTATION RESPONSES**Internal**

WBC CIL – not CIL liable

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	No objection subject to a condition that any rooflights in the roof slopes facing the adjoining dwellings shall be installed with the window sill height at least 1.7m above floor level to protect the privacy and amenity of the neighbouring properties <i>(Officer's note: the rooflights on the side roof slopes are all existing, and there are no additional rooflights proposed as part of the proposal.)</i>
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	One letter from Mr William Luck with the following queries: - No parking plan provided - Plans do not have any dimensions or scale bars <i>(Officer's note: the submitted plans show the scale they have been drawn to (i.e. 1:50), and a parking plan has been submitted by the applicant identifying 2no. parking spaces to the front of the site and within the red line.)</i>

APPRAISAL**Site Description:**

The application site comprises of a detached bungalow-style dwelling, with detached single garage to the side/rear, located within a residential street in Earley. The surrounding context is mixed with mainly detached bungalows and two storey dwellings, many of which have been altered over time.

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 bulk of the proposal would be towards the rear of the existing dwelling, where the proposed two storey extension would have the same width of the main dwelling, so that the characteristic gap between dwellings along this part of Redhatch Drive would be maintained. Moreover, the extension would have the same gable-style roof of the main house and with a lower ridge height, making it a clearly subservient addition.

The existing side extension to replace the existing garage would fairly occupy its same footprint, would be single storey and with similar gable-style roof, so that its view from the main road would not be significantly different from the existing situation.

Consequently, the proposal overall would result in positive improvements to the existing dwellinghouse that would not visually detract from the character and appearance of the street scene, in accordance with Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and the Borough Desig Guide recommendations.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: No windows are proposed on the side elevations of the extensions, and the windows to the rear would have similar views than existing windows which already have oblique views towards neighbouring back gardens, which is commonplace within urban residential areas such as this.

Loss of Light & Overbearing: the proposed two storey extension to the main dwelling would be set in from both side boundaries, and would not project significantly beyond the rear elevations of adjoining properties nos. 91 & 95 Redhatch Drive. Furthermore, the proposed plans demonstrate by using the 45 degree line analysis that the rear windows of the adjoining neighbours would not be overshadowed by the two storey extension.

It is acknowledged that the proposed single storey side extension would be right up to the boundary with no. 95 Redhatch Drive. However, it is noted that this part of the extension would be single storey and occupying almost the same footprint of the existing garage which is also sited close to the shared boundary.

As such, overall it is considered that no significant harm would occur upon

neighbouring amenities by way of loss of light or overbearing impacts.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

The existing garage would be removed as part of the proposal, but a parking plan has been submitted identifying 2 no. parking spaces within the red line, which can utilise the existing vehicular access to the site. This parking provision is considered acceptable in accordance with the Council's parking standards. Furthermore, the site visit confirmed that the frontage of the site is covered with a driveway and gravel, so that additional car spaces can be provided. No concerns are therefore raised on parking/ highways grounds.

Amenity Space:

The remaining rear garden would be in excess of the minimum 11m depth as recommended in the Borough Design Guide, so it is acceptable.

Landscape and Trees:

The Council's mapping system identifies a Tree Preservation Order on the strip of land that runs parallel to the rear boundary of the site (TPO-0654-1994), comprising Oak, Ash, Hawthorn, Various trees. However, the proposed extension would be approximately 20m away from the TPO, so that no impact on the root protection area of the trees would be anticipated. Nonetheless, a tree protection informative will be added to this effect.

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:	Approval
Date:	24 October 2024
Earliest date for	24 September 2024

decision:	
------------------	--

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>HMM</i>
Date:	24 October 2024