

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	261293
Site Address:	60 Rochester Avenue, Woodley, Wokingham, RG5 4NB
Expiry Date:	3 August 2026
Site Visit Date:	11 June 2026
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of two storey side extension following demolition of existing car port plus changes to fenestration.	

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 CC07 – Parking
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Woodley Design Statement

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
252928	Householder application for the proposed erection of a two storey side extension following demolition of the existing car port.	Refused: February 2026
243025	Householder application for the proposed erection of an attached garage following demolition of the existing car port.	Approved: January 2025
240158	Householder application for the proposed single storey rear side extension following demolition of existing conservatory and garage.	Approved: March 2024

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal
None
External
None

REPRESENTATIONS

Woodley Town Council	No objection.
Ward Member(s)	No comments received.
Neighbours	One letter has been received from The Keen Partnership Ltd, objecting to the proposal on behalf of the neighbouring occupier at No.62 Rochester Avenue. The concerns principally relate to the extension projecting up to the shared side boundary and the associated impact on the neighbouring property.

APPRAISAL

Context: The application site is located within an established residential area of Woodley and comprises a 1950s two-storey semi-detached dwelling. This submission seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension following the demolition of the existing car port.

This application follows the refusal of a broadly similar scheme under ref. 252928, which was refused in February 2026. The reason for refusal stated:

“The proposed development, by reason of its poor design, excessive form and scale and inappropriate proximity to the site boundary, would result in an incongruous, cramped and contrived form of development within Rochester Avenue, causing a potential terracing effect and significant harm to the visual amenity of the existing semi-detached houses and the wider character of the area. The proposal is contrary to Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP3, Managing Development Delivery Local Plan Policy CC01, and the design guidance set out within The Borough Design Guide SPD and Section 12 of the NPPF.”

The revised scheme currently under consideration seeks to respond to the concerns previously identified, with amendments made to the design, proportions and scale of the extension in order to improve its relationship with the host dwelling and the wider street scene.

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 proposed two-storey side extension has been subject to careful design amendments following the refusal of the earlier scheme. Whilst the

proposal remains fundamentally similar in principle, the revised scheme demonstrates a clear and positive evolution in design approach, resulting in a form of development that is more sympathetic to the host dwelling.

Most notably, the extension now incorporates a greater set down from the ridge line of the existing dwelling. This amendment serves to visually subordinate the addition and ensures that it reads as a clearly secondary element to the host property. Such an approach reflects established good design principles for residential extensions, whereby additions, particularly above ground floor level, should remain subservient to the original dwelling. The lowered ridge height and corresponding eaves relationship also assist in reducing the perceived bulk and massing of the extension.

In terms of architectural detailing, the revised scheme presents a more coherent and considered appearance. The introduction of the mono-pitched roof element creates a more integrated relationship with the existing built form, whilst both the mono-pitch feature and the proposed dormer help to break up the previously expansive blank façade that formed a key concern within the refused scheme. Collectively, these amendments result in a more balanced and aesthetically pleasing design.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the extension continues to project towards the side boundary, which was a prominent reason for the refusal of the previous application, it is now considered that the significantly improved design quality and reduced scale ensures that the development integrates more successfully with the existing dwelling and no longer appears overly dominant or incongruous within the street scene. The combination of the increased set down, improved proportions, and enhanced detailing results in a scheme that preserves the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area, thereby, on balance, overcoming the previous reason for refusal.

The site also benefits from an extant planning permission for the removal of the existing car port and erection of an attached garage (Ref: 243025). This fallback position represents a material planning consideration in the assessment of the current proposal and does not appear to have been fully acknowledged within the assessment of the previous refusal. Whilst the proposal introduces an additional storey above this approved footprint, it is evident from the submitted plans that the resultant increase in overall bulk and massing, when compared to the approved single-storey garage, is not significantly greater. This is primarily due to the subservient design approach adopted, including the notable set down from the main ridge line as discussed above.

The officer's report relating to the refused scheme references examples of two-storey side extensions within the street scene, although these were afforded limited weight due either to their age or because the degree of setback was more pronounced than that proposed under the refused application. However, the revised proposal now incorporates a notably greater set down and visual subservience, as outlined above. Furthermore, since the refusal of the earlier application in February 2026, there has been additional development within the street scene, including the approval of a larger two-storey side extension at No.46 (Ref: 261186), which similarly extends up to the side boundary. Whilst each application must be assessed on its own merits, the evolving built context of Rochester Avenue is considered to further mitigate any perceived visual impact arising from a first-floor side addition to the host dwelling.

For all of the reasons set out above, it is considered that the proposal successfully overcomes the previous reason for refusal and complies with Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy, having an acceptable impact upon the host dwelling, the street scene, and the wider character of the area.

Neighbouring Amenity: A detailed assessment of the potential impact of the previously refused scheme on the occupiers of No.62 was undertaken as part of application ref. 252928. That assessment concluded that, whilst concerns were raised in relation to design and siting, the impacts in terms of neighbouring amenity were not an issue. The current proposal represents a reduction in scale and overall form when compared to the refused scheme and as such, it follows that the development would not give rise to any greater impacts in terms of outlook, loss of light or overbearing effect. In fact, it is considered that the relationship with No.62 would be no worse, but improved, when compared to the earlier scheme. Accordingly, no unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity would arise.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: It was concluded through the previous submission that the existing parking arrangement would be acceptable to serve the enlarged dwelling. This remains the case and thus no objections are raised on these grounds.

Conclusion: For the reasons set out above, it is considered that the proposed development has satisfactorily addressed and overcome the reason for refusal imposed on application ref. 252928. The revised scheme represents a clear improvement in design, form and overall integration with the host dwelling and surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the relevant development plan policies and is therefore 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:	1 July 2026
Earliest date for decision:	30 June 2026

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>HMM</i>
Date:	1 July 2026

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

- *Major Development Location of Woodley*