

PLANNING STATEMENT

52 Poundfield Way, Twyford, RG10 0XR

Proposed single storey side/rear extension

June 2026



1. Introduction

1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared in support of a householder planning application for a single storey side and rear extension at 52 Poundfield Way, Twyford, RG10 0XR, submitted on behalf of Katie Pauling and Scott Slade, the applicants.

1.2 The site has a recent and directly relevant planning history, comprising one approved single storey extension (application ref. 180943) and one refused two-storey scheme that was subsequently dismissed at appeal (application ref. 251962, Appeal Ref. 6004396). This Statement draws on both of these decisions, and in particular on the reasoning of the Planning Inspectorate, to demonstrate that the current single storey proposal overcomes the concerns previously raised and is acceptable in planning terms.

1.3 This Statement should be read alongside the application drawings and supporting documents and addresses the site and surrounding context; the relevant planning history; the proposed development; the relevant planning policy framework; and an assessment of the scheme against the matters previously raised by the Council and the Planning Inspectorate.

2. Site and Surroundings

2.1 The site comprises a detached, two-storey dwelling within an established residential cul-de-sac at Poundfield Way, Twyford. The surrounding area is characterised by properties of similar scale, materials and design.

2.2 No. 50 Poundfield Way adjoins the site and is orientated at approximately 90 degrees to it, with its rear elevation and conservatory facing the flank wall of the appeal/application property. This relationship is central to the planning history set out below and to the assessment of the current proposal in Section 6.

2.3 No. 54 Poundfield Way adjoins to the south and set back from the front of the no.52 with their garage adjacent. The proposals will not materially impact on them. There is no property directly to the rear of the garden.

3. Relevant Planning History

Application 180943 (Approved, 2018)

3.1 Application 180943 sought permission for a single storey side/rear extension following demolition of the existing garage. Permission was granted on 22 May 2018.

3.2 During determination, the Council's Highways Officer initially raised concern regarding the loss of the garage and the resulting reduction in on-site parking provision, requesting that two

spaces be retained. Following further correspondence, the Highways Officer confirmed that he was satisfied with the scheme as submitted, for the following reasons:

- the existing garage did not comply with the Council's internal dimension standards for parking a vehicle, such that it was not, in practical terms, a usable parking space, and its loss was therefore not a significant material consideration;
- the shortfall against the Council's parking standard (assessed as 0.5 of a space, as a garage is counted as such) could be safely accommodated by on-street parking within a short distance of the site; and
- notwithstanding the increase in floor area, the open-plan internal arrangement meant there was no increase in the number of habitable rooms, such that parking demand would not be significantly affected.

3.3 This decision establishes a clear and directly comparable precedent: the Council's own Highways Officer confirmed that a single retained driveway space was acceptable in highway safety terms, having regard to the practical limitations of the (then-existing) garage and the availability of on-street capacity nearby. Although permission 180943 was never implemented and has since lapsed, this reasoning remains a material consideration directly applicable to the present proposal, which results in the same physical parking outcome — loss of the garage, retention of one driveway space.

Application 251962 and Appeal Ref. 6004396 (Refused/Dismissed, 2025–2026)

3.4 Application 251962 sought permission for a part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension. The Council refused the application for two reasons, both relating to the two-storey element of the scheme: (i) an overbearing impact and unacceptable sense of enclosure to the rear garden and patio of No. 50 Poundfield Way; and (ii) a significant reduction in daylight and sunlight to the rear conservatory and main habitable room of No. 50, and increased overshadowing of its garden, in the absence of a technical daylight/sunlight assessment.

3.5 The applicants appealed under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The appeal (Ref. 6004396) was dismissed on 13 April 2026. The Inspector's reasoning is highly instructive for the current proposal and is summarised below.

3.6 The Inspector identified the main issue as the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 50, with particular regard to outlook and light. The Inspector found that the proposed two-storey element – extending the full width of the host dwelling, up to the shared boundary, and presenting a predominantly blank two-storey elevation less than 10m from the rear elevation of No. 50 (below the 12m separation recommended by the Borough Design Guide SPD for development of up to two storeys) – would be overbearing and harmful to outlook from No. 50, particularly at ground floor level.

3.7 On daylight and sunlight, the Inspector accepted the findings of the appellant's Daylight and Sunlight Report (DSR), which were not disputed by the Council, that there would be no noticeable or unacceptable adverse impact on daylight or sunlight to the conservatory and windows at the rear of No. 50. However, the Inspector found that the two-storey extension, built up to the boundary, would increase overshadowing of the more frequently used northern part of No. 50's garden (near the conservatory and kitchen door), particularly in the morning, harming the quality and enjoyment of that outdoor space notwithstanding compliance with the BRE minimum of two hours' sunlight to the garden as a whole.

