

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	252621
Site Address:	70 Reading Road, Wokingham, Wokingham, RG41 1EL
Expiry Date:	31 December 2025
Site Visit Date:	15/12/2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a front canopy roof, part single-storey and part two-storey rear and side extension with balcony, installation of solar panels and changes to fenestration, alongside the erection of a detached garage and access ramp, following the demolition of the existing porch and lean-to.	

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 CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC07 – Parking TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Joint Minerals and Waste Plan (JMWP)	DM1 - Sustainable Development DM2 - Climate Change – Mitigation and Adaptation DM3 - Protection of Habitats and Species DM4 - Protection of Designated Landscape DM5 - Protection of the Countryside DM6 - Green Belt DM7 - Conserving the Historic Environment DM8 - Restoration of Minerals and Waste Developments DM9 - Protecting Health, Safety and Amenity DM10 - Flood Risk DM11 - Water Resources DM12 - Sustainable Transport Movements DM13 - High Quality Design of Minerals and Waste Development DM14 - Ancillary development DM15 - Site History
Wokingham Borough Local	SS1 – Sustainable development principles SS2 – Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy SS3 – Development within or adjacent to major and modest settlements C5 – Parking and electric vehicle charging

Plan Update (LPU)	NE1 – Biodiversity and geodiversity NE4 – Trees, woodland, hedges and hedgerows DH1 – Place making and quality design DH2 – Safeguarding amenity
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document

PLANNING HISTORY		
Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
251462	Householder application for the proposed erection of front canopy roof, part single and part two storey rear and side extension, changes to fenestration, instalment of solar panels and erection of detached garage and access ramp.	Approved, 15/08/2025
17281	Single storey addition to provide extensions of kitchen and lounge.	Approved 13/04/1982

CONSULTATION RESPONSES
Internal
WBC Property Services – No comments received. WBC Drainage – No objections, subject to a condition. WBC Landscape and Trees – No objections, subject to conditions. WBC CIL – No comments received.
External
None consulted.

REPRESENTATIONS	
Parish/Town Council	No comments received
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	<p>No.64 Reading Road - The occupier of No.64 Reading Road has raised the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that no Construction Management Plan has been submitted to demonstrate that the shared access would remain unobstructed during construction, which could affect access to No.64 Reading Road. Objection to the proposed ramp access, which appears to rely on a shared layby not within the applicant's sole ownership and could result in the loss

	<p>of existing parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that the scale and massing of the proposed two-storey extensions could reduce daylight and sunlight to No.64 Reading Road, with no supporting assessment provided. • Concern that the proposed first-floor balcony could result in overlooking and a loss of privacy
--	---

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application site relates to a two storey, detached property located in an established residential close, immediately off Reading Road. The surrounding area is characterised by detached properties that vary similar in design and appearance.

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:

This application follows a similar scheme that was approved in August 2025 under planning ref: 251462. The current application seeks a number of amendments to the approved scheme, the principal changes of which are summarised below:

- A slight repositioning and enlargement of the single-storey east side projection.
- The introduction of a first-floor balcony with associated balustrade.
- The omission of the previously approved flat-roof dormer infill extension.
- Amendments to the siting, size, and arrangement of fenestration across all elevations.
- The proposed detached garage would be rendered in a finish that would differ from that of the main dwelling.

When considered in the context of the extant permission, these changes are modest

in scale and design and would not result in any adverse impact on the character or appearance of the area.

As the remaining elements of the proposal are materially identical to those approved under application 251462, the assessment undertaken by the previous Case Officer remains applicable, has been updated where necessary, and is set out below.

Front Extension

The proposed single storey front extension would have a pitched roof joining it to the host dwelling and this would extend across and over the existing bay window on the front elevation. The front extension would comply with guidance in the Borough Design Guide (BDG) as the building is set well back from the street frontage and the extension does not project forward of the existing building line. As such, it is deemed that the front extension poses no harm to the character of the area.

Side Extension

The BDG states that “side extensions should be set back from the building by at least 1m, preferably with a lower roof line and should be set at least 1m from the plot boundary”. The proposed side extension is set back from the from the first-floor front building line by 4 metres. Additionally, the ridge height of the side extension will be set down by 0.6 metres from the eaves height of the existing dwelling. In terms of separation distance, the side extension will be set approximately 1.6 metres from the boundary with the access to nos. 66 & 68. The side extension therefore complies with guidance in the BDG, and it is deemed that it would appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling. As such, the proposed side extension poses no harm to the character of the area.

