

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	260698
Site Address:	12 St Marys Road, Sindlesham, Wokingham, RG41 5DA
Expiry Date:	25 August 2026
Site Visit Date:	17 August 2026
Proposal: Householder application for proposed erection of a two storey side extension and a part single part two storey rear extension with 2 no. Juliet balconies following demolition of the existing car port and rear extension, plus installation of a rear gate.	

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 CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage TB06 – Development of Private Residential Gardens
Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update (LPU)	SS1 – Sustainable development principles SS2 – Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy SS4 – Development within or adjacent to minor settlements H12 – Residential development of existing private gardens FD1 – Development and flood risk (from all sources) FD2 – Sustainable drainage
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY

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

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal
WBC Drainage- No objection subject to condition(s) WBC Digital Solutions Scanning- No comments received

WBC CIL- No comments received
External
No comments received

REPRESENTATIONS	
Parish/Town Council	Winnersh Parish Council raise objection to the proposal for the following; - Loss of Privacy – The proposed Juliet balconies would result in overlooking of the neighbouring property at No. 48, leading to an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupiers and their private amenity space. - Relationship to the Boundary – The proposed rear extension is shown extending up to the boundary fence with No. 48. The Committee considers that a gap should be retained between the rear extension and boundary fence to reduce the visual impact of the development, provide appropriate separation and lessen its effect on the neighbouring property.
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	Two representations received - The proposed two-storey extension would appear overbearing and dominant due to its proximity to their dwelling and garden, resulting in a harmful sense of enclosure and a loss of outlook. - Concern is also expressed regarding overlooking and loss of privacy to the objector's garden and habitable rooms, including the living room, kitchen and a rear bedroom. It is argued that the inclusion of Juliet balconies and full-height doors would increase opportunities for overlooking by providing direct views towards the neighbouring property. The representation further refers to the guidance relating to separation distances between facing habitable room windows and considers that the proposed relationship between the properties would result in an unacceptable impact on residential amenity. - The objector considers that the proposed two-storey side and rear extensions would harm the character of St Mary's Road by reducing the visual separation between detached dwellings and creating the appearance of a more continuous form of development. It is argued that the proposal would be out of keeping with the established pattern of development and would appear excessive in scale and massing.

	- Concerns are also raised regarding the impact on residential amenity. The representation states that the proposed extensions would appear overbearing and result in a loss of outlook, increased sense of enclosure, reduced daylight to parts of the neighbouring dwelling, and increased overshadowing of the neighbouring garden. The objector further considers that, when taken together, the side and rear extensions would have a cumulative impact greater than either element individually.
--	--

APPRAISAL

Site Description: The application site relates to a detached two-storey dwellinghouse situated within the residential area of Sindlesham, Wokingham. The dwelling occupies a generous residential plot and is bounded by neighbouring residential properties of a similar scale, design and appearance.

Proposal: This application seeks permission for the proposed erection of a two-storey side extension and a part single part two storey rear extension with 2 no. Juliet balconies following demolition of the existing car port and rear extension, plus installation of a rear gate.

The proposed two-storey side element is approximately 5 meters in depth, 3 meters in width and 2.5 meters to the height of the ridgeline. This part of the proposal at ground floor level will provide an enlarged kitchen, and at first floor level will provide an office/bathroom.

The proposed part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension would project approximately 3 metres beyond the existing rear elevation and span approximately 7 metres in width. At ground floor level, the extension would have a maximum height of approximately 1.5 metres and would provide an enlarged living space serving the dwelling.

At first-floor level, the extension would similarly project approximately 3 metres in depth and 7 metres in width, with a maximum height of approximately 3 metres to the ridgeline. This element of the proposal would provide one additional bedroom and extend an existing bedroom.

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: Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy states that developments are of appropriate scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character the area together with a high quality of design without detriment to other adjoining land users. R1 of the Borough Design Guide SPD requires that development contribute positively towards and be compatible with the historic or underlying character and quality of the local area.

