

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	261262
Site Address:	9 Arthur Road, Wokingham, RG41 2SS
Expiry Date:	6 August 2026
Site Visit Date:	14 July 2026
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of single storey side and two storey front and rear extensions following demolition of existing front, side and rear extensions, plus changes to fenestration and widening of existing dropped kerb.	

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 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 CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping 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 NE3 – Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area NE4 – Trees, woodland, hedges and hedgerows NE5 – Landscape and design
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	
WBC Ecology- No objection subject to condition(s)	
External	
None consulted	

REPRESENTATIONS	
Parish/Town Council	No comments received
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	1 representation as follows; - Clarity on demolition works Concern is raised that demolition activities, including the use of machinery and removal of foundations, could adversely affect the Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of neighbouring mature trees. The representation states that the application does not demonstrate how potential impacts arising from ground compaction or excavation during demolition will be managed to protect adjacent tree roots. - Visual impact and sense of enclosure The proposed extension would result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure and visual dominance when viewed from our property and garden. It is argued that the proposed boundary wall, approximately 3 metres in height and extending for around 9 metres along the shared boundary, would represent a significant increase in scale compared with the existing structure. Concern is raised that the development would create a visually imposing and overbearing form of development, resulting in a "tunnel effect" and harm to the outlook and enjoyment of our garden. - Proximity, wall maintenance and independent structures We consider that the proposal fails to respect the established spacing between detached properties and would result in an impractical and poor-quality design. Concern is raised that the proposed 50mm gap between the extension and the neighbouring dwelling does not reflect the character of the area, where separation between buildings contributes to the suburban street scene. Moreover, the narrow gap would be inaccessible for maintenance, and could allow the accumulation of debris, and may increase the risk of dampness affecting both properties, therefore a greater gap should be required. - Garage Dimensions Causing the Boundary Proximity

	There are concerns regarding the proposed garage dimensions, noting that the submitted plans indicate an internal width of approximately 2.4 metres, which is below the Council's recommended width for a parking space. It is argued that this would make the garage difficult to use for modern vehicles and would not provide a practical parking arrangement. Moreover, the limited width has resulted in the proposed 50mm gap between the extension and our property. - Protection of adjacent mature trees Three mature Silver Birch trees are located adjacent to the proposed development site and concerns are raised regarding the potential impact of the demolition and construction works on their root systems. It is argued that excavation for new foundations close to the boundary could damage roots, adversely affecting the health and stability of the trees. We also note that no tree survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment or Tree Protection Plan has been submitted and we consider that further arboricultural assessment should be undertaken before the application is determined.
--	--

APPRAISAL

Site Description: This application site relates to a two-storey detached dwelling with associated parking and landscaping in the residential area of Wokingham. The site occupies a corner plot with a large amount of amenity space to the eastern and southern boundary. The site is surrounded by dwellings of similar architectural style with varying forms.

Proposal: This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single-storey side extension, two-storey front and rear extensions, and a single-storey rear extension, following the demolition of the existing front, side and rear extensions. The proposal also includes alterations to the fenestration and the widening of the existing dropped kerb.

The proposed single-storey side extension would measure approximately 6 metres in depth, 2.6 metres in width, and 4 metres in height to the ridge, and would provide a new garage. The proposed two-storey front extension would measure approximately 5 metres in depth, 4.8 metres in width, and 6 metres in height to the gable, accommodating an enlarged entrance area, shower room and boot room at ground floor level, together with an additional bedroom at first-floor level.

To the rear, the proposed two-storey extension would measure approximately 4.5 metres in depth, 8.4 metres in width, and 7 metres in height to the ridge. This element would provide two additional bedrooms at first-floor level. In addition, a single-storey rear extension measuring approximately 3 metres in depth, 1 metre in width, and 3 metres in height would create an enlarged kitchen and living area.

As part of the development, the existing front, side and rear extensions, together with the existing chimney, would be demolished to facilitate the proposed works

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 to 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.

9 Arthur Road and the surrounding area are characterised by dwellings of similar character and design with varying forms. As mentioned, No.9 is situated on a corner plot and benefits from a vast amount of amenity space. Whilst it is acknowledged that the overall development adds additional bulk to the host dwelling, it is considered acceptable in principle.

The proposed single-storey side extension is considered to be of an appropriate scale and design in relation to the host dwelling. Whilst it would extend approximately 6 metres beyond the original building line, it remains aligned with the main body of the dwelling and is set down from the ridge height of the existing property, ensuring that it retains a subordinate appearance. The proposed roof design, whilst differing from the existing, ensures in a cohesive and sympathetic addition that integrates well with the character of the property. As such, the extension is not considered to result in any harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area.

The proposed two-storey front extension has been designed to integrate with the host dwelling by incorporating two additional gable ends to match the host dwelling along with a hipped roof design. Whilst the proposed front extension projects forward of the principal elevation and does not fully accord with the Borough Design Guide (BDG) in terms of ridge height, it would project by approximately 4 metres and align with the established building line of the host dwelling. Given its relationship with the host property and its integration with the overall design of the proposal, the extension is not considered to result in harm to the character or appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding street scene.

