

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	241979
Site Address:	18 Ratby Close, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 4ER
Expiry Date:	26 September 2024
Site Visit Date:	16 September 2024
Proposal: Householder application for proposed erection of a single storey front extension to create porch, single storey side and rear extension along with conversion attached garage into habitable accommodation following demolition of the existing conservatory.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Scale and Location of Development Proposals
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 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 CC07 – Parking
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
N/A	N/A	N/A

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways – No objection subject to conditions. *Officer comments: This will be discussed within the main report.*
WBC Ecology Householder – No comments received.

External

None

REPRESENTATIONS	
Parish/Town Council	No objection
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	One neighbour has commented stating that the plans appear to be annotated with the incorrect site address. <i>Officer comments: 22 Netley Close, Caversham, is the office address of the planning agent. All submitted plans clearly identify the correct site address of 18 Ratby Close.</i> Two neighbours have commented on this application in objection and their comments are summarised below: • The side extension being built in line with the existing house at the front will reduce light into the side bay window of the neighbouring property. <i>Officer comments: This will be assessed within the main report.</i> • The rear extension will impact light into the neighbouring properties garden, dining room and kitchen, and this will have an overbearing impact. <i>Officer comments: This will be assessed within the main report.</i> • The extension being built right on the boundary may lead to overhanging of the soffit, fascia and guttering and this is encroachment onto the neighbouring property. <i>Officer comments: An informative will be attached to the Decision Notice bringing the applicants attention to their need for compliance with the Party Wall etc. Act 1996.</i> • A party wall on the boundary line will replace the fence panel, making it higher. <i>Officer comments: Potential overbearing impacts will be assessed within the main report.</i> • The extension will have an impact as a result of the noise and disruption. <i>Officer comments: It is not deemed that an extension of this size would cause unacceptable levels of noise and disruption. However, if noise levels are unacceptable, this could be controlled by other Environmental Health legislation.</i> • Contractor's vehicles during construction may compromise access and result in damage to the tarmac. Will any damage be remedied by those responsible. <i>Officer comments: Not a material planning consideration. Additionally, it is not expected that the construction vehicles would compromise access to the</i>

	<i>cul-de-sac, and it is not deemed that they would disproportionately damage the tarmac.</i> • Access to the neighbouring property may be required during construction and this could lead to damage to the front, side or rear of the paths or neighbouring property due to excavation, scaffolding or building work. <i>Officer comments: The applicant will be made aware of their need to comply with the requirements of the Party Wall etc. Act 1996, but potential damage as a result of construction is not a material planning consideration.</i> • The construction could leave the neighbouring rear garden unsecure, untidy or damaged, or privacy being impacted. <i>Officer comments: Not a material planning consideration. This is something that will need to be agreed between neighbours and the applicant.</i> • The loss of the garage could lead to parking problems within the cul-de-sac. <i>Officer comments: The WBC Highways officer has no objection to the proposed parking situation.</i> • With the kitchen being relocated works will be needed to the drainage and mains water system, will this only affect no. 18. <i>Officer comments: Not a material planning consideration.</i>
--	--

APPRAISAL

Description of Proposed Works:

This application seeks permission for the proposed erection of a single storey front extension to form a porch. A single storey side extension to form a study, store and utility room following the demolition of the existing garage. Plus, the erection of a single storey rear extension to provide a kitchen and a bedroom with an ensuite bathroom, 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.

Character of the Area:

Front (South) Extension

The proposed single storey front extension will have a pitched roof joining to the host dwelling. The porch extension will comply with the Borough Design Guide (BDG) as the building is set well back from the street frontage and the porch will only project forward 2 metres from the building line. As such, it is deemed that the front extension poses no harm to the character of the area.

Side Extension

The proposed single storey side extension does not adhere to R16 design principle within the BDG in relation to separation distances as the proposal is set approximately 0.2 metres from the boundary with the neighbouring property. But given its proportionate scale and unimposing design, the side extension would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the dwelling and wider area. The BDG states that side extensions should not project forward of the building line on the street frontage. The side extension is aligned with the front of the dwelling, thus showing compliance with this guidance. Additionally, the hipped roof form would ensure that the extension appears as a subservient addition to the dwelling. With the proposed bricks and tiles to match the existing dwelling, it is deemed that the side extension would have an acceptable impact on the host dwelling and character of the area.

