

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	260063
Site Address:	49 Reeves Way, Wokingham, RG41 2PS
Expiry Date:	10 March 2026
Site Visit Date:	23 February 2026
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of the existing conservatory, plus changes to fenestration.	

PLANNING POLICY

National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
Core Strategy (CS)	CP1 – Sustainable Development CP2 – Inclusive Communities CP7 – Biodiversity
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping TB06 – Development of Private Residential Gardens
Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update (LPU)	SS1 – Sustainable development principles H12 – Residential development of existing private gardens
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
28783	Single storey rear side extension to provide utility room, single storey front extension to provide ground floor study.	Approved September 1987
002658	Proposed single storey rear extension to dwelling to form conservatory	Approved July 2000
050764	Proposed two storey side extension to dwelling	Approved December 2005

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Digital Solutions Scanning-No comments received
WBC Landscape and Trees-No comments received
WBC CIL-No comments received

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	No comments received
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	Neighbour representations as follows; <i>1. Appearance & Impact on our Property</i> <i>- The planned extension has a large, plain brick wall facing our conservatory and will feel overbearing.</i> <i>- The single-pitch roof increases the height along our boundary, reaching just below their first-floor windows.</i> <i>- Because the extension is only around 1 metre from the boundary, we believe the 2-metre rule applies and the eaves should not exceed 3 metres.</i> <i>2. Preferred Alternative Design</i> <i>- We request a hipped roof with three slopes instead of one.</i> <i>- This would make the extension appear less bulky, reduce height, and be more in keeping with neighbouring properties.</i> <i>We propose:</i> <i>- Reducing the depth from 4365mm to 4000mm</i> <i>- Reducing the width from 11785mm to 9785mm</i> <i>- estimate the current plan would block 82% of side light to your conservatory.</i> <i>3. Proposed Side Window</i> <i>- We request it be either removed or replaced with a small, obscured fanlight to maintain privacy.</i> <i>- We strongly object to the new full-height side window, as it directly overlooks your conservatory.</i>

1. Appearance & Impact on our Property

- The planned extension has a large, plain brick wall facing our conservatory and will feel overbearing.*
- The single-pitch roof increases the height along our boundary, reaching just below their first-floor windows.*
- Because the extension is only around 1 metre from the boundary, we believe the 2-metre rule applies and the eaves should not exceed 3 metres.*

2. Preferred Alternative Design

- We request a hipped roof with three slopes instead of one.*
- This would make the extension appear less bulky, reduce height, and be more in keeping with neighbouring properties.*

We propose:

- Reducing the depth from 4365mm to 4000mm*
- Reducing the width from 11785mm to 9785mm*
- estimate the current plan would block 82% of side light to your conservatory.*

3. Proposed Side Window

- We request it be either removed or replaced with a small, obscured fanlight to maintain privacy.*
- We strongly object to the new full-height side window, as it directly overlooks your conservatory.*

	- We formally object to the proposal due to its unacceptable impacts, including visual dominance, loss of light, boundary proximity, unsympathetic design, and reduced privacy. The suggested amendments—a hipped roof, reduced width and depth, and alterations to the side window—offer practical ways to lessen these effects while still allowing the applicants to extend. Without these changes, the development would cause significant harm to residential amenity and conflict with planning guidance on outlook, privacy, overshadowing, scale, and local character. 1. The size of the extension and its appearance from our immediately adjacent property (taking into account: height, width and depth). - Wokingham Borough Council's Design Guide states that the primary consideration for extensions is their impact on neighbours. The proposed rear extension at 49 Reeves Way would extend the full width of the house, sit only about 1 m from the boundary, and project 4,365 mm—exceeding the 4 m limit for extensions close to a side boundary. Its large, plain brick wall and single-pitch roof would appear overbearing and visually intrusive when viewed from our property, significantly affecting outlook and light. To reduce this impact, I request the extension be limited to 4 m in depth and designed with a hipped roof that slopes in from both sides and the rear. This would lower the apparent height and bulk of the side wall, improve light levels, and create a design more in keeping with neighbouring properties, including the existing hipped-roof extension at 16 Crail Close and similar features in Reeves Way. Further mitigation—such as a shallower roof pitch and setting the extension back by approximately 500 mm from the house wall—would also lessen the overbearing effect. These changes would ensure the proposal aligns better with the Residential Design Checklist, which requires extensions to relate well to their context, neighbouring properties, and the character of the area 2. Proposed new side window overlooking into our property - The proposed side-facing window at 49 Reeves Way is a double-width, full-height unit that would directly overlook our property at 51 Reeves Way, causing an unreasonable loss of privacy. The plans also do not specify whether the glass is to be obscured. The owner had previously indicated that only a small, high-level fanlight window was intended, which we had confirmed we would not object to, so its current size and position are unexpected.
--	--