Rear Extension

The proposed first floor rear extension extends 1.75 metres beyond the existing first floor rear building line and it is set 3.5 metres from the boundary with the neighbouring property. The ridge height of the extension would not exceed that of the existing dwelling, and this is aligned with guidance in the BDG. The proportionate scale and unimposing design of the rear extension ensures that it would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the dwelling and wider area. Additionally, the extension is to the rear of the property and would only be partially visible from the public domain and this further demonstrates that it poses no harm to the character of the area.

Garage and Ramp

The proposed garage and associated access ramp are located to the front of the dwelling. This goes against guidance in the BDG which states “garages should not be sited in front gardens but should be to the side or rear of a dwelling”. However, in this instance the front garden is set down significantly lower than the application dwelling due to a significant change in levels across the site’s frontage. This means that only a small portion of the roof of the garage would be visible from the street scene. Furthermore, the neighbouring properties at no.72 and 74 both feature detached garages sited with their front plots. Therefore, in this instance it is considered that the garage is sited in an appropriate location, and it would not negatively impact upon the street scene or character of the area.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking

The proposed balcony platform would be sited at the north-west end of the property, largely overlooking the front driveway area and public realm. A neighbouring property, No.64 Reading Road, and its associated rear garden are located to the south-east of the application site.

Figure 4.25 provides a summary of the Council's recommended minimum privacy and amenity distances to help maintain privacy and limit any sense of enclosure. Although this specific relationship between these two properties is not explicitly illustrated in the figure, the recommended minimum back-to-flank separation distance of 12 metres is considered most applicable in this instance.

The submitted site plan demonstrates that the eastern edge of the proposed balcony would maintain an approximate 17.5 metre separation distance from the north-western boundary fence and rear patio area of No.64 Reading Road. This distance is considered sufficient to maintain privacy for the neighbouring property. It is also noted that the views from the new balcony would be broadly comparable to those currently experienced from the existing first-floor east-facing windows of the host property, largely providing angled views toward the rear garden of No.64 Reading Road. Therefore, the proposed balcony is not considered to result in any significant additional overlooking or loss of privacy.

The views offered from the remain new windows would be similar to that shared from the existing arrangement, maintaining appropriate separation distances in accordance with the BDG SPD, therefore, no unacceptable overlooking impact over and beyond the degree of privacy as existing would arise.

Loss of Light and Overbearing:

Concerns have been raised by the occupier of No.64 Reading Road regarding the potential impact of the proposed extensions on daylight and sunlight to their property. However, a considerable separation distance would be maintained between the proposed development and the neighbouring dwelling. In particular, the closest two-storey side/rear element of the proposal would be located approximately 14 metres from the rear elevation and patio area of No. 64 Reading Road.

Given this level of separation, together with the relative orientation of the buildings and the scale of the proposed extensions, it is considered that the development would not result in an unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight to the neighbouring property.

With regard to the remaining extensions, they would be suitably located from neighbouring properties and of modest proportions not to pose any unreasonable concerns of overbearing or loss of light impacts.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

The submitted Block Plans indicates five off-street parking spaces which would be sufficient for a dwelling of this size, and in accordance with the council's Parking

Standards. As such, there are no highways issues.

The new access is onto a private road and as such there is no separate approval necessary from the councils Traffic Management team and no impact on the public highway.

The occupier of No.64 Reading Road objects to the proposal on the grounds of access, construction impacts and residential amenity. Concerns are raised that no Construction Management Plan has been submitted to demonstrate that the shared access would remain unobstructed during construction, particularly given the reliance on this access and the constraints identified by the Tree Protection Plan. Objection is also raised to the proposed ramp access, which is shown to rely on a shared layby not within the applicant's sole ownership, potentially resulting in a loss of existing parking.

The granting of planning permission would not authorise the applicant to obstruct or interfere with any shared access, highway land, or third-party land, nor would it override any private rights. The proposal relates to a conventional householder development, and it is reasonable to expect that construction activities, including contractor parking and deliveries, would be managed within the application site, primarily via the existing driveway to the east of the dwelling. Whilst some disturbance is inevitable during construction, this would be temporary and intermittent in nature and not materially different from that associated with typical residential development. As such, it is not considered necessary or proportionate to require a Construction Management Plan for a development of this scale.

