

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	251383
Site Address:	57 Beech Lane, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 5QA
Expiry Date:	5 August 2025
Site Visit Date:	9 July 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension, a single storey side extension, and a front dormer extension.	

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 CP6 – Managing Travel Demand CP7 – Biodiversity CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC07 – Parking TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
241806	Householder application for proposed erection of a single storey side/rear extension plus front dormer extension following demolition of the existing detached garage.	Refused: October 2024
142957	Proposed erection of a single storey rear extension and a two storey side extension to dwelling with front and rear dormer windows.	Approved: August 2014

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal
WBC Highways – No objection WBC CIL – No comments WBC Ecology – No comments
External
None

REPRESENTATIONS

Earley Council	Town	No objection
Ward Member(s)		No comments received
Neighbours		No comments received

APPRAISAL

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: It is acknowledged that the single storey side/rear extension as proposed would be particularly large, where, if approved, it would result in a 75% increase to the footprint of the existing property. Nonetheless, the additional built form in this regard would be limited to the ground floor, with little prominence from views along Beech Lane. Furthermore, the enlargement of the dwelling would be partly offset by the demolition of the existing garage, which currently appears as a discordant feature to the rear of the property.

With regard to the enlargement of the existing front facing dormer, this would be positioned within the main roof, set back from the eaves line and side of the roof, and it does not exceed the height of the ridgeline of the existing dormer. It would therefore appear as a subservient feature to the host dwelling.

In line with the above, both the erection of the single storey side and rear extension, and the extension of the existing dormer feature, would have an acceptable visual impact on the dwelling, with negligible impact on the wider area. As such, the proposal complies with policies CP1 & CP3 of the Core Strategy.

Neighbouring Amenity: Whilst it would appear that the extension would result in a large increase in built form along the shared boundary with No.55, it should be noted that beyond the immediate vicinity of the existing dwelling, the garage occupies the boundary between the sites. Accordingly, the added impact of additional built form along the boundary would be limited relative to the existing situation.

The additional elements of fenestration pose no added overlooking concerns.

Ecology: It should be noted that a similar development at the site was recently refused planning permission, through application 241806. The reason for refusal related to the proposals failure to account for bats, a protected species, being on the site, and how the impact on them could be mitigated.

In line with the above, an emergence survey bat report has been submitted with the application. This appropriately demonstrates that no bats were observed to have used features throughout the property for roosting or feeding and no further surveys or mitigation would be required. An informative has been included to advise the applicants on the appropriate steps to take if bats were to be encountered prior to or during the development.

Conclusion: For all the above, the proposal is acceptable, and the application is 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:	21 July 2025
Earliest date for decision:	2 July 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	22 July 2025

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Major Development Location of Earley

Bat Roost Habitats