

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	241919
Site Address:	8 Hunters Way, Spencers Wood, Wokingham, RG7 1HW
Expiry Date:	12 November 2024
Site Visit Date:	24 September 2024
Proposal: Householder application for proposed first floor front and side extension, 2 no. rear dormers, loft conversion to create habitable accommodation, plus white external render and change of fenestration.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

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
Borough Wards
Landscape Character Assessment Area
SSSI Impact Risk Zones
Thames Basin Heaths SPA Mitigation Zones
Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone Minor

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 CC02 – Development Limits CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC07 – Parking
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
162000	Householder application for the proposed part conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation.	Approve 30/08/16
161681	Application for a certificate of lawfulness for the	Approved

	proposed erection of a single storey rear extension to dwelling, following demolition of existing conservatory.	02/08/16
--	---	----------

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways: No objection

WBC Ecology Householder: No objection

WBC Ecology Newts: No objection

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Shinfield Parish Council: No comment
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	9 Hunters Way: Objects; overbearing, loss of light to garden conservatory and windows, overlooking and noise. Officer response: Overbearing: The Borough Design Guide states the minimum separation distance to maintain privacy and limit sense of enclosure for flank wall to side boundary is 1m. The separation distance between the flank wall of no.8 and the side boundary is approx. 1.13m, thus complying with the BDG. Furthermore, the separation distance from the flank wall of no.8 and the flank wall of no.9 is approx. 8.35m. It is considered sufficient visual separation between houses as the two- storey section of the neighbouring dwelling is set well away from the neighbouring dwelling whilst also complying with the BDG minimum flank wall to side boundary separation distance, thus not considered to be detrimentally overbearing. Loss of light: Both no.8 & no.9 have the same orientation with front to the west and rear to the east. Such relationship and development are common within residential housing estates. Whilst there would be some direct overshadowing in the evening, however it would only affect small part of garden which is not considered to be detrimental. Furthermore, given the property has a large garden to the rear with the most private part of the garden would not being significantly impacted as well as the property having an

	uncharacteristically large side garden. It's concluded there would be no detrimental loss of light. The first-floor window of no.9 is a non-habitable room and is obscured glazed (landing, stairwell and downstairs hallway), therefore no harmful loss of light. Overlooking: The window at the end of the gable will be for a bathroom and obscured glazed (shown on plan 102) and conditioned, therefore no overlooking. Noise: Construction noise/disturbance during development is not a material planning consideration. Loss of a view is not a material planning consideration.
--	---

APPRAISAL

Site Description: Two storey 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 Borough Design Guide states, "*side extensions should not generally project forward of the building line on the street frontage(s)*" and "*side extensions should be set back from the building line by at least 1m, preferably with a lower roof line and should be set at least 1m from the plot boundary*". The first-floor side extension does not project forward of the building, with the roof line matching that of the main dwelling and approx. 0.75m from the side boundary of no.9.

The R23 design principle within the Borough Design Guide states "*alterations or extensions should be clearly subservient to the form and scale of the original building in most situations, although there may be exceptions where it is more appropriate to design a seamless continuation*". The first-floor element of the extension is not subservient to the existing dwelling as the proposal includes the creation of additional first floor habitable accommodation over the garage. However, as the proposal is not overly excessive in size or built form and as the neighbouring properties in the surrounding area differ in size and appearance, there will be no unacceptable harmful impact on street scene and character.

The extension on roof heights as part of the first-floor extension above the garage would result in the continuing the ridge line. Whilst continuing the ridge line of dwellings is discouraged, the set back from the boundary and separation distance from the south site boundary (no.9) sufficiently mitigates any terracing effect concerns. The extension is clearly subservient to the host dwelling and would not adversely impact the character of the area. The proposed side extension would be a complimentary design to the host dwelling and would not be an incongruent or dominant feature to the host dwelling.

As part of the first-floor side extension, one window would be added to the front. The new window would be similar to the existing in size and proportions of current first floor window along Hunters Way, meaning that the proposal would not negatively harm the street scene. The first-floor side extension also includes adding one window to the rear. Whilst not visible from the street scene, it would be similar to the existing in size and proportions of current first floor window along Alderbrook Close.

