

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	251194
Site Address:	10 Westfield Road, Winnersh, Wokingham, RG41 5ER
Expiry Date:	15 July 2025
Site Visit Date:	23 May 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed single storey rear extension.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Scale and Location of Development Proposals – Major Development Location (Winnersh)
Landscape Character Assessment Area
Historic Flooding Points Consultation Zone

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 CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC07 – Parking TB21 – Landscape Character
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
242277	Application for the prior approval of the erection of a single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 8m, for which the maximum height would be 2.5m and the height of the eaves 2.25m.	Prior Approval not required – 05 September 2024.
990961	Proposed rear dormer extension to dwelling to form rooms in roof space.	Approved – 16 February 1999.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal
WBC Highways – No objection. WBC CIL – No comments received.
External
None consulted.

REPRESENTATIONS	
Parish/Town Council	Winnersh Parish Council - Whilst the Planning and Transport Committee does not object to the application, they have noted concerns regarding the inadequate parking provision for five cars. Additionally, it was raised that Westfield Lane is narrow, which may impact accessibility and parking. Officer comments: This will be discussed in the Highways section of the report.
Ward Member(s)	Councillor Prue Bray commented - This application turns this chalet bungalow into a 5 bed/5 bath home which on the balance of probabilities is destined to become an HMO. Given this configuration, a parking arrangement which involves 3 cars parked one behind the other, with 2 cars barely able to squeeze into the remaining area of the front garden, is clearly unfeasible, as it would frequently require cars to be moved to let people out. Westfield Road is not wide enough to support on streetcar parking. Officer comments: This will be discussed in the Highways and HMO Section of the report.
Neighbours	4 comments (excluding duplicate comments) have been received in relation to the application. The key issues which were raised were: • Street parking beyond capacity limits. Officer Comments: The Highways team reviewed the proposal and assessed that the number of parking spaces proposed will meet the council's current standards. Therefore, there should be no need for an increase in street parking as a result of the application. • Congestion Officer Comments: WBC Highways have not raised concern that this proposal would result in congestion on the highway network. • Concerns of the property changing to an HMO (and associated impacts on parking/ character of the area)

	Officer Comments: Please see the HMO Section of the report. - Noise levels from increased occupants. Officer Comments: The proposal is for a single storey rear extension to a domestic dwelling. This is not considered to result in a substantial level of noise compared to the existing situation. Noise issues/ complaints are dealt with under separate legislation by the Council's Environmental Health team. - Inadequate parking provision Officer Comments: Please see Highways section of the report. - Danger to pedestrians, children in pushchairs and people with disabilities/visually impaired due to increased parking. Officer Comments: WBC Highways have confirmed there is sufficient parking on site as a result of this specific application and therefore should not overflow outside of the site. - Rendering and finish on new extension to match the existing property finish. Officer Comments: A condition is recommended to ensure that the materials used for the proposed rear extension match the existing property where applicable. The application form does not discuss rendering the extension; however, officers do not consider this essential to ensure a compatible design given the proposed bricks are to match the existing.
--	---

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application site is a chalet bungalow along Westfield Road, in the village of Winnersh a major development location within Wokingham Borough. Westfield Road is a narrow no through road with the majority of houses being bungalows or chalet bungalows. On the other side of the road to the host dwelling are terrace properties and there is the occasional detached house. The street is therefore made up of a variety of housing types which differ in style, character, and age. The majority of houses have no garages but have small driveways and access to rear gardens.

The host property is made out of brick and has a white render look to the front. The roof is tiled and has two front windows with gable roofs. The property has a large rear

garden and a dormer window at the rear. The house has no garage and has a narrow driveway which can accommodate the parking of five vehicles.

Proposal:

This is a Householder application is for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension which will facilitate a kitchen/lounge area and a bedroom. Also, there will be changes to fenestration. For clarity, if this application were approved, the permission would not convey a material change of use away from a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3), although it should be noted that a small House in Multiple Accommodation (Use Class C4), for occupation by no more than 6 residents, could potentially benefit from permitted development rights. However, this is not a material consideration for assessment under this Householder planning application.