In respect of the new access arrangement, it is acknowledged that the adjacent area may have been used informally for short-term parking by service vehicles. However, this area is not a formally designated layby or parking space. The access lane is privately maintained and is therefore not subject to highway restrictions. Each dwelling served by the lane benefits from either its own or a shared driveway provision, which is capable of accommodating such vehicles.

Accordingly, the proposal would not result in the loss of formal parking provision or give rise to an unacceptable impact on access or highway safety.

Flooding and Drainage:

The proposed development is in Flood zone 1 according to the Environment Agency mapping and in an area that experiences high groundwater levels. The Council's Drainage Officer has reviewed the application and has noted that the drainage details have not been provided, and the existing drainage details has not been mentioned. The Drainage Officer has subsequently recommended a condition be implemented which secures details of the surface water drainage system of the site prior to the commencement of development.

However, the Local Planning Authority considers this condition to be overly onerous given the scale and nature of the development. While the proposal would introduce new areas of hardstanding to accommodate the front driveway and garage, replacing what is currently grassed land, the submitted site plan demonstrates that the hardstanding would still be largely surrounded by soft landscaping. The retention of substantial permeable areas across the site is considered sufficient to ensure that the

development would not adversely affect flood risk on the site or to surrounding properties.

Landscape and Trees:

The site is located along Wokingham Road, which is designated as a Green Route, and contains an Oak tree protected by Tree Preservation Order TPO1325/2009.

The Council's Trees and Landscape Officer has reviewed the submitted Arboricultural Report and is satisfied that its conclusions and recommended mitigation measures are acceptable. Existing tree screening to the front of the site would largely be retained, with three 'C' category trees proposed for removal. Replacement planting is proposed where trees affected by Ash Dieback are no longer viable.

A detached garage and associated areas of hardstanding are proposed within the northern part of the site, with some encroachment into the root protection areas (RPAs) of retained trees. While the incursion into one Ash tree exceeds the recommended threshold, this impact can be appropriately managed through the use of a specialist foundation design and a 'no-dig' driveway construction. Subject to conditions, the Trees and Landscape Officer raises no objection to the proposal.

However, the Case Officer notes that the Arboricultural Report and Tree Protection Plan submitted with this application (Duckworths Arboriculture Ltd, ref: AIA/AMS 06686/2025) are identical to those submitted under the previously approved application (ref. 251462). In that case, the Trees and Landscape Officer reached similar conclusions but recommended conditions requiring that construction be carried out in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Survey, Impact Assessment, and Method Statement, and that existing trees and shrubs be retained. No pre-commencement conditions requiring the submission and approval of detailed foundation and construction specifications were imposed.

For consistency of approach, the Case Officer considers it appropriate to apply the same conditions as previously approved. The scope of works proposed under the current application is modest and relates primarily to the footprint of the main dwelling, without introducing any additional or materially different impacts on surrounding trees. Furthermore, all construction works would still be required to be undertaken in full accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Survey, Impact Assessment, and Method Statement, including the use of specialist foundations and the protection of root protection areas as set out in Appendix F of the report.

Accordingly, appropriate conditions will be attached to any planning approval to secure tree protection measures in line with the previously approved scheme.

Ecology:

The site is located in habitat which matches where bat roosts have previously been found in the borough.

The submitted Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (by Arbtech Consulting, March 2025) highlighted that the loft space of the dwelling was not fully accessible due to large water tank immediately to the north when entering the loft space which

prevented access into the northern section of the loft. As the proposed development would result in the extension of this building on the eastern and southern elevations. This could result in the destruction of any bat roosts present and could cause disturbance, death or injury to bats, therefore, one further bat emergence survey was required.

A subsequent Emergence Survey Report (by Arbtech Consulting, May 2025) was provided, which confirmed that no bats were observed roosting or foraging within the identified features. The report therefore concludes that no further surveys or mitigation measures are required. On this basis, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to adversely affect roosting bats or other protected species.

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:	Approval
Date:	10 December 2025
Earliest date for decision:	30 November 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>MC</i>
Date:	19.12.2025