The two-storey rear element will be positioned on the existing hardstanding, thereby avoiding any encroachment onto the already established amenity space. Furthermore, the extension would be in line with the ridge height that aligns with the existing dwelling, ensuring that it appears as a well-integrated and subordinate addition. As a result, the proposal would maintain the character and proportions of the host property, preserve the visual amenities of the surrounding area, and would not give rise to any undue harm in terms of scale, massing or appearance.

The single storey rear element, whilst positioned up to the shared boundary, its single-storey form ensures that it remains subordinate to the host dwelling. The extension would be located to the rear of the property on the existing hardstanding where the previous extension was sited. Moreover, this element of the proposal will include a flat roof design, further diminishing the appearance of the extension. Additionally, as the extension is positioned to the rear where it would not be readily visible from the public realm, its scale is not considered excessive for a development of this nature. The proposal would maintain an appropriate relationship with the adjoining dwelling and, by virtue of its height and siting, would not result in an unacceptable level of overbearing impact or harm to residential amenity.

Given the locality and the modest size plot, the proposed development would appear as a sympathetic and subservient addition to the host dwelling, and the development will utilise materials that match the existing, further enhancing visual continuity.

Therefore, the proposed development is considered acceptable and will have an acceptable impact on the character of the street scene. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy and the advice and guidance contained in the Borough Design Guide.

Neighbouring Amenity: Paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires development to secure a “high standard of amenity for existing and future users”. This is reinforced by 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.

The application site is located within a good-sized residential plot. As discussed above, whilst the proposal would introduce additional built form to the host dwelling, the extensions follow the established building line and maintain visual continuity within the street scene. Whilst several concerns have been raised regarding the proposal from No.7 Arthur Road, which include the visual impact of the proposal and sense of enclosure the development is acceptable in principle as further discussed below.

Regarding the visual impact of the proposal and the potential sense of enclosure when viewed from No. 7 Arthur Road, the proposed extension complies with the 45-degree guideline when assessed from the nearest habitable room window and is not considered likely to result in an unacceptable loss of light to neighbouring occupiers. In terms of overbearing impact, the development has largely been designed over the existing footprint of the dwelling, with the two-storey rear extension positioned away from No. 7 Arthur Road towards No. 3 Caroline Drive. The rear element would not project significantly beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring property to the north.

As such, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure when viewed from No. 7.

Whilst the proposed extensions would introduce additional fenestration alterations to the front, side and rear elevations, the proposed front elevation would remain approximately 11 metres from boundary and significantly more to the dwelling the opposite side of the road. This exceeds the minimum 10-metre separation distance recommended within the Borough Design Guide for development situated directly across a street.

Concerns have also been raised regarding the proposed single-storey front extension and its relationship with the shared boundary wall, and the tunnelling effect. As mentioned, the extension follows the established footprint of the host dwelling and has been brought forward to align with the principal front elevation. Although positioned on the boundary, this does not, in itself, give rise to unacceptable design or residential amenity impacts. A planning application does not negate the requirement of the applicant to comply with the Party Wall Act.

As such, the proposal would not result in any detrimental loss of privacy or daylight, nor a detrimental overbearing impact. Having regard to the size of the plot, the reduced separation distance is considered acceptable and would not result in significant harm to neighbouring amenity.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: The proposed block plan shows three spaces for vehicles to the front of the property and an integral garage. Even if the garage is discounted, three on-plot vehicle parking spaces is sufficient for the dwelling. As a result, the proposal does not impact parking or access provisions. Furthermore, part of the proposal introduces an extension to the existing dropped kerb. Separate consent would be required from the Council's Traffic Management team.

Flooding and Drainage: The application site is situated within Flood Zone 1 and whilst the Council's Flooding and Drainage Officer raises 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: This application site is located in an area suited for bat roosts. The Council's Ecology Officer has reviewed this application and has no objection to the principle of development subject to conditions. The Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment undertaken by John Wenman Ecology on 23rd February 2026, concluded that there is no evidence of bats within the roof void, and the property is considered to have low potential suitability for bats.

Whilst the Council's Ecologist has recommended a number of conditions, these are not considered necessary in this instance to make the development acceptable. To ensure that appropriate action is given to protected species, an informative will be applied

reminding the applicant of their responsibilities in respect of bats and the relevant wildlife legislation. Accordingly, the proposal is not considered to warrant the imposition of further ecological conditions.

Trees and Landscape: It is acknowledged the comments from the neighbouring dwelling No.7 Arthur Road. Concerns have been raised for the demolition activities, including the use of machinery and removal of foundations, and how this could adversely affect the Root Protection Areas (RPAs).

The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer stated that no AIA or Tree Impact Assessment is required for this application specifically due to the fact that the Silver Birch Trees are not yet matured and there are no protected trees on site. Moreover, the applicant has the right to trim any overhanging branches that fall within their property boundary.

Notwithstanding this, an informative has been applied to remind the applicant that it would be good practice not to store any plant, machinery, materials or equipment along the northern boundary in order to avoid any potential impact on neighbouring trees and their Root Protection Areas.

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: For all the above, the proposal is acceptable, and the application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION	
Conditions agreed:	Not required
Recommendation:	Approve
Date:	3 August 2026
Earliest date for decision:	2 July 2026

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>MC</i>
Date:	06.08.2026