

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	252886
Site Address:	65 Eastcourt Avenue, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 1HH
Expiry Date:	17 April 2026
Site Visit Date:	3 February 2026
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a two-storey side extension with a single-storey rear extension and an enclosed front porch, together with alterations to the front garden, following demolition of the existing garage.	

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
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
090348	Proposed erection of a single storey rear extension to dwelling to form a timber framed conservatory.	Approved: November 2009

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal
WBC CIL – No comments
External
None

REPRESENTATIONS

Earley Town Council	No objection
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	Two letters of objection have been received, raising concerns that the proposed extension would appear overly dominant and result in a terracing effect, contrary to policy. Additional concerns relate to the potential for damp arising from the extension being constructed up to the shared boundary.

APPRAISAL

Context: The application site lies within a residential setting of Earley. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey side extension, together with a single-storey rear extension and a front porch.

It should be noted that the proposal now under consideration differs from that originally submitted, with the Local Planning Authority initially raising concerns regarding the scale of the original scheme and its potential impact on neighbouring properties. The amended proposal represents a significant reduction in massing and is assessed below.

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 side element of the extension, despite being the most apparent component of the proposed scheme, would be set back from the main front elevation and lowered below the existing ridge line, thereby maintaining a clear hierarchy between the original dwelling and the proposed addition. This subservient form is an important design principle given the overall scale of the proposal. The extension would also retain balanced proportions through its appropriate width, and the use of matching fenestration and in keeping materials would further reinforce its complementary appearance. Overall, the design demonstrates compliance with the Borough Design Guide and is considered visually acceptable.

Notwithstanding the above, the reduction in the gap between the application property and No. 63 warrants careful consideration. Spacing between dwellings is often an important characteristic of residential areas, helping to maintain a sense of openness and to avoid a terraced appearance, which is a core concern raised in the representations received. Whilst the proposal would clearly narrow the existing gap, it is acknowledged that similar extensions have already been constructed along Eastcourt Avenue, and these have diminished the spacious qualities of the street scene compared with its original form. In this evolving context, it is not considered that the reduction in spacing, in itself, would justify withholding planning permission. In any event, a gap between the two properties would remain at first-floor level, with the neighbouring garage providing separation between the dwellings. In addition the properties are not on the same building line, therefore a perceived terracing effect would be diluted and lack visual coherence. Accordingly, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a harmful terracing effect.

As noted above, the scale and form of the proposed extension is consistent with other additions in the road. The development would therefore sit comfortably within the established pattern of built form and cannot reasonably be regarded as out of character.

The single storey front and rear extensions are far more modest and unimposing additions, which would comfortably integrate within the footprint and character of the enlarged dwelling proposed.

A portion of the site's landscaped frontage would be lost to accommodate a more practical driveway arrangement. However, as the most visually prominent frontage features would be retained, no objection is raised to these alterations.

Taking all of the above into account, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable visual impact and complies with Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy.

Neighbouring Amenity: The submitted Site Plan illustrates how the enlarged dwelling would sit in relation to the two adjacent properties. As the additional massing is largely concentrated on the western side of the plot, No.67 would not be adversely affected.

The primary consideration is the potential impact on No.63, which informed the amendments made to the original scheme. The two-storey element would project beyond the rear of No. 63; however, the extent of projection would be relatively limited. Crucially, where the two-storey element extends beyond the rear elevation of No.63, it would be adjacent to the neighbouring garage rather than the main habitable rooms of the dwelling, which are set sufficiently away from the extension. It is therefore not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of light or an overbearing impact for the occupiers of No.63.

Whilst the ground-floor addition would increase the length of built form along the shared boundary, this would be mitigated by its modest height and by the fact that it would broadly replace the footprint of the existing detached garage in this location, which would be demolished to facilitate the development. Taken together, these factors would significantly limit any additional sense of enclosure experienced by neighbouring occupiers.

In terms of privacy, the additional first-floor rear windows would allow only oblique views across neighbouring gardens and would not result in harmful overlooking. The remaining proposed fenestration would not give rise to any invasive outlooks.

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:	Not required
---------------------------	--------------

Recommendation:	Approve
------------------------	---------

Date:	9 April 2026
--------------	--------------

Earliest date for decision:	7 April 2026
------------------------------------	--------------

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
---	---

Date:	10 April 2026
--------------	----------------------

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

- *Major Development Location of Earley*