	<i>We request that this window be changed to a high-level fanlight design with obscured glazing, positioned as high as possible without affecting the existing lean-to roof. This would prevent overlooking and align with the Council's material planning considerations, including privacy, loss of light, and overbearing impact, as well as its own design guidance.</i>
--	--

APPRAISAL

Site Description: This application site relates to a two-storey detached dwelling situated on the outskirts of Wokingham town centre towards Finchampstead.

Proposal: This application seeks permission for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of the existing conservatory, plus changes to fenestration.

The proposed extension is approximately 4.3 meters in depth, 11.8 meters in width and 3.8 meters in height (to the point of the roof) and consist of 4 No. roof lights.

The proposal involves demolishing the existing conservatory to accommodate a new extension that will span the full width of the dwelling and create an open-plan living area.

Planning History: This site has had previous planning applications submitted. Application 29783 submitted in 1987 for the proposed single storey rear side extension to provide utility room, single storey front extension to provide ground floor study, was approved in September 1987. Then follows application 002658 submitted in May 2000, was approved in July 2000. Application 050764 lastly submitted in October 2005 was approved in December 2005.

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.

Reeves Way and the surrounding estate comprises of a mixture of semi-detached and detached two-storey dwellings. A number of the surrounding have benefited from side and rear extensions, which are visible from the street scene.

The proposed extension will be positioned to the rear of the dwelling and will be situated on the existing hardstanding that has been used to facilitate the conservatory. As a result of this proposal, the conservatory will be demolished to make room for the extension.

As stated in the BDG (Borough Design Guide), alterations and extensions should be well designed, respond positively to the existing dwelling, contribute positively to the existing character and relate well to existing properties.

The extension will be set down from the ridgeline of the host dwelling and will incorporate a lean-to roof design, and it appears modest in scale and a subservient and sympathetic addition to the main dwelling. It is located to the rear of the property and will not be prominent from the public realm. The proposal will utilise matching/similar materials that relate well to the host dwelling.

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: The proposed extension is single storey and modest in scale, and is positioned marginally away from the side boundaries. The rear of the site is also well screened by existing boundary treatments. In this context, the development would not give rise to a detrimental loss of light or appear overbearing to neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed side elevation windows would face the brick flank walls of the adjoining dwellings and would not overlook any primary amenity areas such as patios or the main parts of neighbouring rear gardens. As such, the proposal would not result in a detrimental loss of privacy.

A neighbour representation refers to a requirement for extensions to be set 1 metre from the side boundary. The Borough Design Guide SPD refers to this relationship in the context of new dwellings and side extensions. In this case, the proposal relates to a rear extension which would align with the side walls of the existing dwelling and therefore the guidance is not directly applicable. It is an acceptable design solution for a rear extension to continue the side elevations of the existing house, maintaining the current spatial relationship.

Whilst the depth of the extension would exceed 4 metres, it is not considered excessive within the context of the site. The Borough Design Guide SPD advises that rear extensions should generally not exceed 4 metres in depth; however, this is guidance rather than policy and proposals must be assessed on their individual merits. In this instance, the scale and form of the extension would not result in demonstrable harm. Furthermore, changes to the permitted development regime under the General Permitted Development Order allow rear extensions of up to 6–8 metres in depth

(subject to the prior approval process), meaning extensions of a comparable scale are not uncommon within suburban areas. The property and neighbouring houses have good size gardens and the extension would not appear excessive in the context of the site.

Overall, having regard to its modest height, scale and relationship with neighbouring properties, the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity by reason of overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impact.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: The submitted block plan shows spaces for two parking spaces. There is no change in level of driveway parking available, and no off-street parking is proposed. As a result, the proposal does not impact parking or access provisions, therefore, no objection from Highways have been raised.

Trees:

The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer has considered the application and stated:

"I have no objections to the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of the existing conservatory, plus changes to fenestration. The proposed footprint of these changes appears to remain within the existing building's footprint and/or other existing hardstanding within the Site. There are no protected trees in the area which would be impacted by these changes."

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

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:	Yes
Recommendation:	Approve
Date:	9 March 2026

Earliest date for decision:	3 February 2026
------------------------------------	-----------------

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>MC</i>
Date:	10.03.2026

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS
Insert where relevant