

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	261349
Site Address:	19 Arborfield Road, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9DY
Expiry Date:	21 August 2026
Site Visit Date:	22 July 2026
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a porch extension, part two-storey and single storey rear extension following the demolition of existing conservatory plus changes to fenestration including a Juliet balcony to rear.	

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 CP7 – Biodiversity CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits TB25 – Archaeology
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

NO RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Drainage – No objection subject to a condition
WBC CIL – No comments
WBC Ecology – No comments

External

Berkshire Archaeology – No objection

REPRESENTATIONS

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

APPRAISAL

The application site is located within a residential setting of Shinfield.

This application seeks to obtain planning permission for the erection of two storey side/rear extension, a ground floor rear extension, along with the erection of a side porch to replace the existing. Amended plans have been received since the application was initially validated, comprising the reduced depth of the flat roofed, first floor extension.

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: Following the submission of the amended elevations, it is considered that the proposed extension now presents a more restrained form that better reflects the proportions of, and integrates with, the host dwelling. The proposal retains the dominant form of the existing property, with the original dwelling remaining clearly legible as the principal element of the building. The most notable design improvement of the revised scheme is evident on the rear elevation, where the reduced depth of the first-floor, flat-roofed element ensures that it no longer extends across the full width of the dwelling, significantly reducing its visual prominence.

Notwithstanding these positive amendments, the two-storey side extension, incorporating a flat-roof design, continues to project beyond the existing side elevation. This projection would be visible in views along Arborfield Road and would introduce a degree of visual awkwardness when viewed from certain angles. The flat-roofed form does not fully reflect the established pitched-roof character of the host dwelling and therefore appears somewhat at odds with the architectural composition of the original house.

However, when assessed in the context of the revised scheme as a whole, this discordant feature is not considered to result in unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of either the host dwelling or the surrounding area. The extension remains subordinate in scale and massing to the original building, with additional weight afforded to its setback from the public realm, which limits its visual impact within the street scene. Whilst the development does not fully replicate the existing roofscape, it is considered to achieve an acceptable standard of design that preserves the overall character of the site and does not appear so incongruous or dominant as to justify refusal on design grounds.

With regard to the ground floor rear extension and replacement side porch, these are considered modest and sympathetic additions to the dwelling, thus raising no visual concerns.

On balance, the proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene, and is accordingly considered to comply with Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy.

Neighbouring Amenity: There are two first-floor side-facing windows proposed as part of the development. One of these would serve the landing and, by virtue of its non-habitable function, would not give rise to any privacy concerns. The second window would serve a bedroom and, as the sole source of outlook for that room, requires careful assessment, as its treatment could not reasonably be secured through condition. It was noted during the site visit that the bedroom window would be positioned directly opposite the flank wall of the neighbouring dwelling, No.20. As such, it would not afford views towards the principal front or rear amenity areas of that property. Furthermore, the adjacent first-floor windows within the flank elevation of No.20 serve ensembles rather than habitable rooms, thereby avoiding any direct intervisibility between habitable spaces. Whilst the proposal would introduce a degree of side-facing overlooking, this is expected within suburban residential environments and, in this instance, the relationship is not considered to result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers. It is material that the neighbouring occupants have not submitted an objection to the layout as proposed or raised any issues on overlooking grounds.

The additional first-floor rear-facing windows, including the Juliet balcony, would primarily afford oblique views across neighbouring gardens but would not result in any direct overlooking.

With regard to any loss of light or overbearing impacts, the ground floor extension would extend no further than the rear of the adjoining semi-detached property, which combined with the separation to No.20, would mitigate any impact in this respect.

Flooding and Drainage: WBC Drainage has requested further details to be submitted prior to the commencement of development. However, given that the site is located within Flood Zone 1 and the proposal is of a relatively modest scale, this requirement is not considered proportionate. As such, it has not been secured by condition.

Ecology: The submitted Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment concludes that the proposed development would not result in adverse impacts upon bats or their roosting habitats. On this basis, it advises that no further bat surveys are required in support of the application.

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:	12 August 2026
--------------	----------------

Earliest date for decision:	20 July 2026
------------------------------------	--------------

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	

Date:	12 August 2026
--------------	-----------------------

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

- *Modest Development Location of Shinfield*
- *Bat Roost Habitat*
- *Archaeology Consultation Zone*