

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2026

by S Ramsden BSc (Hons) MA IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6004396

52 Poundfield Way, Wokingham, Twyford RG10 0XR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs K & S Pauling against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 251962.
 - The development proposed is for a part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of 50 Poundfield Way, with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached, two-storey dwelling in an established residential cul-de-sac. The surrounding area comprises properties of similar materials, scale and design. Fifty Poundfield Way (No 50) is orientated at approximately 90 degrees to the appeal dwelling, with its rear elevation and conservatory facing the flank wall of 52 Poundfield Way (No 52).
4. The Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) seeks to promote good design and ensure reasonable levels of amenity. It recommends a minimum distance of 12m between the back and flank walls of neighbouring development to limit the sense of enclosure from adjacent development of up to two-storeys.
5. The proposed development would present a predominantly two-storey elevation, extending the full width of the main house and up to the shared boundary to the rear of the garden of No 50. It would be less than 10m from the rear elevation of this neighbouring property. This would be below the minimum recommended distance in the SPD. Given its scale, overall height and proximity, this would bring built form closer to the rear outlook of this neighbouring property, at a two-storey level. As such, the extension would be both overbearing and harmful to the outlook from No 50, particularly to habitable rooms located on the ground floor. Whilst the proposed extension would be set down from the roof of the existing property, the overbearing nature of the built form overall would be exacerbated by its blank face, which would face No 50 with little expression.
6. I shall now turn to the impact on light to No 50. The main parties agree that parts of the proposed development would impinge on the 25-degree angle, cited in the

Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidance¹. The appellant has provided a Daylight and Sunlight Report (DSR), based on the tests and guidance in the BRE publication, assessing impacts on the conservatory and windows to the rear of No 50. The calculations in the DSR are not disputed by the Council.

7. The DSR indicates that, whilst there would be some reduction to current levels, there would not be a noticeable or unacceptable adverse impact to levels of both daylight and sunlight to the conservatory and windows to the rear of No 50. I see no reason to disagree with these findings.
8. The DSR also considers potential overshadowing of the garden to No 50, concluding that most of the garden would receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on 21 March each year. Whilst this may comply with the minimum recommendation in the BRE guidance, it is necessary to consider the orientation and usage of the garden.
9. The rear of No 50 is roughly east facing, with the area to the north of the garden, particularly around the conservatory and kitchen doorway, likely to be in more frequent and prolonged use. The proposed two-storey extension built up against the boundary of the two properties would cause increased overshadowing of this area, particularly during the morning. Allied to the overbearing nature of the proposed extension, the reduction in the levels and hours of sunlight will harm the quality of the outdoor space and the enjoyment derived from it by the occupants of No 50. It would therefore not accord with advice in the SPD, or Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupiers of 50 Poundfield Way, with particular regard to outlook, sense of enclosure, and light. As such, it conflicts with Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Wokingham Borough Council Core Strategy, 2010, which seek to deliver high quality design, without detriment to the amenities of adjoining occupiers and their quality of life.

Other Matters

11. My attention has been drawn to other developments at 2 Poundfield Way and 151 Broad Hinton. I have not been provided with full details of these examples and therefore, I cannot be certain as to the reasoning behind these decisions. In any case, each planning proposal is assessed on its own merits. I have come to a decision based on the circumstances of the case.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Ramsden

INSPECTOR

¹ Building Research Establishment: Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – a guide to good practice (2022).