

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	250590
Site Address:	52 Oatlands Road, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9DN
Expiry Date:	9 June 2025
Site Visit Date:	6 February 2025
Proposal: Householder application for proposed part single, part two story front extension, part single, part two storey rear extension. Along with changes to fenestration and demolition of the existing conservatory. (Part-retrospective).	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Bat Roost Habitat Suitability
Scale and Location of Development Proposals – Modest Dev. Location (Shinfield)
Landscape Character Assessment Area

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 CP7 – Biodiversity CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document Shinfield Neighbourhood Plan

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
09015	Extension of kitchen, new porch and construction of bedroom over existing garage	Approved 31/08/1978
101889	Proposed erection of a single storey rear extension to dwelling, plus part garage conversion to habitable accommodation and front boundary wall.	Approved 30/11/2010
102078	Application for certificate of lawfulness for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension and part garage conversion.	Refused 01/11/2010

240188	Householder application for proposed part single part two storey front extension, part single part two storey rear extension. garage conversion to create habitable accommodation, following demolition of front bay windows.	Approved 17/02/2024
--------	---	------------------------

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways – No objection
WBC Ecology – No objection

External

None

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Shinfield Parish Council object to the application as it fails to identify retrospective works. The roof line appears to overlap the boundary, and the linking of the property to the adjacent dwelling creates a terrace effect. <i>Officer comments: The application description clearly states that this application is 'Part-retrospective'. All works appear to be contained within the red line of the application site, additionally, any boundary dispute is a civil matter that the council cannot get involved in. The 'linking' referred to is single storey and therefore is not deemed to cause a terracing effect. Additionally, the current proposal does not 'link' with either neighbour, but a separate application is anticipated to be submitted soon for this element.</i>
Ward Member(s)	Two Councillors have commented on this application, and they have made the following observations: - The proposed plans differ from the initial plans that were granted. <i>Officer comments: This application intends to amend the discrepancies between the approved plans from application 240188 and the development as it has been built on site.</i> - The revised plans intrude on the privacy of neighbours and cause light pollution. <i>Officer comments: Impacts on neighbouring amenities will be assessed within the main report.</i> - The side extension roof has been attached to a neighbouring property, which is not included in the plans. <i>Officer comments: The side extension would be assessed under a separate application which has yet to be validated.</i> - The link by no. 52 onto no. 50 will devalue the property.

	<i>Officer comments: The side extension is not part of this application. Regardless, blight on property values is not a material planning consideration.</i> • Extensive lighting has been installed which impedes and disturbs neighbours. <i>Officer comments: This application hasn't been submitted to apply for external lighting installed at the property. Moreover, such lighting is often not considered development requiring planning approval. However, any excessive nuisance caused by the lighting could be reported by neighbours to the Council's Environmental Protection team for investigation.</i> • Lorries have caused damage to the private road with no contribution made. <i>Officer comments: Not a material planning consideration.</i>
Neighbours	Two neighbours have commented on this application and their comments are summarised below: • Exposed live wires are on the extension roof. <i>Officer comments: This has been reported to Building Control but is not a planning issue.</i> • Part of the new roof does not have a gutter, resulting in rainwater falling onto my driveway. <i>Officer comments: This has been reported to Building Control but is not considered so significant to warrant mitigation through the planning process.</i> • The works subject of this application have already been completed. <i>Officer comments: The description of this application states that it is 'Part-retrospective'.</i> • The roof of the rear extension protrudes over the boundary of no. 54. <i>Officer comments: All of the works appear to be within the red line of the application site. Boundary disputes are a civil matter that the Council cannot get involved in.</i> • The rear extension is within inches of the flank wall of no. 54 and now prevents access for maintenance and repair. <i>Officer comments: This is a civil matter to be discussed between neighbouring landowners.</i> • The first-floor extension has increased in size and this infringes on privacy and right of light to living areas. <i>Officer comments: Impacts on neighbouring amenity will be assessed within the main report.</i> • The new window at first floor level in the extension opens fully and is near the main bedroom of no. 54 and intrudes on the privacy.

	<i>Officer comments: Impacts on neighbouring amenity will be assessed within the main report.</i> • The front boundary fence has been constructed on land not owned by no. 52, and this has taken some of the garden of no. 54. <i>Officer comments: All of the works appear to be within the red line of the application site. Boundary disputes are a civil matter that the Council cannot get involved in.</i> • The red boundary lines on the submitted plans are inaccurate. <i>Officer comments: The boundary lines appear to be correct. Boundary disputes are civil matters that the Council cannot get involved in.</i> • A side extension has been constructed at ground floor level attached to no. 50 without planning permission. <i>Officer comments: A separate application has been submitted for the side extension that is currently invalid.</i> • A window has been installed at first floor level on the right-hand wall of no. 52 and this overlooks no. 50. <i>Officer comments: Impacts on neighbouring amenity will be assessed within the main report.</i> • Excessive external lighting has been installed at the front and rear of no. 52, which causes light pollution. <i>Officer comments: This application hasn't been submitted to apply for external lighting installed at the property. Moreover, such lighting is often not considered development requiring planning approval. However, any excessive nuisance caused by the lighting could be reported by neighbours to the Council's Environmental Protection team for investigation</i>
--	--

APPRAISAL

Description of Development:

This part retrospective application seeks permission to erect a part single, part two-storey front extension. A part single, part two-storey rear extension. Plus, changes to fenestration.

