



DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Number:	251171
Site Address:	6 The Mews, High Street, Sonning, Wokingham, RG4 6UP
Expiry Date:	14 July 2025
Site Visit Date:	22 May 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed single storey rear extension.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Conservation Area
Archaeological Sites
Scale and Location of Development Proposals – Limited Development Location (Sonning)
Landscape Character Assessment Area
Listed Building Buffer Zone

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 TB21 – Landscape Character TB24 – Designated Heritage Assets TB25 – Archaeology
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Sonning Parish Design Statement Sonning Design Appraisal

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
001625	Proposed demolition of the garage and works within conservation area.	Approved – 25 July 2000.
990027	Proposed erection of 6 dwellings.	Approved – 18 November 1999

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC CIL – No comments received.

External

Berkshire Archaeology – No objection.

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Sonning Parish Council – have carefully considered this application and can find no reason to object.
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received

APPRAISAL**Site Description:**

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling in the village of Sonning a limited development location within Wokingham Borough. The property is also within the Sonning Conservation Area. The Mews is a gated complex of six houses along the High Street of Sonning. The surrounding area is made up of a variety of housing types from semi-detached, detached, terraces and cottages. The majority of properties along the High Street are listed. The properties vary in age, style and character with most houses have no parking or garages and instead having on street parking.

The host property is made out of a reddish brick and a tiled roof. The property is not listed and is a newer age being built in 2001. The property has a small rear garden and a dormer window at the front and back in the roof. The house has a small, shared driveway with other properties along the Mews. There is parking outside the dwelling for two vehicles.

Proposal:

The application is for the proposed single storey rear extension to provide additional ground floor accommodation, changes to fenestration and the installation of roof lights.

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.

Design and Character of the Area:

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.

Rear extension:

In the Borough Design Guide, it states that rear extensions should not project more than four metres from the main rear wall where they are close to a side boundary. In this case the rear extension measures 3 metres in length and is less than four metres from the main rear wall. Therefore, the proposed rear extension meets this aspect of the Borough Design Guide.

Also, for rear extensions the Borough Design Guide states that the maximum eaves and ridge height should be no more than those of the existing property. The maximum eaves height of the proposed rear extension is 2.75 metres whilst the maximum eaves height of the existing property is 3.82 metres and is less than those of the existing property and therefore meets this set criteria of the Borough Design Guide. The ridge height of the proposed rear extension measures 3 metres whilst the ridge height of the existing property is 7.21 metres and is less than the existing property and therefore meets this set criteria of the Borough Design Guide.

For single storey rear extensions, the Borough Design Guide states that the eaves height should not exceed three metres within two metres of a side boundary. The eaves height of the proposed rear extension measures 2.75 metres which is less than three metres within two metres of a side boundary. Therefore, it does meet this aspect of the Borough Design Guide.

In terms of materials the existing house is made out of a red brown facing brickwork and the proposed extension will be constructed out of a red brown facing brickwork to blend with the existing house. The existing house roof is made out of brown concrete roof tiles and the proposed roof of the rear extension will be constructed out of a proprietary roof system with brown (burnt umber) roof tiles. The window of the existing house is made out of brown timber. The proposed new windows of the rear extension will be made out of brown, black uPVC. The doors to the existing house are made out of brown timber and the proposed doors will be made out of brown, black uPVC. The materials should match the existing house or be as close as possible to the existing house and these will be secured via a condition.

There have been examples of similar applications for rear extensions in the area. No 1, no. 2 and no. 3 The Mews have had similar applications for rear extensions (WBC Refs. 220586, 170807 and 051536) approved and implemented. This shows other houses along The Mews have had similar applications approved and as such would not be out keeping with the character of the area.

Overall, in terms of design it complies with all of the criteria of the Borough Design Guide in a number of respects. The proposed single storey rear extension would not have any detrimental effect on the existing street scene, or the character of the area. The proposal is acceptable in accordance with the rear extension criteria of the Borough Design Guide and in terms of design and character.

Conservation Area:

Policy TB24 of the Management Development Delivery (MDD) states that applications in Conservation Areas should have supporting development proposals or other initiatives that will conserve and, where possible, enhance the local character, setting, management, and historical significance of designated heritage assets. As the extension is at the rear of the property and will not be visible from the front or the street, the proposed extension will not cause any significant harm to the conservation area. In this case the proposed single storey rear extension will conserve and enhance the conservation area. The proposed extension will not look out of place being in a conservation area due to the materials matching the existing as close as possible. Therefore, the proposed extension should not have a significant impact on the conservation area.

Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, there have been other extensions approved and implemented nearby and so this proposal will not be out of keeping or unduly affect the character of the surrounding conservation area. The proposed extension meets policy TB24 of the MDD.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Policy CP3 states that development should not have any detrimental effect on the amenities of adjoining land users. In the Borough Design Guide the primary consideration for rear extensions is its impact upon neighbours.