Section 14 of The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places emphasis on securing good design. Paragraph 1 of Design Policy 3 “Key principles for well-designed places” states that *“Development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings”*

Paragraph 3 of Design Policy 3 further confirms that *“Development proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with paragraph 1 of this policy or relevant aspects of the principles in paragraph 2, or with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan (including those in locally specific policies, guides, codes or masterplans”*

St Mary’s Road consists of dwellings that share a similar and coherent architectural style and set of features. The properties are constructed of red brick with tiled hipped roofs and white uPVC windows and doors. The dwellings occupy a generous residential plot. The prevailing housing mix comprises a combination of small terraces, semi-detached and detached properties.





Some properties within the development incorporate Juliet balconies; however, these are significantly different from the development proposed, as these are positioned to the front of the dwelling overlooking the street scene. The properties adjoining no. 12 are set along a staggered building line giving each individual dwelling prominence within the streetscene.

The proposed development would occupy a substantial proportion of the east and southern elevation and would appear excessively large, bulky and dominant. Rather than reading as a subordinate addition, the two-storey side and part single part two storey rear extension would dominate the host dwelling and materially disrupt the simple hipped roof form that is a defining architectural characteristic of the dwelling and the wider estate development.

The addition of a two-storey element above the existing garage, albeit the garage is set to be demolished, would create a near-continuous block of two-storey built form across a substantial proportion of the plot. This would remove the sense of spacing currently experienced and introduce a solid mass of development that appears tightly confined within the site. Although the carport/garage presently occupies part of this position it is a lightweight structure, set back from the principle elevation. The proposed development introduction of additional height and bulk would materially increase the overall bulk and massing, resulting in an incongruous and visually cramped form of development hard against the front and side boundaries.

The design concerns are further exacerbated by the fact that the proposal fails to comply with the Borough Design Guide (BDG). In relation to side/rear extensions, the primary concern is the impact upon neighbours. As set out above, the proposed development would dominate the host dwelling and materially disrupt the simple hipped roof form that is a defining characteristic of the dwelling and the wider estate development. The simple hipped roof form is a recurring design feature of both the host dwelling and surrounding estate development. The scale and configuration of the proposed side and rear additions would substantially diminish the visual dominance of this roof form, undermining a key element of the architectural character and coherence of the estate. Moreover, the proposed two storey side/ rear element would be approximately 13 meters from the rear of No. 48 St Mary's Road which is a significant

shortfall as to the advised distance of 22 meters as set out in the Borough Design Guide. The impact of this will be later discussed in the neighbouring section of the report. The first-floor accommodation extends across the full width of the rear elevation with two sets of full-height doors and Juliet balconies which substantially reinforces the argument that the proposal is an overly dominant enlargement rather than a subordinate addition.

The proposed development would also detrimentally impact the simplicity and continuity of the existing dwelling and would be out of keeping with the other nearby houses which also have a simple form resulting in a contrived and incongruous design. The existing front elevation benefits from five symmetrical windows that provide balance and continuity. The introduction of a set of bi-fold doors and one additional window to the front elevation does not reflect the established style would disrupt this unified appearance.

A defining characteristic of this part of St Mary's Road is the visual separation between dwellings, with subordinate garages and open space between the principal built forms. The proposal would substantially erode this separation by introducing two-storey built development across much of the side plot, resulting in a terracing effect and materially reducing the sense of openness that presently contributes to the spacious character of the street scene. Overall, the form and variation in fenestration results in a contrived appearance, lacking the simple form that characterises both the host dwelling and the surrounding properties. Rather than appearing as a sympathetic addition, the extension would read as a visually discordant enlargement, harmful to the overall street scene.

The proposal would transform the dwelling from a simple detached house with a hipped roof into a substantially larger and more complex building occupying much of the available plot width. The scale, massing and siting of the side and rear extensions would erode the visual separation between buildings and create an unduly bulky and dominant form of development. The alterations to the front elevation and roof form would further detract from the simple and cohesive architectural character that typifies both the host dwelling and the surrounding estate. The proposed development is contrary to policy CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy, the Borough Design Guide SPD and section 14 of the NPPF.

Neighbouring Amenity: Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy, which requires development to be of an appropriate scale, mass, layout and height, and to achieve a high quality of design without detriment to the amenities or quality of life of adjoining occupiers.

