

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	250482
Site Address:	21 Leith Close, Crowthorne, Wokingham, RG45 6TD
Expiry Date:	28 April 2025
Site Visit Date:	7 April 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension to include rooflights following demolition of existing conservatory.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Water Utility Consultation Zones
Bat Roost Habitat Suitability
Scale and Location of Development Proposals – Modest Development Location
Farnborough Aerodrome Consultation Zone
Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone
Nuclear Consultation Zone
Public Open Space
Tree Preservation Orders
Landscape Character Assessment Area
Land Terrier
SSSI Impact Risk Zones
Thames Basin Heaths SPA Mitigation Zones
Historic Flooding Points Consultation Zone

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 CP6 – Managing Travel Demand CP7 – Biodiversity CP8 – Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area 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 CC06 – Noise CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Crowthorne Village Design Statement

PLANNING HISTORY

No Planning History.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Property Services – No comments received
WBC Drainage – No objection subject to conditions
WBC Green Infrastructure - No comments received
WBC Landscape and Trees – No objection subject to conditions
WBC Ecology – No objection subject to conditions

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	No objection
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The site is at the end of a cul-de-sac within a verdant, maturing housing estate. The house is a semi-detached bungalow attached and surrounding the site are a mixture of bungalows and two storey dwellings of the same age and design characteristics. The site is set back from the main highway allowing for substantially large front garden

The bungalow has dark brown bricking and tiled roof with brown/maroon fenestration detailing.

Proposal:

Planning permission is being sought for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension to facilitate a kitchen/dining room extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory.

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/Character of the Area:

In terms of policy CP3 'General Principles for Development', point (a) states that proposed developments should be of an appropriate scale, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character to the area together with a high-quality design. The proposed development matches the existing activity and character of the area.

In terms of the Borough Design Guide, it states that single storey rear extensions should not project past the rear wall for more than 4m. It also states that the maximum eaves and ridge height should be no more than those of the existing property.

The proposed rear extension would project 2.92m from the existing rear wall of the property. The modest projection of the extension is in line with the Borough Design Guide in terms of depth and ridge and eaves height no exceeding that of the original dwelling. Similarly, No 12 Leith Close has had alike scheme approved and implemented (WBC Ref. 161041). The proposal is justifiable in terms of CP3 and the Borough design guide, it is an appropriate projection and design fitting within the residential character of Leith Close.

The surrounding area is not uniform, with properties having some variation in their design and finishes. While a large number of properties in the area do have conservatories/ rear extensions, they are not a prominent feature in design terms and not all properties have one. The demolition of the conservatory would not cause detrimental harm to the overall street scene present on Lieth Close owing to the variation present. The proposed development would predominantly be based at the rear of the property, there would be minimal visibility from the street scene.

The use of external materials will be secured via condition to ensure the external appearance of the extension matches the host dwelling.

The proposal is acceptable in terms of character and design of the area.

Neighbouring Amenity:

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

Overlooking:

The proposed rear extension would have a side window installed on the eastern facing elevation. This would have limited visibility on No 20 Leith Close and there is a vegetative barrier alleviating overlooking implications. There would be limited overlooking of the direct neighbour to the west of the property as there is no side

windows shown to be present on that elevation.

It is noted that there is a side window present on No 22 Leith close facing the application site, however it is not considered that the proposed rear extension would overlook that window as there is no window shown to be installed on the western elevation.

Loss of Light:

A 45-degree angle light test was performed on the immediate neighbour to the right No 22 Leith close. The line was not breached by the proposed rear extension and therefore there would be no substantial loss of light for the neighbour.

Overbearing:

The proposed rear extension would be set in from the boundary shared with No 22 Leith Close, as result there would be minimal overbearing. Furthermore, the extension would not project past the rear building line of no. 22.

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.

As the proposal seeks to extend the kitchen and living space, it is not considered that this would have any adverse implications on the existing parking provisions available on site. It would create additional habitable space, however this is a modest amount and not enough, in the opinion of Officers, to warrant additional parking being provided on site.

Flooding and Drainage:

Policy CC09 states that all sources of flood risk, including historic flooding, must be taken into account at all stages and to the appropriate degree at all levels in the planning application process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding.

Policy CC10 states that all development proposals must ensure surface water arising from the proposed development including taking into account climate change is managed in a sustainable manner.

The application site is located in flood zone 1 which is an area that experiences a low level of surface water flooding. WBC Drainage were consulted and advised that as the footprint of the extension is increasing and no drainage details have been provided, that these details are required before development commences.

However, as the extension would be partially located in the area presently occupied by the existing conservatory, this area is already impermeable. A patio is also laid immediately adjacent to the existing conservatory, so again, the rest of the footprint of the extension would largely be where the patio is. As such, a very minimal, if any, of

the extension would be on presently impermeable ground.

Given the above, the site being in flood zone 1 and given the scheme is a modest proposal, it is not considered that the WBC Drainage Officer's request for details of the drainage scheme to be secured via condition is necessary or reasonable.

Landscape and Trees:

Policy CC03 of the MDD states that development should protect and retain existing trees, hedges and other landscape features.

There is a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 896/1997 on oak, sweet chestnut, scots pine, beech, rowan, birch, holly and hawthorn bounds the rear of the plot. Other trees offering public visual amenity feature within the site.

The WBC Tree and Landscape Officer have reviewed the proposal and the submitted Arboriculture Tree Assessment. The arboriculture submissions have erroneously not considered the tree root suboptimal road and the foundations of no.20 Leith Close. The rooting area of the trees will be much further into the soft landscaping of the sites. Section 4.6.2 of the BS5837:2012 refers. However, in this instance, for this scheme, the root protection specified appears sufficient.

WBC Tree and Landscape team have requested a condition that the proposal shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted arboricultural impact assessment and tree protection plan to ensure that trees are protected during the construction and lifetime of the development.

Ecology:

Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy and TB23 of the MDD seek to protect biodiversity.

The application site is within an area for potential bat roosting.

WBC Ecology officer reviewed the preliminary bat roost assessment and concluded that the PRA survey methodology and effort are adequate for the Ecologist to conclude that the property currently has negligible suitability for roosting bats. The ecologist recommended a condition to protect existing trees on site. This is the same condition recommended by the WBC Tree & Landscaping Officer.

Conclusion:

In consideration of the assessment made above the proposal is considered acceptable 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:	Approve subject to conditions: 1. Full Planning Permission – 3 Years 2. Approve Details 3. Materials 4. Protection of Existing Trees
Date:	10 April 2025
Earliest date for decision:	25 March 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	10/04/25