Overlooking:

For rear extensions, the Borough Design Guide states that the side walls of extensions must not contain windows especially at first floor level, to minimise any potential impact upon the privacy of neighbours. The proposed single storey rear extension will not include the addition of any new windows at first floor level due to the proposed rear extension being single storey.

The proposed development will include changes to fenestration. There will be no fenestration changes to the front of the property although there will be an installation of a new ground floor window at the proposed eastern elevation which will look towards the far end of the rear garden on The Old House. Moreover, views would be heavily screened by vegetation along the boundary of these two properties so not significantly overlooking would occur to this neighbour. At the rear of the property the existing bifold doors will be removed and the existing opening will be enlarged. The proposed rear extension will include the replacement bifold doors out into the garden and a pitched roof. The proposal will also include the erection of two roof lights which will be on either side of the roof of the proposed extension.

The distance between the proposed replacement ground floor bifold door windows and habitable room windows in the rear of Brook House looking northwards towards the application site, would be approx. 11.5 metres. While this back-to-back arrangement would be less than the 22 metres advocated within the Borough Design Guide, no significant overlooking to Brook House would occur due to the proposed extension being single storey only and screened from existing vegetation. Hence, a line of sight

would only exist between the rear windows in the proposed extension and the first-floor rear windows of Brook House, which would be elevated above. Moreover, views between these windows would be at an oblique angle further limiting any direct overlooking between these two properties. Therefore, there are no concerns in respect of any significant loss of privacy to neighbouring resulting from this application.

Loss of Light:

A 45-degree horizontal line was taken from the centre of the adjoining neighbour's closest habitable room at no. 5 The Mews. The line would be breached and the test failed.

Vertical loss of light test:

As the proposed development fails the 45-degree horizontal loss of light test, a 45-degree vertical loss of light test is required to see if the proposed development will result in any loss of light to the neighbour at no. 5 The Mews.

Figure 1 below shows the vertical 45-degree angle test from the corner of the proposed extension. This test is advocated within the British Research Establishment's (BRE) publication Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to good practice to assess impact on daylight and sunlight levels to neighbours potentially impacted upon by adjacent developments. As can be seen here the test is complied with in relation ground floor window to the nearest habitable room of the neighbouring property.

Figure 1 – annotated image to show 45-degree angle in relation to rear ground floor of neighbouring property (not to scale).



Proposed Rear Elevation

As the proposed extension is ground floor only, the 45-degree vertical test would be complied with (see above) which demonstrates that there would only be a limited loss of light for this neighbour during the first half of the day. Furthermore, due to the neighbours' garden being south facing they would still receive full sunlight unobstructed by the proposed rear extension in the afternoons and evenings.



Figure 2 - screenshot showing the Mews collection of houses.

The house on the left is no. 5 The Mews and no. 6 The Mews on the right. This shows the distance between the two properties and how no. 5 The Mews sits back to no. 6 the Mews. The window on the left-hand side is where the vertical loss of light test was taken from.

Overbearing:

The proposed single storey rear extension building line will come out 4.6 metres further than the neighbour at no. 5 The Mews. The existing dwelling is already set forward from the rear building line from the neighbour at no. 5. As such the primary assessment needs to be made in relation to no. 5 The Mews. Owing to the extension being single storey and of a limited height of 3 metres, only its shallow pitched roof would be visible over the existing boundary fence between these two properties. Also, due to the dwelling being set slightly off the site boundary (by approx. 0.45metres) and no significant overbearing presence would occur.

Amenity Space:

The existing rear garden measures 11.87 metres long and the proposed rear extension will measure 3 metres in depth. Therefore, the remaining garden space will be 8.87 metres. This is more garden space than some properties in the Mews and overall considered a sufficient level of amenity space would be retained.

Archaeology:

Policy TB25 of the Management Development Delivery (MDD) states that applications in areas of high archaeological potential, applicants will need to provide a detailed assessment of the impact on archaeological remains.

Berkshire Archaeology were consulted on the application. They had no objection to the application and did not believe a condition was necessary to be imposed. Berkshire Archaeology commented that although in an area in the historic core of Sonning, they do not believe mitigation is necessary or proportionate for this application.

They went on to further say mitigation, in the form of a watching brief, was undertaken immediately to the west in 2001, however no archaeological deposits were identified – although the ground was shown to be intact with no truncation, which suggests some potential remains.

Given the scale of this extension, however combined with the results of the previous mitigation at the garage site, they do not recommend mitigation for this application. Therefore, there are no concerns with Berkshire Archaeology and the proposal meets policy TB25 of the MDD.

Conclusion:

Taking all the above into consideration, the proposal is deemed acceptable in relation to national and local policy and therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

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 subject to conditions: 1. Time Limit 2. Approved Plans 3. Materials and Specified
Date:	9 July 2025
Earliest date for decision:	10 June 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	09/07/25