

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	252344
Site Address:	11 Retford Close, Woodley, Wokingham, RG5 4TP
Expiry Date:	16 December 2025
Site Visit Date:	29 October 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a part two- storey, part single-storey side extension, a single storey rear extension, plus alterations to fenestration and external materials.	

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 CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC07 – Parking TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

NO RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Drainage – Request further information
WBC Highways – Request further information
WBC CIL – No comments
WBC Ecology – No objection

External

None

REPRESENTATIONS

Woodley Town Council	The Town Council initially raised an objection to the application on the following grounds: - the proposed cladding would be out of keeping with the street scene - the proposed design would be overbearing, due to massing The Town Council did provide further comments following the submission of amended plans and the subsequent re-consultation, in which they raised no objection to the scheme.
Councillor Alison Swaddle	Cllr Swaddle initially raised an objection to the application on the following grounds: - the proposed cladding would be out of keeping with the street scene - the proposed design would be overbearing, due to massing Cllr Swaddle did not provide any further comments following the submission of amended plans and the subsequent re-consultation.
Neighbours	One objection letter received following the submission of amended plans, raising the following concerns: <u><i>South-facing lavatory window</i></u> They strongly object to any window or vent in the south wall overlooking No. 10. Even if marked as fixed and obscured, they fear it may be altered later. They request alternative ventilation that avoids this elevation. <u><i>Maintenance access along the boundary</i></u> The proposal alters the form of No. 11 along the shared boundary, and it is unclear how gutters and external walls will be maintained without access from No. 10. Previously, the flat-roofed garage allowed easy maintenance from within No. 11. <u><i>Storm-water drainage</i></u> They seek assurance that rainwater from the south side of the roof will not discharge towards No. 10, potentially affecting its foundations. They request that all storm water

	be connected to below-ground drainage rather than draining onto open ground. <u><i>Incorrect site boundary shown</i></u> They state the submitted plans show the site boundary inaccurately, extending into No. 10's garden. The true boundary follows the face of the existing garage and longstanding fence line. Correcting this will affect construction methods, foundation placement, and may require party-wall considerations. They suggest discussions between both owners to resolve any boundary or construction issues.
--	--

APPRAISAL

Context: The application site is situated within a residential area of Woodley. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey side extension, a single-storey rear extension, and associated minor alterations.

The current iteration of the scheme follows a formal re-consultation process, prompted by significant concerns that the original proposal would have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity due to its scale and overbearing nature. In response, the applicant has submitted amended plans incorporating the following key changes:

- Omission of the first-floor rear extension
- Repositioning of the first-floor side extension
- Reduction in the depth of the ground-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: The proposed two-storey side extension would be set back from the existing front elevation and noticeably set down 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 where visible from Retford Close. Overall, the extension exhibits well-balanced proportions and complies with the

Borough Design Guide, leading to the conclusion that it would have an acceptable impact on both the character of the property and the surrounding area.

Notwithstanding the above, a further consideration is the reduction in spacing between the application site and No. 10. Gaps between buildings are essential for maintaining the openness of the street scene and avoiding a terracing effect. In this case, careful attention has been given to this issue, where the first-floor element of the extension is set in from the boundary, and the roof slopes away from it. This design ensures that the retained separation at first-floor level is sufficient to preserve the spacious character of the street scene.

To the rear of the property, a modest single-storey extension is proposed. Due to its discreet location and unimposing design, it would not have a significant impact on the wider character or dwelling itself. Potential effects on neighbouring properties will be addressed in the relevant section of this report.

To the front, the proposal includes a replacement window, a new front door, and a canopy roof. These are minor alterations that would have little effect on the overall character of the property and therefore raise no objection.

In conclusion, the development is considered to have an acceptable visual impact on the host dwelling and the wider area. Accordingly, the proposal complies with Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP3.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Loss of Light / Overbearing

As noted above, the original scheme posed an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity due to its scale and overbearing nature. The amended proposal, which includes the omission of the first-floor rear extension, the repositioning of the first-floor side extension, and a reduced depth for the ground-floor extension, is considered to address these concerns effectively.

The revised design has been carefully formulated to minimise impact on the adjacent property, primarily through compliance with the 45-degree test for loss of light. This assessment confirms that the first-floor side extension would not infringe upon the closest habitable window of the neighbouring dwelling. While the single-storey element falls within the 45-degree line of sight, its modest scale ensures that any effect on light levels would be limited.

Although the ground-floor addition would extend the built form along the shared boundary, its impact is mitigated by the limited height and the roof design, which slopes away from the boundary. Furthermore, the depth of this extension has been reduced compared to the original submission, with the proposed plans illustrating only a modest increase beyond the footprint of the existing garage.

Overall, while it is acknowledged that the enlarged dwelling will have a greater presence than the current arrangement, this is not considered to result in unacceptable harm to the amenities of No. 10.

Objection Letter:

Following re-consultation, the objecting neighbouring resident did not raise any further concerns relating to the loss of light or overbearing impacts. They did, however, raise concerns on the matters below:

Overlooking

The neighbour raised concerns regarding the proposed south-facing ground-floor window, intended to serve a toilet. Given that this is a non-habitable room at ground-floor level, the window would not create any significant overlooking potential. Furthermore, the plans require the window to be fixed shut and fitted with obscure glazing, providing an additional safeguard for the privacy of adjacent residents. While the neighbour expressed concern that these measures might be altered in the future, it should be noted that any change to clear glazing would conflict with the plans and therefore would not benefit from planning permission.

The proposed rear-facing first-floor window would offer only oblique views of neighbouring gardens on both Retford Close and Denmark Avenue. It would not result in direct overlooking, and the outlook would remain broadly consistent with that of the existing first-floor rear windows. There are no other proposed windows that would introduce any additional overlooking potential.

Maintenance Access

Although the proposed development alters the extent of built form along the shared boundary, a sufficient gap remains to allow maintenance of No. 11. Accordingly, no concerns are raised in this regard. In any case, maintenance access is not a material planning consideration.

Drainage Details

The resident of No. 10 requested that all stormwater be directed to below-ground drainage rather than discharging onto open ground, to prevent any potential impact on their property. Given the site's location within Flood Zone 1 and the limited scale of the proposed development, it is not considered necessary to require additional drainage details in this instance.

Incorrect Site Boundary

The neighbouring resident expressed concern that the submitted red line boundary does not accurately reflect the existing ownership boundaries. While the Local Planning Authority acknowledges these concerns, the submitted plans align with the land registry parcels available online, and therefore there is no justification to reject the application on this basis. Nevertheless, the applicant is reminded that the granting of planning permission does not confer any rights to access or carry out works on, over, or under neighbouring land without prior consent. Furthermore, compliance with the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 remains the applicant's responsibility.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: The Highways Officer has identified a shortfall in parking spaces relative to the number of habitable rooms and requested additional provision. While this shortfall is acknowledged, it is not considered sufficient grounds to refuse planning permission. Retford Close is a quiet residential road with adequate opportunities for on-street parking, which mitigates the impact of the limited shortfall in this instance.

Flooding and Drainage: Drainage matters have been addressed in the Neighbouring Amenity section of this report.

Ecology: No objection has been raised by WBC Ecology. The appropriate survey concluded that the building has negligible potential to support roosting bats, hence further surveys are unnecessary.

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:	15 December 2025
-------	------------------

Earliest date for decision:	10 December 2025
-----------------------------	------------------

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

Date:	15 December 2025
-------	------------------

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

- *Major Development Location of Woodley*