

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	242050
Site Address:	25 Tiger Close, Woodley, Wokingham, RG5 4UY
Expiry Date:	4 October 2024
Site Visit Date:	10 September 2024
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension with rooflights, single storey front infill extension and fenestration changes following demolition of the existing raised patio at the rear.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Major Development Location (Woodley)
Landscape Character Assessment Area – Woodley-Earley Settled and Farmed Clay

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 CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC07 – Parking TB21 – Landscape Character
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Woodley Design Statement

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
F/2007/2669	Proposed first floor and two storey side extension to dwelling.	C/A – 12/12/2007
F/2007/1715	Proposed erection of two storey side and rear extension to dwelling. Demolition of existing garage.	Refused – 04/09/2007
19124	Detached House & Garage	C/A – 31/03/1983

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

None consulted

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Woodley Town Council raised no objection.
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	1 comment received objecting on the following grounds: - Overdevelopment of the plot's original footprint, excessive increase in volume of built form which is out of character. <i>Officer's Comment: This is discussed in the 'Design and Character of the Area' section of the report.</i> - Loss of light and overbearing impact on No.24 Tiger Close resulting from the height and depth of the rear extension. <i>Officer's Comment: This is discussed in the 'Neighbouring Amenity' section of the report.</i> - Reduction of rear garden space will set a clear precedent for similar development across the estate. <i>Officer's Comment: This is discussed in the 'Amenity Space' section of the report. Each application submitted to the Local Planning Authority must be assessed on its own merits.</i>

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application site is a detached two storey dwellinghouse located within the 1980's Woodley Airfield residential development. The dwelling sits at the southern end of a row of 4no. detached dwellings on a shared access drive off the cul-de-sac (Tiger Close) which are similar in style but have a varied appearance due to differing alterations and extensions. The site benefits from a previous two storey side extension to the southern elevation.

Proposal:

This application proposes the erection of a single storey rear extension, a single storey front infill extension and other alterations to the site's frontage as well as the demolition of a raised patio at the rear.

The proposed rear extension would have a depth of approximately 4m beyond the original rear elevation and would span the full width of the dwelling. The extension would have a part flat, part pitched roof form with a total ridge height of approximately 3.7m and eaves height of 2.75m. The single storey front would have a modest depth of approximately 0.9m and would not encroach the existing front building line, with a pitched roof form at a total height of approximately 3.45m.

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:

There are several examples of rear extensions within the area which vary greatly in terms of form and size, including two storey additions. While the proposed single storey rear extension would further enlarge the footprint of the host dwelling, it would not be a disproportionately sized or bulky addition due to its modest eaves height, appropriate roof form and the existing gaps between the site and its side boundaries being retained.

The shape and size of residential plots varies considerably across the wider estate. The size and form of the proposed rear extension is not dissimilar from other examples of large single storey rear extensions within the area and is therefore not out of character in this respect. While the proposal would be partly visible from the main street (Tiger Close), it would not appear overly dominant from public vantage points to the south due to the separation from the site's rear and side (southern) boundaries fronting Tiger Close.

The proposed single storey front infill extension is a modest addition to the site's frontage which would respect the existing principal building line. The alterations to the existing canopy roof would complement the main gable roof form and is in keeping with similar additions within the wider estate.

While it is acknowledged that the site benefits from a previous two storey side extension, it is not considered that the proposal is synonymous with overdevelopment of the residential plot due to the reasons identified above. Although it would constitute a further enlargement over and above the size of the original dwelling, the total size following the development would not be out of character for a detached family sized dwelling within an urban setting.

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

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: Due to the single storey nature of the proposal, there are no concerns relating to potential overlooking impact. The proposed demolition of the raised patio

area at the rear, which appears to have been constructed without planning permission and enables direct views into the rear fenestration and amenity space serving No.26 Tiger Close adjacent, is a significant positive of the scheme and improves the amenity of the adjacent neighbour in this respect.

Loss of Light: An objection has been raised regarding potential loss of light impact on the rear facing windows and garden space serving No.26 Tiger Close adjacent to the north. The extension would retain a minimum separation distance from No.26 of approximately 2.35m, with a minimum separation distance of approximately 0.8m from the shared boundary.

While the proposal would encroach beyond the shared building line with No.26, any potential loss of light impact on the rear facing windows and garden space would be sufficiently mitigated due to the proposal being set sufficiently in from the boundary, its flat roof form and relatively modest ridge height. Moreover, measurements taken on the submitted plans from the rear elevation of No.26 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 received regarding potential overbearing impact on No.26 Tiger Close adjacent to the north. 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 flat roof form and relatively modest ridge height its design would sufficiently mitigate any potential overbearing impact.

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.

Amenity Space:

Section 4.7 of the Borough Design Guide SPD provides guidance on the provision of amenity space and recommends that 11m is a generally suitable depth for private garden space. In this case, the proposed 4m deep rear extension would conflict with this guidance as the remaining garden length would be reduced to approximately 6m. however, considering that the plot is approximately 10m wide, the development would retain an appropriate amount of garden space for the size of the dwelling and remain usable.

Moreover, the demolition of the existing raised patio area and its replacement with a level grasses area would result in a more functional garden space and is a significant benefit of the scheme. As such, the proposal would not be detrimental to the enjoyment of current and future occupiers of the site.

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:	2 October 2024
Earliest date for decision:	6 September 2024

Recommendation agreed by:	
(Authorised Officer)	
Date:	02/10/24