

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	251203
Site Address:	16 Erleigh Court Gardens, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 1EH
Expiry Date:	7 August 2025
Site Visit Date:	19 June 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed single storey rear extension and first floor rear extension.	

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
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC07 – Parking
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
090228	Erection of a single storey rear extension to dwelling.	Approved 31/12/09

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways: No objection

WBC Ecology: No objection

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Earley Town Council: No objection
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	14 Erleigh Court Gardens: 14 Erleigh Court Gardens, was refused permission to extend any further as per planning

	parameters, as the property was already extended as far as extensions are permitted. The drainage system across the rear gardens can be further impinged, structural engineer assessment required. Officer response: Every application is assessed on case-by-case basis, on its own merit. Drainage system part of building control, not a material planning consideration.
--	---

APPRAISAL

Site Description: Two storey semi-detached dwelling.

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 first-floor flat roof side extension would be of a complimentary design to the host dwelling and would not be an incongruous or dominant feature to the host dwelling. The extension would be a subservient addition to the main dwelling and an unimposing feature which would not harm the character of the area. The flat roof would match that of the existing side element of the dwelling. Moreover, being located at the rear it wouldn't be visible from public locations. Hence, this aspect of the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character of the host property or surrounding area.

The single storey rear extension is approx. 4.70m in depth which exceeds the recommended 4m depth for extensions advocated within the Borough Design Guide. However, the host property has a very spacious garden and there are similar sized extensions in the surrounding area. Moreover, being located at the rear it wouldn't be visible from public locations. Hence, the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character of the host property or surrounding area.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: The first-floor rear elevation of the property already contains four windows at first floor level and reducing to three. The two small windows will be replaced by a single larger window, thus a similar outlook. Therefore, it is not considered that the side extension would not result in a loss of privacy or overlooking for neighbouring properties. The first-floor side extension would match that of the existing rear building line and still be set behind the rear building line of no.18. Most rear gardens are overlooked at an oblique angle from the upper floor windows in the neighbouring property. This is no different with the new window as part of the first-floor rear extension and its oblique angle/view of no.14 & no.18 rear garden. Thus, the rear window would not cause any significant harm with regards to neighbouring amenities and the relationship with the neighbouring house would be orthodox for dwellings in a suburban area.

Loss of Light/Overbearing: The first-floor side wall of no.18 and is blank with the ground floor having a side window for the kitchen. The first-floor side extension would be approx. 0.95m from the boundary of no.18 and approx. 1.60m from the flank wall of no.18, given such distance the extension would not result in harmful loss of light or considered to be overbearing. Furthermore, the kitchen and dinning room of no.18 are linked and would benefit from a window on the front elevation, therefore still having adequate access to natural light.

The closest window of no.18 would be for a shower room, classed as a non-habitable room as well as being set off from the boundary of no.18 by approx. 1.20m. Also, the single storey rear extension would be set back from the rear building line of no.14 as well as being. Thus, no concerns with regards to overbearing or loss of light.

Given the size, scale and sitting of the first-floor extension, it would not appear physically overbearing or oppressive to neighbours with the height of the dwelling not increasing and as such that it would be significantly detrimental to their amenities. Therefore, such aspect of the proposal would not result in harmful loss of light or overbearing.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: The proposal will not have a significant impact in respect of the overall number of habitable rooms. The existing level of parking will be retained and this is considered acceptable to serve the development.

Ecology: The PRA concludes that the building has evidenced no suitable features of value to bats where the proposed development works shall take place and no internal evidence of bat was identified both internally or externally. Therefore, no further assessment for bats will be required. Thus, the proposal will not have any harmful ecological impacts.

Amenity Space: The proposal reduces the amount of amenity space available to the property, but it would still be roughly rectangular in shape, receive sunlight for part of the day and be able to accommodate typical garden activities as set out in the Borough Design Guide. Therefore, the reduction in amenity space is not considered to have a harmful impact on the amenity of the occupier.

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, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief. 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:	4 August 2025
Earliest date for decision:	3 July 2025

Recommendation agreed by:	
(Authorised Officer)	
Date:	4 August 2025