

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	251567
Site Address:	82 Cannock Way, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 4EF
Expiry Date:	10 October 2025
Site Visit Date:	05/09/2025
Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of a single storey side extension to existing ground floor flat.	

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 CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC05 – Renewable Energy and Decentralised Energy Networks CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage TB21 – Landscape Character TB22 – Sites of Urban Landscape Value
Joint Minerals and Waste Plan (JMWP)	DM1 - Sustainable Development DM2 - Climate Change – Mitigation and Adaptation
Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update (LPU)	SS1 – Sustainable development principles SS3 – Development within or adjacent to major and modest settlements CE1 – Design principles for efficient buildings NE4 – Trees, woodland, hedges and hedgerows NE5 – Landscape and design NE6 – Valued landscapes NE7 – Sites of Urban Landscape Value DH1 – Place making and quality design DH2 – Safeguarding amenity
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY

There is no relevant Planning Application or Planning Appeal History to the current application (i.e. being substantially the same development).

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Drainage – No objections, subject to a condition.

WBC Highways – No objections.

WBC Landscape and Trees – No objections.

External

None consulted.

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Earley Town Council raises no objection to this application. However, the applicant's notice should be drawn to the need to serve a Party Wall Notice on the first-floor maisonette, No.78, for works to their flank wall.
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	Flat 78, Cannock Way – Has raised the following comments: <u>Consultation & Access:</u> They dispute the applicant's claim of prior informal consultation, noting no direct engagement before submission. <i>Officer comment: All neighbouring occupiers were notified by the Local Planning Authority through the statutory neighbour notification procedure. While informal engagement prior to submission did not occur, this is not a statutory requirement and does not affect the validity of the application.</i> <u>Loss of Outlook & Overbearing Impact:</u> The extension would replace the view from the first-floor kitchen side window with a flat roof, which they argue will accumulate debris and reduce outlook. The extension would also be directly visible from their garden and parking area, creating a sense of enclosure and blocking light. <u>Boundary & Infrastructure:</u> Questions are raised regarding the legal ownership of the existing boundary wall, foundations, and potential impacts on a relocated waste manhole. <i>Officer comment: Matters relating to the legal ownership of the boundary wall, foundations, and the relocation of services such as a waste manhole are not material planning considerations. These issues are typically addressed through the Party Wall etc. Act 1996, building regulations, or civil agreements between property owners.</i>

	<i>From a planning perspective, the proposal can be assessed without prejudice to these private arrangements.</i> <u>Maintenance Access:</u> The proposed extension could restrict access to the kitchen window and roofline features, complicating window cleaning and routine maintenance. <u>Noise & Occupancy:</u> Existing poor soundproofing is noted, and the extension is expected to increase noise disturbance. The occupier also expresses concern that the additional bedroom could allow larger households, changing occupancy patterns and increasing disturbance. <u>Structural Concerns:</u> Potential impacts on the structural integrity of their property due to works on shared walls and services are highlighted, though they acknowledge this is not typically a planning matter. <u>Character & Precedent:</u> The occupier disputes claims that the proposal is comparable to other extensions in the area, arguing it is out of character with the building and could set a precedent for other flats, creating inequities between leaseholders. <i><u>Officer comments:</u> Each planning application is considered on its own merits, taking into account the specific site context, design, and impacts on neighbouring properties. The potential approval of this proposal would not automatically set a precedent for other flats, as future applications would be assessed individually against the relevant planning policies and guidance.</i> Please refer to the Officer Report below, which addresses the remaining concerns raised above.
--	---

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application site relates to a ground-floor flat within a two-storey residential building, located in an established residential area. The surrounding area is primarily characterised by semi-detached properties set in discernible groupings which are distinguished by repeated house type.

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 application site is a ground-floor flat within a two-storey building of four units. Two entrances face Cannock Way, while the flat's entrance is at the rear, giving it no direct street frontage.

The proposal seeks the erection of a single-storey, flat-roof side extension projecting from the south-west elevation of the dwelling to provide additional habitable space. The extension would be modest in scale and design, appear as a subservient addition to the building, and the use of matching materials would ensure that it integrates appropriately with the appearance of the existing property.

While Cannock Way is characterised by groups of similarly designed buildings, a number of properties within the street already feature side extensions and projections of varying design and roof form. As such, the introduction of a modest single-storey side addition would not appear incongruous or disrupt the established rhythm of the street. Furthermore, as the proposal would be located well back from the public realm, its visibility would be limited, and its impact on the character and appearance of the wider area would be minimal.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking:

The views afforded from the proposed fenestration on the front elevation would be comparable to those already available from the existing arrangement, primarily overlooking the front garden of the application site. The new windows would situate approximately 10.2 metres from the side wall of No. 68. As such, the proposal would not give rise to any unacceptable overlooking impacts beyond the existing situation, and the current levels of privacy would be maintained.

Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the proposed single-storey extension on the outlook from the first-floor kitchen window on the south-west elevation of Flat 78, which is located above the application flat. While it is acknowledged that the extension would alter this view, the development is modest in scale and single-storey in height. The window would retain a clear line of sight above the roof of the extension, ensuring that an open outlook is maintained.