The Borough Design Guide states *“loft conversions and dormer windows should not project above the existing ridge line”* and *“dormer windows should generally be positioned within the main roof, by being set back from both eaves line and the sides of the roof”*. The dormer and loft conversion does not project above the existing ridge line and the dormer is situated within the main roof whilst also being set back from both eaves line and the sides of the roof, therefore complying with the BDG.

With the dormers being located at the rear it would not be particularly visible from public locations. Hence, the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character of the host property or surrounding area.

The 3 roof lights as part of the first-floor side extension are minor additions which would not harm the street scene.

Due to the high degree of personalisation in the surrounding area, there are no objections to the use of this material and the subsequent appearance of the dwelling. Furthermore, within Hunters Way there are examples of white render including no.3 and no.7.



Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: As part of the first-floor extension, one window will be added to the front. This window would overlook onto the street scene rather than directly looking into any adjacent dwelling. As such, the proposal would not result in any overlooking concerns.

The 3-roof lights on the side elevation would not result in harmful impact upon neighbouring amenities.

Most rear gardens are overlooked at an oblique angle from the upper floor windows in the neighbouring property. This is no different with the rear dormer and it's oblique angle/view of 7 & 9 Hunters Way rear garden. Thus, the rear dormer would not cause any significant harm with regards to neighbouring amenities. Furthermore, along the rear boundary there is mature/established trees and vegetation of significant height acting as natural screening.

The separation distance between the rear of 8 Hunters Way and The White Cottage is approx. 13.95m, which complies with the rear to side separation distance. Furthermore, it would overlook onto the garden rather than the main dwelling and this type of overlooking is common withing residential plots and would not warrant a reason for refusal. Furthermore, along the rear boundary there is mature/established trees and vegetation of significant height acting as natural screening.

The window at the end of the gable would be for a bathroom and obscured glazed (shown on plan 102 D).

Overbearing: The Borough Design Guide states the minimum separation distance to maintain privacy and limit sense of enclosure for flank wall to side boundary is 1m. The separation distance between the flank wall of no.8 and the side boundary is approx. 1.13m, thus complying with the BDG.

The separation distance from the flank wall of no.8 and the flank wall of no.9 is approx. 8.35m. Whilst this gap exposes the flank wall of the extension more than a tighter relationship, the extension would be largely within the profile of the existing dwelling. The neighbouring dwelling to the south has a large rear garden and side extension would not be detrimentally overbearing.

Loss of light: Both no.8 & no.9 have the same orientation with front to the west and rear to the east. Such relationship and development are common within residential housing estates. The proposed side extension would be to the north of the garden to the south and therefore any overshadowing from direct sunlight would be limited. Whilst there would be some direct overshadowing in the evening, it would only affect small part of garden which is not considered to be detrimental. Furthermore, given the property has a large garden to the rear with the most private part of the garden would not being significantly impacted as well as the property having an uncharacteristically large side garden. It's concluded there would be no significant loss of light.

The first-floor window of no.9 is a non-habitable room and is obscured glazed (landing, stairwell and downstairs hallway), therefore no harmful loss of light.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: The proposal will not have a significant impact in respect of the overall number of habitable rooms, and therefore, the councils parking standards are unaffected.

The existing level of parking (driveway parking for three vehicles) will be retained, and this is considered acceptable in this instance. The garage is also to be retained and this would be suitable for a small car.

The drawing indicates a fourth driveway parking spaces, however, this is not a highways requirement of this planning application. Should the applicant wish to pursue this, or make any alterations to the dropped crossing, they will need to liaise directly with WBC Traffic Management team.

Ecology: The officer is satisfied that the survey methodology and effort are adequate for the ecologist to conclude that there are no visible features which could be utilised by roosting bats or in which bats could access the building to roost and internally there are no potential roosting opportunities for bats. There are no ecological objections to the development as proposed.

Ecology Newts: The officer is satisfied the development is unlikely to cause an impact on great crested newts and/or their habitats.

It is considered unreasonable to require the applicant to submit a survey because this could be considered disproportionate to the scale and the likely impacts of the development.

However, as the site falls within the red Impact Risk Zone for great crested newts, as modelled by district licence mapping, and there are recent records of great crested newts within 150m of the site, an informative has been included as part of the decision notice.

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:	12 October 2024
Earliest date for decision:	8 October 2024

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>MC</i>
Date:	12.11.2024