

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	250808
Site Address:	67 Reynards Close, Winnersh, Wokingham, RG41 5NU
Expiry Date:	11 July 2025
Site Visit Date:	6 May 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a single storey front extension, the erection of a two storey side and rear extension, installation of 1 no. roof light, changes to fenestration and the demolition of the existing conservatory.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Local Authorities
Affordable Housing Thresholds
Bat Roost Habitat Suitability
Borough Parishes
Scale and Location of Development Proposals
Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone
Nuclear Consultation Zone
Borough Wards
Landscape Character Assessment Area
SSSI Impact Risk Zones
JCEB Mineral Safeguarding Areas

PLANNING POLICY

National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
Core Strategy (CS)	CP1 – Sustainable Development CP2 – Inclusive Communities CP3 – General Principles for Development CP6 – Managing Travel Demand CP7 – Biodiversity CP8 – Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC05 – Renewable Energy and Decentralised Energy Networks CC06 – Noise CC07 – Parking
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY- No relevant planning history

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways: No objection subject to conditions

WBC Ecology: No objection

WBC CIL: See CIL section of report

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	No comments received
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received

APPRAISAL

Site Description: Two storey semi-detached dwelling.

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: The Borough Design Guide states *“porches should generally project less than 2m forward of the building line”*. The front porch would approx. 1.50m forward of the building line, thus complying with the BDG. Furthermore, the porch is considered to be modest in scale and form which does not harm the street scene.

The Borough Design Guide states *“side extensions should be set back from the building line by at least 1m, preferably with a lower roof line and should be at least 1m from the plot boundary”*. The proposed two storey side extension would be set back from the building by over 1m, with a lower roof line and 1m from the plot boundary, thus complying with the BDG. It would be built over and not project forward of the existing garage making it a large extension but it remains subservient to the main dwelling and an unimposing feature which would not harm the character of the area. The proposed roof form would match that of the existing, in keeping with the current characteristics of the dwelling. Furthermore, it's clear the proposal has taken design

inspiration from 68 Reynards Close and therefore would not look out of place and be acceptable.

The single storey flat roof rear extension would have a very similar footprint as the existing conservatory, so it is not going to have a significant harmful impact. With it being located at the rear it wouldn't be visible from public locations. Hence, the proposal would unlikely have an adverse impact on the character of the host property or surrounding area. Moreover, the host property has a very spacious garden to accommodate for such sized extension.

The BDG requires rear extensions to be limited to 4m in depth and extensions to be stepped down from the main ridge. It also seeks to achieve a coherent and well-designed approach that influences and responds to the original building. The two-storey rear extension would be greater than 3m in depth with rear extension would be stepped down from the main ridge, thus complying with the BDG. The eaves/ridge height would be set down from the main dwelling appearing as a subservient feature. Whilst the proposed roof form would be odds with the main dwelling, such addition would be largely indiscernible and not visible from the public domain. Hence, it would not have an adverse impact on the character of the host property or surrounding area.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: The scheme would add additional window at the front of the property as part of the side extension. The proposed window would overlook onto Reynards Close, thus no overlooking concerns. As part of the front porch a side window would be added but would not result in harmful overlooking.

The ground floor windows will be screened by the exiting boundary treatments, thus no harmful overlooking concerns.

The first-floor rear elevation of the property contains two windows with an additional window proposed. The first-floor rear element would project 3m further than the existing. However, most rear gardens are overlooked at an oblique angle from the upper floor windows in the neighbouring property. This is no different with the new window as part of the first-floor rear extension and its oblique angle/view of no.66 and no.68 rear garden. Thus, the rear window would not cause any significant harm with regards to neighbouring amenities and the relationship with the neighbouring house would be orthodox for dwellings in a suburban area.

The minimum back-to-back separation distance over 2 storey is 26m. The separation distance from the back of 67 Reynards Close and back of 21 Danywern Drive is over 30m, thus complying with the BDG.

Loss of Light: No.66 does have a bedroom window on the first-floor side elevation. For the initial consideration of windows opposite a proposed new extension, the British Research Establishment (BRE) Daylight and Sunlight Analysis guide advocates a 25-degree angle rule of thumb test. The extension would breach the 25-degree rule as shown on plan 003/B.

However, as shown on plan 005, the extension sits within the zone 45 degrees from the window, this is facing back which is to the north-east. The compass sun path shows the path is not obscured by the proposed extension, in fact it is obscured by the existing house before it is obscured by the extension due to the 1m set back and subservience. Furthermore, the extension is approx. 3.65m away from the no.66 flank wall.

Whilst it does breach the 25-degree angle rule of thumb test, when the above is considered, it would still have adequate access to natural light no.66 bedroom.

As a result of the rear extension, there is a potential loss of light to the rear windows of no.68. Whilst a line of 45* degrees would marginally be breached as a result of the extension, the 45* degree rule of thumb is guidance rather than policy, and so is applied on a case-by-case basis. In this instance, the breach is considered minimal and only a limited amount of light would be lost to patio doors of the kitchen/diner. Furthermore, the kitchen/diner benefits from a secondary window on the rear elevation therefore and this is not considered to be a reasonable reason to refuse the scheme given its compliance with local policy in other respects and given the neighbouring property would still have adequate access to natural light.

The first floor is compliant with the 45-degree lines to the nearest window of no.68.

Also, it's important to note that no objections were raised by no.4.

Overbearing: The proposal would not appear physically overbearing or oppressive to neighbours with the height of the dwelling not increasing and as such that it would be significantly detrimental to their amenities.

The overall scale and massing of the extension is proportionate to the host property and consistent with typical residential extensions in the surrounding area. It does not introduce an excessive height, depth, or bulk that would dominate neighbouring outlooks, thus not considered to be overbearing.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: Following the submission of parking plan show on 004/B, the proposed part conversion of the existing front garden into hardstanding for the third parking space is acceptable subject to conditions. Such conditions have been attached in the decision notice.

Ecology: All species of bats are protected under The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017). Under this legislation it is a strict liability offence to injure or destroy a bat or to disturb damage or destroy the resting place of a bat. A bat roost is interpreted as any structure or place used for shelter or protection whether or not bats are present at the time.

The officer is satisfied that the survey effort is adequate to conclude the property currently has negligible potential for roosting bats. Provided that the development is implemented in accordance with Section 4 of the Bat Scoping Survey there are no objections to the development as proposed.

Amenity Space: The proposal reduces the amount of amenity space available to the property, but it would still be roughly rectangular in shape, receive sunlight for part of the day and be able to accommodate typical garden activities for the size of property as set out in the Borough Design Guide. Therefore, the reduction in amenity space is not considered to have a harmful impact on the amenity of the occupier.

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.

It's 80sqm new build floor space, which is below the CIL threshold.

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:	Yes
Recommendation:	Approve
Date:	4 July 2025
Earliest date for decision:	21 May 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	4 July 2025