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.

Design and Character of the Area:

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.

Rear extension:

In the Borough Design Guide, it states that rear extensions should not project more than four metres from the main rear wall where they are close to a side boundary. In this case the rear extension measures 5.47 metres in length at its maximum and is therefore more than four metres from the main rear wall. As such, the proposed rear extension does not meet this aspect of the Borough Design Guide. However, in this instance the proposed rear extension would be deemed acceptable due to the extension being at the rear of the property, single storey, retention of adequate separation distances away from property boundaries and the neighbouring dwellings along Westfield Road having staggered building lines. Hence, it would not unduly impact the design and character of the surrounding area.

Also, for rear extensions the Borough Design Guide states that the maximum eaves and ridge height should be no more than those of the existing property. The maximum eaves height of the proposed rear extension is 2.69 metres whilst the maximum eaves height of the existing property is 4.96 metres and is less than those

of the existing property and therefore meets this aspect of the Borough Design Guide. The ridge height of the proposed rear extension measures 2.94 metres whilst the ridge height of the existing property is 5.18 metres and is less than those of the existing property and therefore meets this set criteria of the Borough Design Guide.

For single storey rear extensions, the Borough Design Guide states that the eaves height should not exceed three metres within two metres of a side boundary. The eaves height of the proposed rear extension measures 2.69 metres which is less than three metres within two metres of a side boundary. Therefore, it does comply with this aspect of the Borough Design Guide.

In terms of materials the existing house is made out of brick. The proposed rear extension will also be constructed out of brick to match the existing property. The existing roof of the house is made out of tiles. The proposed rear extension roof will be made out of GRP and be a flat roof only. The existing windows of the property are made out of white uPVC. The proposed windows of the rear extension will also be made out of white uPVC. This will be secured via condition.

There have been examples of similar applications for rear extensions in the area. No. 2, no. 6, and no. 14 Westfield Road, Winnersh have had similar applications for rear extensions (WBC Refs. 120435, 231004 and 012040) approved and implemented. This shows other houses along Westfield Road have had similar applications approved and as such would not be out keeping with the character of the area.

Overall, in terms of design it complies with most of the criteria of the Borough Design Guide in a number of respects. The proposed single storey rear extension would not have any detrimental effect on the existing street scene, or the character of the area. The proposal is acceptable in accordance with the rear extension criteria of the Borough Design Guide and in terms of design and character.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Policy CP3 states that development should not have any detrimental effect on the amenities of adjoining land users. In the Borough Design Guide the primary consideration for rear extensions is its impact upon neighbours.

Overlooking:

For rear extensions, the Borough Design Guide states that the side walls of extensions must not contain windows especially at first floor level, to minimise any potential impact upon the privacy of neighbours. The proposed single storey rear extension will not include the addition of any new windows at first floor level due to the proposed rear extension being single storey.

The proposed development will include changes to fenestration. There will be no fenestration changes to the front of the property. There will be an installation of a new ground floor window at the side elevation facing towards the neighbour at no. 12 Westfield Road. At the north side elevation backing onto the neighbour at no. 8 Westfield road the existing side windows will be blocked up. This new ground floor window will not overlook the neighbours at no. 12 Westfield Road as it will face the

boundary fence between the two properties. The existing boundary fence between these two properties will help to alleviate any overlooking concerns. At the rear of the property the existing two windows and door will be replaced with bifold doors out into the garden. The existing bifold doors will be replaced with a window and the existing roof will be changed to a pitched roof.

