

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	250469
Site Address:	10 The Ridgeway, Woodley, Wokingham, RG5 3QD
Expiry Date:	23 April 2025
Site Visit Date:	13 March 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of an outbuilding to rear (retrospective).	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Scale and Location of Development Proposals – Major development location
Landscape Character Assessment Area
SSSI Impact Risk Zones
JCEB Mineral Safeguarding Areas

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 CC07 – Parking
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
111234	Proposed erection of a single storey side extension following demolition of existing garage.	19 April 2011 – Approve
42505	Single storey rear extension to form kitchen and bedroom	11 May 1994

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal
WBC Enforcement – No comment

External
None

REPRESENTATIONS	
Parish/ Town Council	No objection – have requested that the neighbours comments be taken into account
Ward Member (s)	No comments received
Neighbours	There is a number of neighbour comments on this application. These will be addressed throughout the report. A summary of neighbour comments (in no particular order) plus some officer comments are below: Comment 1: The neighbour expressed concerns that the building height exceeds 2.5 meters, making it overbearing. They suggested that a flat roof would be more appropriate. Additionally, a mature tree was cut down, affecting their privacy, and the proximity of the building to their rear garden fence is concerning. <i>Officer comments:</i> - <i>The tree in question is not part of this application and was not protected</i> - <i>The potential overbearing and privacy impacts will be addressed in the report</i> - <i>The Local Planning Authority cannot consider alternations schemes or suggestions put forward by third parties</i> Comment 2: The neighbour raised concerns about the installation of kitchen units and wastewater connections. Noise is also a concern due to the proximity of the building, and they believe it sets a precedent for others to follow. <i>Officer comments:</i> - <i>Planning applications are assessed on their individual merit, and do not set precedents</i> - <i>Waste water concerns are not a planning matter and would be dealt with by building control and the utility operator</i> Comment 3: The neighbour expressed frustration over the retrospective planning permission for a substantial building. They questioned the installation of services like water, electricity, and drainage. The building is close to the back of their property, which can often experience damp ground, and they are concerned about increased traffic on an unadopted road. <i>Officer comments:</i> - <i>Additional traffic is not a concern in this application as the outbuilding is to remain ancillary to the main dwelling</i> - <i>Installation of utilities is not a material consideration</i>

- *Drainage impacts will be assessed as part of the application*
- *Retrospective applications must be considered in the same manner as other planning applications, i.e. on their individual merits and against relevant planning policy and guidance and any other material considerations.*

Comment 4: The neighbour stated that the building is too high and too close to the rear boundary fence, affecting their privacy. They raised concerns about increased vehicle usage, which impacts road maintenance and pedestrian safety.

Officer comments:

- *Increased vehicle usage is not a concern for this application given the proposal is ancillary to the main dwelling and does not proposed any additional habitable rooms.*
- *Neighbour amenity issues, e.g. potential overlooking, overbearing etc. are addressed in the appraisal below.*

Comment 5: Concerns about the proximity of the building to the boundary wall and the height of the building. They also raised concerns about the limit on use and the impact on road maintenance due to increased vehicle movements.

Officer comments:

- *As above, increased vehicle usage is not a concern for this application*
- *The potential impact on neighbours will be addressed in the report*

Comment 6: The neighbour stated that the building is too high and too close to the rear boundary fence, affecting the occupants in the houses behind. They questioned the water and drainage connections and their impact on water pressure. They also raised concerns about increased vehicle usage and its impact on road maintenance and pedestrian safety.

Officer comments:

- *Effects on utilities are not a planning matter*
- *The potential impact on neighbours will be addressed in the report*
- *Drainage issues will be addressed in the report*

Comment 7: The neighbour questioned the intended purpose of the building (office, gym, etc.) and the plumbing plans. They raised concerns about water pressure challenges and the removal of a large tree and hedge bushes. They believe the structure is too tall for its location and that a flat roof would be more appropriate.

Officer comments:

- *The use of the building is in the plans and will be addressed in the report*
- *The potential impact on neighbours will be addressed in the report*

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application relates to a bungalow set on a large plot with extensive off-street parking and a large rear garden. There is no common design on the street of the application site, although mostly large dwellings, there is a mix in design between detached and semi-detached and between bungalow, two-storey and chalet. There is differing gaps between properties, creating a varied street scene with no real pattern. This development is relating to the outbuilding located in the rear garden, in the northeast corner of the plot. The outbuilding has already been built and is set close to some properties on the Coniston Close cul-de-sac.

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:

Core Strategy Policy CP3 states that planning permission will be granted for proposals that are of an appropriate scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character, together with a high quality of design without detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users, including open spaces or occupiers and their quality of life. Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy requires developments to maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment.

The outbuilding is set at the rear of the property, and not visible from any street scene, including Coniston Close. Additionally, outbuildings are not uncommon in the large gardens seen along The Ridgeway and on the near Loddon Bridge Road, indeed they are ubiquitous to dwellinghouses generally. In this instance, the proposal is set within a spacious residential plot and would appear suitably subservient to the host dwellinghouse in terms of its scale, massing and height. Therefore, it is considered that the development has an acceptable impact on the application site and surrounding character of the area.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Core Strategy Policy CP3 states that development proposals should not result in a detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users including open spaces or occupiers and their quality of life. The Borough Design Guide SPD states that the eaves height of extensions should not exceed 3m within 2m of a boundary, and a gap should be retained between the building and the boundary of 1m.

Overlooking:

As the works are limited to ground floor, there is no potential for this development to significantly impact the privacy of neighbours, the views offered from the outbuilding are similar to those offered from standing in the rear amenity space.

Loss of Light and Overbearing:

The development is set approximately 4.5 metres from the rear boundary and 0.75 metres from the closest side boundary. There are a number of objections regarding the proximity of the outbuilding to the properties at the rear, on Coniston Close. However, to the rear there is a suitable separation distance, big enough to include valuable amenity space in the shape of a small fish pond and a shed. The shed, along with the solid boundary treatment, partially screens the development from view from the rear amenity spaces on Coniston Close. Therefore no issues on loss of light and overbearing have been identified.

Regarding the proximity of the boundary to the side, although this is within the 1 metre guidance, it is well away from the main amenity space of the neighbour. Furthermore, the eaves of this outbuilding are approximately 2.2 metres, which is well within the guidance of a limit of 3 metres when the development is close to a boundary and therefore the impact is considered to be acceptable.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

There are several concerns from residents regarding increased traffic and on street parking on The Ridgeway, which is a private road. However, as this development is to be used ancillary to the dwelling and no habitable rooms are proposed, there are no parking or traffic concerns as it will only be used by the current household. Furthermore, there is a large driveway with space for upwards of 5 cars, well above the recommended minimum for a property of this size.

Flooding and Drainage:

The proposal is set in flood zone 1 meaning there is a low risk of flooding. The area does not suffer from any increased risk of surface water flooding. Hence there are no concerns around the impact that the development will have on drainage.

Other:

The outbuilding is marked on the plans to be used as a home office and a gym. Multiple site visits have been made to the property and it was observed that on all occasions, the outbuilding was being used for storage. Importantly, it was not being used for accommodation, as some neighbour comments suggested. The outbuildings use will be secured by a condition ensuring that it will remain ancillary to the main dwelling, and that it cannot be used as standalone accommodation.

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:	No
Recommendation:	Approve
Date:	15/4/25
Earliest date for decision:	20 March 2025

Recommendation agreed by:	
(Authorised Officer)	
Date:	15/04/25