3.8 It is important to note that the appeal was dismissed solely on these grounds, both of which were attributable specifically to the height, bulk and proximity of the proposed two-storey

element. Parking was not raised as an issue at any stage of application 251962 or the appeal, notwithstanding that the refused scheme included a garage providing a second on-site parking space. No overlooking objection was raised or upheld.

4. The Proposed Development

4.1 The current application seeks permission for a single storey side and rear extension, providing an additional habitable room. The proposal is, by definition, single storey throughout and therefore does not repeat the two-storey form of development that was the subject of the Inspector's concerns in respect of application 251962/Appeal Ref. 6004396.

4.2 The scheme is a 3m extension to the rear of the existing house and fills in a redundant area behind the existing garage. A new roof over this proposal allows a hipped roof rising from the existing eaves level at a 17.5 degree pitch improving on the existing relationship with no.50. The extension provides a utility room and office space for working from home, and also for occasional guest room provision.

5. Planning Policy Context

5.1 The statutory development plan for the site comprises the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010), including Policies CP1 (Sustainable Development) and CP3 (General Principles for Development). Relevant guidance is also contained in the Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012), and in Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers.

5.2 It is stated that Wokingham Borough Council determines residential parking standards on a site-by-site basis, factoring in property size, allocated vs. unallocated spaces, and public transport accessibility. The existing property has two bedrooms and a box room (not big enough for a bed). There is currently freely-available on street parking, a regular local bus service and walking distance from the train station on the mainline to London.

6. Assessment Impact on the Amenity of No. 50 Poundfield Way

6.1 The Inspector's dismissal of the previous appeal turned entirely on the bulk, height and proximity of the two-storey element of that scheme, and its consequences for outlook and overshadowing at No. 50. The current proposal removes that element of concern: as a single storey extension, it does not introduce upper-floor massing close to the shared boundary, does not present a two-storey blank elevation towards No. 50, and does not raise the same outlook or sense-of-enclosure issues identified by the Inspector in respect of habitable rooms at ground floor level at No. 50.

6.2 The proposal retains the existing eaves level on the boundary with No.50 with a lower roof pitch, effectively improving the resulting scale of impact even from the existing position, and significantly better than the dismissed scheme.

6.3 On daylight and sunlight, the Inspector's appeal decision already confirms – on the basis of an agreed technical assessment – that impacts to the conservatory and rear windows of No. 50 from a more substantial two-storey scheme were not unacceptable. A single storey extension of lesser height and bulk would be expected to have a materially lesser effect again. The proposed scheme provides a improvement to existing daylight levels by lowering the roof pitch within the vicinity of the boundary.

6.4 On overshadowing, the Inspector's concern related specifically to the two-storey extension built up to the boundary affecting the northern, more frequently used part of No. 50's garden. The single storey proposal, by virtue of its reduced height, offers a decrease in overshadowing to this part of the garden.

Parking

6.5 Although permission 180943 was not implemented and has lapsed, the Council's assessment of parking under that application remains a material consideration, and is directly comparable here: the current proposal results in the same outcome — demolition of the garage and retention of a single driveway space. The Council's own Highways Officer confirmed in 2018 that the garage did not provide a genuine, usable parking space given its substandard internal dimensions, and that any shortfall against the Council's standard could be safely accommodated by on-street parking within a short distance of the site. Nothing about the garage or the on-street parking conditions has changed since.

6.6 It is acknowledged that the Highways Officer's 2018 assessment also relied in part on there being no increase in the number of habitable rooms, given the open-plan layout then proposed. The current scheme does introduce an additional habitable room, and this Statement does not seek to suggest that the 2018 decision is identical in this respect. However, this does not undermine the overall conclusion that a single space remains acceptable: the shortfall against the Council's standard arises from the same constrained, substandard garage already found not to constitute a genuine parking space, and the available on-street capacity identified by the Highways Officer in 2018 is unaffected by the internal layout of the dwelling. With the additional service of Crossrail, provided in recent years improving the connections of Twyford for commuters, the demands for parking spaces for local housing are further reduced.

6.7 It is also relevant that no parking objection was raised in respect of application 251962, despite that scheme proposing a garage providing a second on-site space; parking was not identified by the Council or the Inspector as a matter of concern at this site.

7. Conclusion

7.1 The site's planning history demonstrates that single storey development of the type now proposed has previously been found acceptable at this property, including in respect of the resulting level of on-site parking provision. The only scheme found unacceptable at this site – application 251962 – was refused and dismissed at appeal solely by reason of the height, bulk and proximity of its two-storey element, with the Inspector's findings on daylight, sunlight and outlook confined to that specific form of development.

7.2 The current proposal, being single storey throughout, does not raise the concerns that led to the dismissal of the previous appeal, and the principle of acceptable parking provision established by application 180943 remains applicable. For these reasons, the proposed development is considered to accord with the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, and planning permission should be granted.