Application 240188 was approved on 17/02/2024. However, works were not carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This application follows an enforcement investigation and aims to address the discrepancies between the approved plans and the development as it has been built on site. The changes include an increase in depth of the first-floor rear extension, an increase in the height and width of the front extensions, plus changes to fenestration.

This report will assess the application on its individual merits, against planning policy and any relevant planning guidance and any other material considerations following consultation with neighbours, Parish, Ward Members and internal consultees.

For clarity, the submitted Proposed Site Plan is incorrectly orientated with reference to the 'North arrow'. The application has been assessed on the basis of the development outlined in the submitted plans but using the correct orientation, as indicated in Fig 1 below, and as provided in the submitted Location Plan. It should also be noted that an existing porch to the front of no. 54 has also not been provided on this plan but has been roughly annotated (hatched) by officers on Fig. 1 below to show the approximate relationship following an thorough site visit by the officer.



Fig. 1.0: Extract of Proposed Site Plan to show correct 'north arrow' orientation

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:

Front Extensions

The proposed part single, part two storey front extension will follow the demolition of the existing front bay windows. At ground floor level, the front extension will extend forward by approximately 0.9 metres from the existing bay windows, but it will still be set back from the front building line by 0.9 metres. The existing right-hand projection at ground floor level is also being widened by 0.5 metres to provide a study room. At first floor level the front extension will project forwards by 0.9 metres, and it will form a gable projection. The ridge height of the gable projection is set down approximately 1 metre from the maximum ridge height of the main roof and this ensures that the front gable projection appears as a subservient feature of the dwelling. Given the proportionate scale and unimposing design of the front extensions, it is deemed that they would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the dwelling and wider area.

Rear Extension

The proposed part single, part two-storey rear extension, at ground floor level, will extend up to and in line with the existing rear wall of the dwelling. This single storey ground floor element is infilling space at the rear of the property and does not extend further than the existing walls. The single storey element does not adhere to R16 design principle within the Borough Design Guide (BDG) in relation to separation distance as the proposal is set right on the boundary with the neighbouring property. But, given its proportionate scale and unimposing design, the single storey element of the extension is deemed as having an acceptable impact on the appearance of the dwelling and wider area.

At first floor level, the proposed rear extension would extend the dwelling by 1.7 metres, and this would bring it in line with the first-floor rear building line. The two-storey element will have a flat roof, and this will ensure that the extension appears as a subservient feature of the dwelling. The two-storey element is right on the boundary with the neighbouring property, but given its proportionate scale, and unimposing design, it is deemed as having an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Changes to Fenestration

The proposed changes to fenestration are relatively insignificant changes that pose no harm to the character and appearance of the host property or that of the surrounding area.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Front Extensions

The front extensions are central to the dwelling and set away from neighbouring boundaries. As such, it is not deemed that they would be overbearing or causing a loss

of light. There are no windows proposed on the side of the extension and therefore there are no concerns on neighbouring amenity grounds relating to overlooking.

Rear Extension

The part single, part two-storey rear extension does not feature any windows on the side elevation, and therefore it raises no concerns on neighbouring amenity grounds relating to overlooking of neighbouring properties.

Both the single storey, and two-storey elements of the rear extension are set directly on the boundary with the neighbouring property no. 54. However, due to the existing staggered arrangement of the two properties, the single storey element aligns with the front of this neighbouring dwelling, and the two-storey element aligns with the front driveway of no. 54. It is not deemed that the rear extension would cause a significant loss of light to habitable rooms on the neighbouring property as the proposal complies with the vertical 45-degree line test (as advocated within the BDG) when taken from the nearest ground floor habitable room windows of no. 54 (noting that the immediate window closest to the application site is a front door window and therefore not a habitable room). Moreover, the proposal would be unlikely to cause any additional significant overshadowing to no. 54, even though this neighbour is located to the north, given existing overshadowing caused by the bulk and height of the original host dwelling at the application site.

To avoid being overbearing, guidance in the BDG states that the eaves height of single storey extensions should not exceed 3 metres within 2 metres of a side boundary. The single storey element is set right on the boundary, but an eaves height of 2.3 metres shows compliance with this guidance relating to overbearing. The two-storey element is aligned with the front driveway of no. 54 and therefore would not unduly impact on the most private outlook of no. 54 which is to the rear of the property. As such, this aspect of the proposal would not result in a significant overbearing impact such that it would significantly detract from the amenities of this neighbour. Hence, it would not warrant a refusal of this application, in its own right.

Changes to Fenestration

A window has been inserted at first-floor level on the side (south) elevation to serve a staircase/landing and forms part of this proposal. This window does not serve a habitable room, and therefore there are no significant privacy concerns resulting from any overlooking associated with this window and its relationship to no. 50 to the south, which also has an existing side window pertaining to a staircase/landing.

Residential Amenity Space:

The proposals will not adversely harm the usability of the site's rear amenity space for current and future occupiers.

Conclusion:

For the reasons stated above, the proposal is acceptable in local plan policy terms and therefore is recommended for approval.

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.

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.

RECOMMENDATION

Conditions agreed:	Not required
Recommendation:	Approve
Date:	13 May 2025
Earliest date for decision:	8 May 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	14/05/25