

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	242083
Site Address:	68 Arthur Road, Wokingham, RG41 2SY
Expiry Date:	21 November 2024
Site Visit Date:	4 October 2024
Proposal: Householder application for proposed single storey rear/side extension along with changes to fenestration, following demolition of the existing storage unit.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Major Development Location (Wokingham)
Bat Roost Habitat Suitability
Local Wildlife Site – Adjacent to Woosehill Meadows (at the rear)
Landscape Character Assessment Area
Flood Zone 2

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 CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
B/5/60	Detached bungalow	C/A – 11/02/1960

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Drainage: No objection subject to condition
WBC Ecology Householder: No comments received

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	No comments received
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	Two objections received on the following grounds: - The height and size of the proposed extension is excessive and out of keeping with the size of the plot and the area. - It would considerably exceed the rear building line of the neighbouring bungalows and out of character. - Overbearing and loss of light impact on No.70 Arthur Road adjacent. - Loss of privacy from proposed side doors on No.66 Arthur Road adjacent. - Impact on mental health of neighbour, request that personal circumstances can be considered. <i>Officer's Comment: The request to consider the development's impact on the general mental health of an individual cannot be considered a material planning consideration.</i>

APPRAISAL**Site Description:**

The application site is a detached bungalow within a 1960s residential development in Wokingham. The immediate area comprises a mix of detached bungalows and two storey dwellings, with the site forming part of a row of bungalows which sit on a fixed building line facing the street. The site benefits from an attached garage with amenity space and parking to the front.

Proposal:

This application proposes the erection of a single storey rear/side extension and fenestration changes following the demolition of the existing detached storage unit to the rear of the garage. With a total ridge height of approximately 4.1m and eaves height of 2.6m the extension would project beyond the existing rear elevation by approximately 3.3m. The proposal would effectively raise and enlarge the existing pitched side addition to the 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.

Design and Character of the Area:

The site forms part of a row of detached bungalows which are broadly similar in form and appearance, however there are examples of later side additions with varying roof forms as well as differing rendering which adds variety to the street scene. While it is acknowledged that there are very limited examples of single storey rear extensions within the immediate row of bungalows, there are examples at Nos. 62 & 76 Arthur Road and it is a common form of development within the wider estate. The proposal would not be out of character with the area in this respect.

From the street scene, the proposal would appear as a subservient addition to the host dwelling due to it being set down from the main ridgeline and set well back from the principal (front) elevation. While it would appear more prominent than the existing side addition due to its raised ridge height, the proposed asymmetrical pitch roof form would not be too dissimilar than the existing. Moreover, the form of later side additions within the immediate street scene are varied while the visual impact of the scheme would be further mitigated by the use of matching external materials.

While the proposed extension would enlarge the footprint of the host dwelling at the rear, it would not be a disproportionately sized or bulky addition due to its modest eaves height, which matches the main dwelling, its appropriate roof form and the existing gaps between the site and its side boundaries being retained. Although it is acknowledged that it would encroach the shared rear building line with both adjacent neighbours, its total depth would not project more than 4m, in accordance with the Borough Design Guide SPD, while its width is proportionate to the size of the existing dwelling and the residential plot.

Due to the reasons identified above it is not considered that the proposal would be synonymous with overdevelopment of the residential plot. The total size following the development would not be out of character for a detached family sized dwelling within an urban setting. Moreover, there are similarly sized extensions within the street scene and the wider estate.

Overall, the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the visual amenity of the street scene and the character of the area in accordance with Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: An objection has been raised concerning the proposed patio doors on the side (north-west facing) elevation of the proposed extension and the resultant loss of privacy on No.66 Arthur Road adjacent. During the assessment of this application, a site visit was carried out to both the application site and No.66 to clarify the existing relationship between the properties and consider whether the patio doors would directly overlook the neighbouring property.

Due to the sloping gradient of the street, No.66 sits on higher ground, approx. 0.5m, than the application site. Subsequently, there is an existing restricted view from a side facing kitchen window serving No.66 above the fence line into the application site. However, as the application site sits at a lower level, views from the proposed patio doors would be largely restricted to the fence line and would not result in direct overlooking into the kitchen window serving No.66. It is acknowledged that the occupant(s) of No.66 may have a restricted view into the extension following the development, however any view would be extremely limited to the top portion of the doors, and this relationship would not represent conflict with Core Strategy policy CP3. Therefore, this would not warrant a reason for refusal.

Loss of Light: An objection has been raised regarding potential loss of light impact on the rear facing windows serving No.70 Arthur Road adjacent to the south-east. Due to the layout of the estate, the flank elevation of the existing attached garage sits in close proximity to the shared side boundary with No.70. The proposed extension would be set back from the shared boundary by approximately 0.3m.

While the proposal would encroach beyond the shared rear building line with No.70, any potential loss of light impact on the rear facing windows and garden space would be sufficiently mitigated due to its modest eaves height and its pitched roof form. Moreover, measurements taken on the submitted plans from the rear elevation of No.70 indicate that the proposal would comply with the 45 degree test (horizontal) under BRE Guidance, meaning that the rear fenestration would not be directly impacted by the proposed development.

Overbearing: An objection has been raised regarding potential overbearing impact on No.70 Arthur Road. While the proposal would encroach beyond the existing shared building line at the rear and result in a change of outlook from the neighbouring property, due to the proposal being set in from the shared boundary, its modest eaves height and pitched roof form its design would sufficiently mitigate any potential overbearing impact. Moreover, the extension would only border a small portion of the neighbouring garden, with the majority of the neighbour's private amenity space unaffected by the proposal.

Moreover, the proposal fully complies with the guidance contained within Section 4.11 of the Borough Design Guide SPD to prevent adverse impact on neighbouring properties. Overall, any potential harm on neighbouring amenities has been sufficiently mitigated, prohibiting the introduction of adverse harm over and above the existing level of amenity. The proposal is therefore compliant with Core Strategy policy CP3.

Flooding and Drainage:

Policy CC09 of the MDD Local Plan requires consideration of flood risk from historic flooding and policy CC10 requires sustainable drainage methods and the minimisation of surface water flow. The site falls within Flood Zone 2 according to Environment Agency (EA) data, meaning that there is a medium probability of flooding from rivers.

A Flood Risk Assessment was submitted in support of the application which concludes that the proposal would meet the EA's standing advice for domestic

extensions, with risk of fluvial and pluvial flooding very low. Following discussions with the Council's Drainage and Flood Risk Officer, the applicant has confirmed that the drainage serving the proposed extension would connect to the existing surface water sewer. This is proportionate in relation to the relatively modest scale of the proposal, and is appropriate in relation to the SuDS hierarchy under policy CC10.

Subject to conditions, the application is acceptable and is therefore 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
Date:	19 November 2024
Earliest date for decision:	7 September 2024

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	20/11/24