

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	261421
Site Address:	38 Henley Wood Road, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 7EE
Expiry Date:	14 August 2026
Site Visit Date:	6 July 2026
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed rear conservatory.	

PLANNING POLICY

National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Core Strategy (CS)	CP1 – Sustainable Development CP3 – General Principles for Development CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage
Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update (LPU)	SS1 – Sustainable development principles SS2 – Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy SS3 – Development within or adjacent to major and modest settlements FD1 – Development and flood risk (from all sources) FD2 – Sustainable drainage DH1 – Place making and quality design
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
201508	Householder application for proposed erection of a single storey front extension to create a porch.	Approve 20.07.2020

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal
WBC Drainage- No objection subject to condition
External
None

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	No objection
---------------------	--------------

Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The property is a semi-detached dwelling within the major development location of Earley. The property has a front porch and detached outbuilding and faces the railway.

Proposal:

The development is for a proposed rear conservatory which extends out 2.8m and has a maximum height of 3m.

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/ Character of the Area:

Policy CP3(a) of the Core Strategy states proposals should be of an appropriate scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character to the area together with a high quality of design.

R23 of the Borough Design Guide provides explicit guidance on extensions. For rear extensions, 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
- Maximum eaves and ridge height should be no more than those of the existing property

It also states that a gap should be retained between the building and the site boundary and this should be a minimum of 1m in width. This is echoed by R16.

It should be noted that the Borough Design Guide is a guide rather than hard policy requirements; ultimately each application will have to be assessed on its merits.

The conservatory would measure a depth of 2.8m and so would be well below the 4m depth advocated in the BDG. Due to the extension being single storey, it would naturally the eaves height would be less than that of the main property. However, it is acknowledged that the conservatory would be less than 1m away from the boundary with no. 40. It would fall short by 0.4m. However, given its proportionate scale and unimposing design, the extension would have an acceptable impact on the appearance

of the dwelling and wider area with the separation shortfall not resulting in any identified material harm.

The proposed rear extension is single storey in nature and would not be visible from the public domain, and therefore the visual effect of the extension poses no substantial harm to the character of the area or conflict with the aforementioned design policies

Neighbouring Amenity:

Policy CP3(a) of the Core Strategy states proposals should not result in detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users including open spaces or occupiers and their quality of life.

R23 of the BDG 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. It also states that the eaves height of single storey extensions should not exceed 3m within 2m of a side boundary.

Overlooking & Loss of Light:

The proposed single storey rear extension would extend 2.8 metres from the rear of the dwelling and would be single storey in nature. There are windows proposed on the side of the extension facing No. 40, so there would be a degree of conflict with R23, however, the single storey nature of the extension and existing boundary treatment ensures that there are no issues on neighbouring amenity terms through overlooking. Due to the modest depth and boundary treatment with no.40 the proposal would also not breach a 45-degree loss of light test and so the proposal will not result in an adverse loss of light to the adjoining neighbour.

Overbearing:

To avoid being overbearing, guidance in the BDG states that the eaves height of single storey extension should not exceed 3 metres within 2 metres of a side boundary. The proposed development is set 0.6 metres from the boundary with the neighbouring property No. 40, but an eaves height of 2.2 metres raises no concerns on neighbouring amenity terms relating to the issue of overbearing.

Residential Amenity Space:

Section 4 of the BDG provides guidance on the provision of amenity space and recommends that 11 metres is a generally accepted depth for private garden space. On this occasion the implementation of a rear extension measuring 2.8 metres in depth does not conflict with this guidance as garden space of approximately 15m would remain.

Flooding and Drainage:

Policy CC09 of the MDD states "All sources of flood risk, including historic flooding, must be taken into account at all stages and to the appropriate degree at all levels in the planning application process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding". Policy CC10 of the MDD states "All development proposals must ensure

surface water arising from the proposed development including taking into account climate change is managed in a sustainable manner”.

WBC Drainage have no objection to the principle of the development owing to the site being located within Flood Zone 1 meaning the site has a low risk of fluvial flooding. However, as the development will result in an impermeable area and no drainage details have been provided, Drainage Officers have recommended that a condition to secure details of the drainage system are provided prior to commencement of the development

However, as the rear extension is minor in scale and extends onto an existing patio (which is already an impermeable surface), this condition is not considered to meet the six tests for planning conditions as outlined in paragraph 57 of the NPPF due to the fact it is not necessary or reasonable in all other respects, given the patio is already an impermeable area

Conclusion:

For the reasons stated above, the proposal is acceptable in local plan policy terms and therefore 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:	10 August 2026
Earliest date for decision:	17 July 2026

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	10/08/26

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Affordable Housing Thresholds | Total count: 3

#	NAME
1	Within Major Development Locations
2	Within Major Development Locations
3	Within All Development Locations

Scale and Location of Development Proposals | Total count: 1

#	FEATURE_TYPE	NAME
1	Major Development Locations	Earley

Mineral Safeguarding Areas | Total count: 1

#	Type	SubType
1	Sharp Sand and Gravel	River Terrace deposits

Public Rights of Way within Wokingham Borough Consultation Zone | Total count: 1

#	FEATURE_TYPE	CONSULT	STATUS
1	Public Rights of Way in Wokingham Borough	Public Rights of Way Officer, Green Infrastructure Team	Footpath

Major Nuclear Sites Consultation Zone | Total count: 1

#	FEATURE_TYPE	FEATURE_NAME	PLANNING_NOTE
1	Consultation Zone - Major Nuclear Site	AWE: 12km Zone	This is the 12km Zone. A circular zone of 12km radius around all nuclear sites, for certain types of significant development due to the potential for such developments to pose an external hazard to sites.

Aerodrome Safeguarding: Heathrow Consultation Zone | Total count: 1

#	Height Band	Wind Turbine	Aviation
1	All works exceeding 150 metres (492.1 feet)	NO	YES

Network Rail Railway Consultation Zone | Total count: 1

#	FEATURE_TYPE
1	Network Rail Estate (inferred)

Risk of Flooding from Surface Water | Total count: 2

#	FEATURE_TYPE	FEATURE_NAME
1	Environment Agency Surface Water Flood Zones	1 in 100 year risk extent
2	Environment Agency Surface Water Flood Zones	1 in 1000 year risk extent

Great Crested Newt Impact Risk Zones | Total count: 1

#	FEATURE_TYPE	FEATURE_NAME	CONSULT
1	Great Crested Newt Impact Risk Zone	Green	Consult NatureSpace for Major developments only

SSSI Impact Risk Zones | Total count: 1

#	SSSI Impact Risk Zone Advice Hyperlink
1	https://irz.geodata.org.uk/IRZ/step2.html?irzcode=0301000530000&notes=&location=480914,172519%20(IRZ%20polygon%20centre)

Landscape Character Assessment 2019 | Total count: 1

#	FEATURE_TYPE	Name
1	Landscape Character Assessment 2019	Woodley-Earley Settled and Farmed Clay

Wards | Total count: 2

#	NAME	Closest Approximate Distance
1	Maiden Erlegh & Whitegates Ward	0 m
2	South Lake Ward	11.19 m

Parishes | Total count: 2

#	NAME	Closest Approximate Distance
1	Earley CP	0 m
2	Woodley CP	11.19 m