Rear (North) Extension

The proposed single storey rear extension does not adhere to R16 design principle within the BDG in relation to separation distance as the proposal is set 0.2 metres from the boundary with the neighbouring property. But, given its proportionate scale and unimposing design, the rear extension would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the dwelling and the wider area. This element of the proposal is to the rear of the property where it would only be partially visible from the public domain which further demonstrates that it poses no harm to the character of the area.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Front (South) Extension

The proposed single storey front extension would extend 2 metres forward of the existing building line and would be single storey in nature. There are no windows proposed on the side of this extension and therefore there are no issues relating to overlooking or loss of light. The front extension is set significantly (approximately 5.65 metres) away from the boundary with the neighbouring property (no. 19 Ratby Close) and therefore it is not considered that the front extension would be overbearing.

Side Extension

The proposed single storey side extension would extend 2.25 metres from the side of the dwelling and is single storey in nature. No windows are proposed on the side of the extension and therefore there are no concerns relating to overlooking. With regards to loss of light, it was raised by a neighbour that the side extension being aligned with the front building line of the host dwelling would cause a loss of light to the side of the bay window on the front elevation of no. 19. Side-facing views towards the application site, and any daylight received from the application site, are essentially 'borrowed from the

host property' so only a limited degree of protection can be afforded in this instance. It is considered that sufficient daylight would still be received through the neighbour's bay window from the front (southern) elevation, hence it is not deemed that the side extension would cause a significant loss of light in planning terms.

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. In this instance there is only a separation distance of 0.2 metres to the boundary, but an eaves height of 2.75 metres raises no concerns on neighbouring amenity terms relating to the issue of overbearing. This is further supported by the fact this element of the proposal aligns with the side wall of the neighbouring dwelling.

Rear (North) Extension

The proposed single storey rear extension would extend 4.6 metres from the rear of the dwelling. There are no windows proposed on the side of the extension facing the neighbouring property and therefore there are no concerns relating to overlooking. With regards to loss of light, given the length of the proposed rear extension, the rear extension would not comply with the 45-degree horizontal test. However, the rear extension would pass the 45-degree vertical test as advocated within the BDG and BRE publication "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice". Therefore, it is not deemed that the rear extension would cause a significant loss of light to the neighbouring property. Additionally, the extension is to the north of the property which further demonstrates that the rear extension would not cause a significant loss of light.

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 proposed development is set 0.2 metres from the boundary with the neighbouring property, but an eaves height of 2.75 metres raises no concerns on neighbouring amenity grounds relating to the issue of overbearing.

Residential Amenity Space:

Section 4 of the BDG provides guidance on the provision of amenity spaces and recommends that 11 metres is a generally accepted depth for private garden space. On this occasion the implementation of a rear extension measuring 4.6 metres in depth would result in a conflict with this guidance as the remaining garden length would be reduced to 7.5 metres. However, considering that the plot is approximately 9.6 metres wide, there would still be an appropriate amount of garden space to facilitate the development, and it will not be detrimental to the enjoyment of the current and future occupiers.

WBC Highways:

The WBC Highways officer has no objection to the proposed parking layout, but they have requested a condition for cycle parking to be approved by the local planning authority. Given that the garden could easily accommodate a shed or another form of secure cycle storage, it is considered to be onerous and unreasonable to attach a condition requiring detail of the cycle parking to be submitted. Accordingly, the condition is not recommended.

Conclusion:

For the reasons 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.

Conditions:

Officer recommended standard conditions: CA2, CA5, CB7

Officer recommended non-standard conditions: None

Consultee recommended conditions: None

Conditions agreed: Not required

RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation:	Approve
Date:	25 September 2024
Earliest date for decision:	27 August 2024

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	25/09/24