Loss of Light and Overbearing:

Concerns have been raised by the occupier of Flat 78 regarding a potential loss of light to their parking and garden area, located immediately west of the proposed

extension. It is noted, however, that Flat 78 does not benefit from a fully private garden space, with the front driveway and side area instead functioning as both an amenity area and vehicle parking spaces.

The proposed extension would have a modest height of 3.36 metres with a low, flat-roof design. Given these proportions, and the fact that the area already experiences reduced levels of light due to the presence of a large mature tree within the rear garden of No. 74, it is not considered that the extension would materially worsen the existing situation.

Accordingly, the proposal is unlikely to give rise to an unacceptable loss of light, nor would it result in an overbearing impact or an undue sense of enclosure for any neighbouring occupiers.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

The Council's Highways Officer has reviewed this application and considers that the two off-street parking spaces would be sufficient for a dwelling of this size, and in accordance with the council's Parking Standards. As such, there are no highways issues.

Amenity Space:

Section 4 of the Borough Design Guide (BDG), with reference to flats, advises that all dwellings should have access to some form of amenity space, preferably private or communal garden space.

The application site does not currently benefit from fully private garden space, as the existing garden area is located to the side of the dwelling and is unenclosed. The proposed single-storey extension would occupy this side garden area. However, the remaining front garden area would continue to function as usable amenity space. It receives direct sunlight for part of the day and is capable of accommodating activities such as sitting, play, clothes drying, and outside storage, as evidenced by the existing shed. Furthermore, an informal communal area with open green space to the rear of the building would be maintained with provides additional amenity space for residents.

While the remaining garden area would not be fully private, this arrangement is consistent with the existing situation, and the remaining spaces would still provide practical outdoor amenity for the occupants. On this basis, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of amenity space provision and would comply with the aims of the BDG in ensuring flats have access to functional outdoor areas.

Flooding and Drainage:

The proposed development is in Flood zone 1 according to the Environment Agency mapping with a low risk of surface water flooding. The Council's Drainage Officer has reviewed the application and has noted that the drainage details have not been provided and the existing drainage details has not been mentioned. The Drainage Officer has subsequently recommended a condition be implemented which secures details of the surface water drainage system of the site prior to the commencement of

development.

However, the Local Planning Authority consider this condition too onerous when compared to the scale of the development; the increase in hardstanding would be minimal. As such, the remaining permeable land around the site would be considered sufficient enough to as not adversely impact the flood risk of the site and the surrounding dwellings.

Landscape and Trees:

Google Earth imagery from July 2022 shows that the southern side boundary of the application site previously contained mature planting, including a hedgerow. However, the site visit conducted by the Case Officer in September 2025 confirmed that this hedgerow has since been removed.

Section 4 of the Borough Design Guide SPD encourages the inclusion of soft landscaping in development proposals to enhance visual amenity. In this case, due to the open-plan layout of the flats, opportunities for additional landscaping are limited, with the primary area available being along the southern side boundary wall.

The Council's Trees and Landscape Officer have reviewed the proposals and considers that the former hedgerow was not critical to the character of the space and does not make a significant contribution to the communal area to the north, which is accessed and appreciated by multiple residents as their immediate external realm.

Overall, there are no protected trees on the site, and given the modest scale of the proposed development and the separation distances to any remaining mature trees, it is considered that the proposals would not result in any unacceptable harm to trees or landscape features. While soft landscaping could enhance the visual appearance of the site, the absence of such planting does not warrant refusal, and the development would not materially detract from the character or amenity of the surrounding area. related impacts would arise from the proposed development.

Other matters:

Concerns have been raised by the occupier of Flat 78 regarding the impact of the proposed single-storey extension on access to the first-floor kitchen window and roofline features such as gutters and drainage systems at Flat 78. While these matters are noted, issues relating to routine cleaning and private maintenance are not material planning considerations, as they fall outside the scope of the planning system. Such matters are normally addressed either through building regulations, which ensure safe and practical construction, or through property management arrangements between parties.

Importantly, the proposed extension is modest in height at 3.36 metres with a flat roof design and would not obstruct the kitchen window itself, which would retain an open aspect above the extension and would still be accessible in any case.

Concerns have been raised regarding potential noise impacts between Flats 78 and 82, given the existing soundproofing arrangements. While the neighbouring occupier notes some background noise transference, the proposed single-storey extension is modest in scale and is intended to provide additional residential accommodation (a

bedroom). Such a limited domestic extension is not expected to generate significant additional noise beyond normal residential use that would warrant the refusal of this application.

Concerns have been raised regarding potential impacts on the structural integrity of the neighbouring property, including effects on shared walls and services. These matters fall outside the scope of the planning system and are not material planning considerations. Structural safety, alterations to shared walls, and impacts on services would instead be addressed through building regulations and any relevant party wall agreements.

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.

RECOMMENDATION

Conditions agreed:	Not required
Recommendation:	Approval
Date:	6 October 2025
Earliest date for decision:	6 September 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>MC</i>
Date:	07.10.2025