

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	252742
Site Address:	95 Hyde End Lane, Spencers Wood, Wokingham, RG7 1ES
Expiry Date:	15 January 2026
Site Visit Date:	19 December 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of two-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension, 2no. rooflights, 2no. roof dormers and front canopy.	

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 CP7 – Biodiversity CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals CP11 – Proposals Outside Development Limits CP19 – South of M4 Strategic Development Location
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC05 – Renewable Energy and Decentralised Energy Networks CC06 – Noise CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
242085	Householder application for the proposed erection of a two storey side extension, single storey front extension, single storey rear extension, loft conversion along with 1No dormer to create habitable accommodation, roof alterations and changes to fenestration.	Refused: September 2024 (Appeal Dismissed)

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC CIL – CIL liable development
WBC Ecology – No comments

External

None

REPRESENTATIONS

Shinfield Parish Council	No comments
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received

APPRAISAL

Context: The application site comprises a modest two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated on Hyde End Lane, Spencers Wood. The property forms part of a pair of narrow Victorian-era semi-detached houses that have largely retained their original appearance when viewed from the roadside.

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension, a front canopy roof, and additional development to the rear of the property.

The current submission follows the refusal of application 242085, which was subsequently dismissed at appeal. The previous refusal was based on the following reason:

‘By reason of the development’s excessive width, scale, massing and incongruous and complicated design, the proposal would result in disproportionately large and contrived addition to the existing dwelling that would subsequently misbalance the symmetry of the semi-detached dwelling pair, and to the detriment of the dwellings’ attractive and simple built form, which is a characteristic of the immediate area. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policies CP1, CP3, CP11 and CP19 of the Core Strategy, policy CC01 of the MDD Local Plan, the Borough Design Guide SPD, the National Design Guide and sections 12 and 15 of the NPPF.’

The revised design seeks to overcome the issues identified in the refusal by reducing the overall scale and adopting a more simplified and sympathetic design approach.

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 in the countryside and is therefore to be considered under Policy CP11 of the adopted Core Strategy, which seeks to control development outside defined settlement boundaries. Relevant to this scheme, CP11 not permit development outside of development limits unless it falls within the exemption criteria below:

- It does not lead to excessive encroachment or expansion of development away from the original buildings.
- It does not result in inappropriate increases in the scale, form or footprint of the original building.

The application property occupies a generous plot, which provides scope for enlargement without resulting in overdevelopment. While the proposed extension represents a clear increase in mass, it would remain largely within the coalesce of the existing built form, thereby safeguarding the countryside from undue encroachment. Furthermore, the additional volume would appear proportionate within the context of the site, which is surrounded by other substantial properties. Accordingly, and given the reduced scale compared to the previously refused scheme, the proposed development would not harm the rural character of the area. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy CP11 in this respect.

Character of the Area: As noted above, the previous scheme was refused due to its excessive scale and overly complicated design, which was considered to disrupt the symmetry of the semi-detached pair and cause an unacceptable impact on the character of the area. These concerns have been carefully addressed in the revised proposal, which adopts a more traditional and sympathetic design approach, as outlined below.

The proposed two-storey side extension would be set back from the existing front elevation and lowered from the main ridge, creating a clear sense of subservience, an important consideration given the relatively large scale of the development. This subordinate relationship is further reinforced through the use of matching materials and fenestration. Importantly, the extension now exhibits well-balanced proportions, owing to its reduced width, which directly addresses a key concern associated with the previously refused scheme.

In addition, the omission of the previously proposed front extension, which was intended to span both the original dwelling and the extended element, has resulted in a more cohesive and simplified frontage, enhancing the overall appearance of the scheme. The front canopy now proposed is a minor addition that would not significantly alter the dwellings façade.

It is acknowledged that the extension would still introduce a slight imbalance to the semi-detached pair; however, this effect is inevitable with any side extension. Importantly, the harm identified in the previous Officer Report related to the excessive width, scale, and massing of the earlier proposal. These issues have now been mitigated through the revised design.

To the rear, the development includes several alterations: the installation of two dormer windows, the enlargement of the existing first-floor rear extension, and the addition of a single-storey ground floor extension.

While the primary concerns in the previously refused application related to the side extension and elements visible from Hyde End Lane, the Officer also raised issues regarding the scale and form of the proposed flat-roofed dormer. In response, the large dormer has been replaced with two smaller, well-proportioned features that sit comfortably within the roofscape of both the original and extended dwelling. The remaining elements, the ground floor extension and the enlargement of the existing first-floor rear extension, are modest and unobtrusive additions that do not detract from the character of the property.

In conclusion, the proposed development is considered to overcome the reasons for refusal imposed on application 242085, posing an acceptable visual impact on the host dwelling and the wider area. Accordingly, the scheme complies with Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP3.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: The changes to the ground and first floor rear fenestration would be acceptable in terms of overlooking. The outlook of the rear dormer would be almost identical to that of the first-floor windows (with a minor increase in the arc of outlook) thus would not detrimentally harm the privacy of the adjoining neighbours. The front facing fenestration and rooflights would overlook the vegetated highway verge on the opposite side of Hyde End Lane, thus raising no concern.

Loss of Light and Overbearing: The two-storey side extension, despite its massing, would still retain a generous separation distance from the site boundary shared with No.97 Hyde End Lane, which mitigates any concerns in these regards. The majority of the development would be sited to the east of the site and the only changes proposed adjacent to No.93 Hyde End Lane would be the alterations to the existing first floor rear extension and the addition of the proximate dormer feature. The minor increase in massing from these enlargements would pose no harm to the adjoining residents.

Ecology: A preliminary bat roost assessment and accompanying emergence surveys have been submitted in support of this application. The emergence surveys concluded that the proposals are highly unlikely to result in the damage or destruction of a bat roost or lead to the disturbance and or/harm to bats, such that no ecological objections are raised.

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:	6 January 2026
Earliest date for decision:	5 December 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	6 January 2026

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

- *Contaminated Land Consultation Zone*
- *Affordable Housing Thresholds*
- *Bat Roost Habitat Suitability*
- *Scale and Location of Development Proposals – Countryside (CP11)*
- *Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone – Green and Amber Risk Zones*
- *Nuclear Consultation Zone*
- *Strategic Development Location – South of M4*
- *Landscape Character Assessment Area*
- *SSSI Impact Risk Zones*
- *Thames Basin Heaths SPA Mitigation Zones*