As mentioned, the proposed extension would extend across the rear boundary positioning-built form in line with No.48 St Mary's Road and No.14 St Mary's Road. As stated above, the Borough Design Guide (BDG) recommends a minimum back-to-back separation distance of 22 metres between two-storey dwellings. In this case, the proposed extension would be positioned only approximately 13 meters from the neighbouring rear elevation, allowing overlooking into private residential amenity areas and rear windows. Although the existing dwelling does not fully comply with current guidance the main rear windows of the dwelling do not directly overlook the rear neighbour due to the asymmetric plot presently the garage is the only built form with direct relationship to 48 St. Mary's Road. Although there may be some indirectly overlooking at present this does justify further intensification of built form that would

materially worsen the relationship and create additional harm to neighbour amenity. The proposal would fundamentally alter that arrangement by introducing extensive two-storey accommodation and first-floor habitable-room windows directly facing No. 48. The proposal would therefore fail to reflect the separation standards intended to safeguard residential amenity.

Furthermore, the additional two-storey built form across the eastern elevation would fall on No.14 St Mary's Road boundary, as show on the block plan. The proposed two-storey side extension would be constructed immediately adjacent to the common boundary with No. 14 St Mary's Road. The development would replace the existing sense of openness at the side of the plot with a substantial two-storey wall of development extending along much of the boundary. Due to its height, length and proximity, the proposal would create an increased sense of enclosure and an unduly dominant and overbearing relationship when viewed from the neighbouring property and its private rear amenity space, resulting in further harm to residential amenity. As mentioned in the representations received, there has been concerns raised regarding the sense of enclosure, and overbearing relationship on the neighbouring dwellings. As discussed, the proposed development introduces additional block form and by doing this, creates a sense of enclosure particularly on No.14 St Mary's Road, and dominates the established street scene.

Therefore, the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupants at No. 14 and 48 St Mary's Road by reason of an over-dominant and overbearing impact; and a perception of overlooking, contrary to policy CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy, the Borough Design Guide SPD and section 14 of the NPPF.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: There is no change in level of driveway parking available, and no off- street parking is proposed. As a result, the proposal does not impact parking or access provisions, therefore, no comments from the Council's Highways Officer have been raised.

Flooding and Drainage: The application site is situated within Flood Zone 1 and whilst the Council's Flooding and Drainage Officer raise no objection to the principle of the proposed development, it is acknowledged that the development would result in an increase in impermeable surface area, and a condition has been recommended requiring the submission of drainage details prior to commencement. It is considered that such a condition is not necessary in this instance. Having regard to the limited scale of the proposal and the site's location within an area of low flood risk, the development is not considered likely to give rise to significant drainage or flooding concerns.

Ecology: The application site is situated in an area suitable for bat roosts. The Preliminary Roost Assessment submitted by John Wenman Ecology undertaken on the 8th June 2026, concluded that the property and attached garage lacked any potential bat access points or crevice roosting opportunities, therefore, the property is considered to be of negligible potential suitability for bats.

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 reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation. 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.

Conclusion: The proposed development is unacceptable, will result in material harm and is contrary to National and Development Plan policies for the following reasons;

1. The proposed development, by reason of its excessive scale, massing, width, siting and design, would result in a disproportionate and unsympathetic enlargement of the host dwelling. The development would fail to remain subordinate to the original dwelling, substantially erode the characteristic spacing between neighbouring properties, diminish the simple hipped roof form that is a defining feature of the dwelling and surrounding estate, and create a cramped, contrived and visually discordant form of development. As a result, the proposal would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the established pattern of development and the prevailing character of the area. The proposed development is contrary to policy CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy, the Borough Design Guide SPD and section 14 of the NPPF 2026.
2. The proposed development, by reason of its scale, height, massing and siting, would result in an unacceptable relationship with neighbouring residential properties. The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupants at No. 14 and 48 St Mary's Road by reason of an over-dominant and overbearing impact; and unacceptable overlooking, contrary to policy CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy, the Borough Design Guide SPD and section 14 of the NPPF 2026.

RECOMMENDATION	
Conditions agreed:	Not required
Recommendation:	Refuse
Date:	18 August 2026
Earliest date for decision:	27 July 2026

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>HMM</i>
Date:	24 August 2026