The distance between the neighbouring habitable room windows of the application site and the no. 2 Chatsworth Avenue is 33.39 metres. This is more than 22 metres advocated within the Borough Design Guide and therefore complies with this aspect of the Borough Design Guide. The distance between the neighbouring habitable room windows of the application site and no. 26 Calver Close is 31.93 metres. This is more than 22 metres advocated within the Borough Design Guide and therefore complies with this aspect of the Borough Design Guide. There is a good separation distance between the rear extension and these properties owing to the extension being single storey, would face onto the rear fence/boundary treatment and not across into their gardens or any side windows they have. Therefore, there should be no concerns of overlooking towards these neighbours or concerns of overlooking resulting from this application.

Loss of Light:

A 45-degree horizontal line was taken from the centre of both adjoining neighbour's closest habitable rooms primary windows. The line would be marginally breached by the proposed extension and therefore a vertical test should also be conducted.

Vertical loss of light test:

As the proposed development fails the 45-degree horizontal loss of light test, a vertical loss of light is required to see if the proposed development will result in any loss of light to either neighbour.

Fig. 1 below shows the vertical 45-degree angle test from the corner of the proposed extension. This test is advocated within the British Research Establishment's (BRE) publication Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to good practice to assess impact on daylight and sunlight levels to neighbours potentially impacted upon by adjacent developments. As can be seen in Fig. 1 the test is complied with in relation ground floor window to the nearest habitable room of either neighbouring property.

As the proposed extension is ground floor only and given adequate separation distances are maintained between the habitable room windows of either neighbouring property, the 45-degree vertical test would be complied with (see below) which demonstrates that there would only be a limited loss of light for this neighbour during the first half of the day. Both neighbours are set off the boundary with the application site which will alleviate concerns and the fact the extension has a flat roof which should minimise impact.

Fig.1: Extract of from the submitted proposed rear elevation



Overbearing:

The proposed single storey rear extension building line will come out further than the neighbours at no. 12 and no. 8 Westfield Road. The existing dwelling already projects further out than no 8 and 12 at its deepest point. Only a small part of the garden of no. 8 would be enclosed by the extension, this being the area between the house and their outbuilding. Also, given that the proposed single storey rear extension will have a flat roof therefore overbearing impacts will not be on the majority of the garden, despite the extension being built up to the boundary with this neighbour.

Regarding no. 12 there is a separation distance of 2.40 metres between the proposed rear extension and the site boundary. This is sufficient to minimise overbearing issues, combined with the fact it is a flat roof extension. Therefore, there should be no overbearing concerns to either neighbour as a result of the proposed development.

Amenity Space:

The existing rear garden measures 31.25 metres long and the proposed rear extension measures 5.47 metres in depth. Therefore, the remaining garden space will be 25.78 metre in length. This is more garden space than some properties along Westfield Road and overall considered a sufficient level of amenity space would be retained.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

Policy CP6 of the Core Strategy states that development shall not cause highway problems. Policy CC07 states that development shall be provided with sufficient parking.

The WBC Highways team reviewed the proposal. The WBC Highways team had no objection to the application. They went on to say that the proposed plan will include the rear extensions to be converted into a lounge/kitchen area as well another extension adding a bedroom making a total of 7 habitable rooms. According to the drawings a total of 5 parking spaces will be planned. Therefore, sufficient space to park more than

3 vehicles on the driveway. According to the drawings, driveway parking will meet the council's current standards. Therefore, the proposed rear extension is acceptable with WBC Highways team.

Concerns the property is to be used as an HMO:

Several neighbour comments have raised concerns that the layout of the dwelling is akin to an HMO. Officers have been notified by the agent that at this present moment in time the house will remain as a family home, and it is not proposed to be changed to an HMO. Therefore, officers are required to assess this application at face value, on its merits, as a householder application for an extension to a family dwelling.

Conclusion:

Taking all the above into consideration, the proposal is deemed acceptable in relation to national and local policy and therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

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 subject to conditions: 1. Time Limit 2. Approved Plans 3. Materials as Specified
Date:	10 July 2025
Earliest date for decision:	11 June 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	11/07/25