

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	241977
Site Address:	23 Aldbourne Avenue, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 7DB
Expiry Date:	30 September 2024
Site Visit Date:	11 September 2024
Proposal: Householder application for proposed single storey front infill extension, 2 storey side extension, part single part 2 storey rear extension with changes to the fenestration.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Scale and Location of Development Proposals – Major Development Location of Earley 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

External

None

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Earley Town Council raise objection to this application by virtue of the design, built form, mass and character of the extension on this prominent corner plot. They also find it fails
---------------------	---

	to create a good design solution that complements the character and location of the property. <i>Officer comments: The potential impact on the character of the area will be assessed within the main report.</i>
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	Four neighbours have commented on this application and their comments are summarised below: - Has the applicant addressed the potential impact of the extension on the prominent trees in the adjoining highway verge. <i>Officer comments: The proposed side extension will extend 4 metres from the side of the dwelling, and it is not deemed that this would significantly impact the trees on the adjoining highway verge. Additionally, it is noted that these trees are not protected trees or veteran trees.</i> - The site plan does not appear to reflect the situation on the ground. The boundary fence and wall appear to follow the back edge of the footway and do not angle in slightly as indicated by the red line. <i>Officer comments: A revised proposed site plan was received on 30/09/2024 to amend this inaccuracy.</i> - The size of this extension may open the flood gates to similar applications where houses would be extended to more than twice their original size. <i>Officer comments: The application site is a corner plot and therefore benefits from the opportunity to extend out further to the side. The potential impact on the character of the area will be assessed within the main report.</i> - Extending 6m from the property is very significant and impactful, how would this impact the garden outlook from our house. <i>Officer comments: The potential impact on neighbouring amenities will be assessed within the main report.</i> - It is unclear from the drawings as to the height of the planned extension, and the potential impacts of this. <i>Officer comments: The single storey element of the rear extension has an eaves height of 2.6 metres, and the potential impacts will be assessed within the main report.</i>

APPRAISAL

Description of Proposed Work:

This application seeks permission for proposed erection of a single storey front infill extension, this will see the front door being brought forward to be in line with the front of the dwelling. A two storey side extension, this will provide a study, playroom and

ensuite bathroom at ground floor level and this will provide a bedroom and two ensuite bathrooms at first floor level. A part single, part two storey rear extension, this will provide a sitting area and kitchen at ground floor level and a bedroom and bathroom at first floor level.

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 Infill Extension:

The proposed front infill extension to bring the front door forwards to being in line with the front of the dwelling poses no harm to the character of the area.

Side Extension:

The Borough Design Guide (BDG) states that “side extensions should not project forward of the building line on the street frontage(s)” and “side extensions should be set back from the building by at least 1m, preferably with a lower roof line and should be set at least 1m from the plot boundary”. The proposed two storey side extension is aligned with the front of the dwelling at ground floor level, is set back by 0.5 metres at first floor level and the ridge height is set down by approximately 0.2 metres from the main roof. Additionally, the side extension is set 0.5 metres from the boundary at the nearest point. Whilst not fully complying with the guidance in the BDG, it is demonstrated that the side extension will appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling. It is therefore considered that the side extension which extends by 4 metres from the side of the dwelling poses no harm to the character of the area.

Rear Extension:

The proposed part single, part two storey rear extension does not adhere to R16 design principle within the BDG in relation to separation distances as the proposal is set right on the boundary with the neighbouring property at the nearest point. But, given its proportionate scale and unimposing design, the rear extension would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the dwelling and 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 Infill Extension:**

The proposed front infill extension to bring the front door forward to being in line with the front of the dwelling would not have any overbearing, loss of light, or overlooking impacts on neighbouring amenities.

Side Extension:

The proposed two storey side extension is on the side away from the neighbouring property no. 25, and therefore there are no concerns relating to overbearing and loss of light. Windows are proposed on the side of the extension but given that these face no. 21 which due to the applications site being on a corner plot is on the other side of Ramsbury Drive. These windows are 14.4 metres from the boundary with no. 21 and therefore there are no concerns relating to overlooking.

Rear Extension:

The single storey element of the proposed part single part two storey rear extension will extend 6 metres from the rear of the dwelling. There are no windows on the side of the single storey element of the rear extension and therefore there are no concerns relating to overlooking. The neighbouring property, no. 25, has benefited from a rear extension, and the single storey element proposed under this application will only extend by 3.4 metres beyond this. To avoid being overbearing, guidance in the BDG states that the eaves height of single storey rear extensions should not exceed 3 metres within 2 metres of a side boundary. The proposed development is right on the boundary with the neighbouring property at the closest point, but an eaves height of 2.6 metres shows compliance with the guidance. Additionally, given this modest eaves height, the rear extension would comply with the 45-degree vertical test as advocated within the BDG and the 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.

The two storey element of the rear extension extends 3 metres from the rear of the dwelling, but it is set 3.4 metres from the boundary with the neighbouring property. This adequate separation distance for the two storey element raises no concerns on neighbouring amenity grounds relating to loss of light or overbearing. One window is proposed on the side of the two storey element, but this faces no. 21 which due to the application site's location on a corner plot is on the other side of Ramsbury Drive. This window is 14.4 metres from the boundary of no. 21 and therefore there are no concerns relating to overlooking. Overall, the rear extension poses no harm to neighbouring amenities.

Residential Amenity Space:

The proposal would not adversely harm the usability of the site's rear amenity space for current or future occupiers.

WBC Highways:

The WBC Highways officer is satisfied with the proposed level of parking and has no objection to the proposal. However, a condition has been recommended for cycle parking to be approved by the local planning authority. There is an existing outbuilding at the rear of the garden which could be used for cycle parking, and therefore it is

considered too onerous and unreasonable to attach a condition requiring further cycle parking. 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: 30 September 2024

Earliest date for decision: 27 August 2024

Recommendation agreed by:
(Authorised Officer)



Date: 01/10/24