

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	252301
Site Address:	31 Allnatt Avenue, Winnersh, Wokingham, RG41 5AU
Expiry Date:	27 November 2025
Site Visit Date:	3 November 2025
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a two-storey side and rear extension, a single storey rear extension, a loft conversion facilitated by a hip to gable enlargement, plus changes to fenestration to include 1no. Dormer to the rear elevation.	

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 CP7 – Biodiversity 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 CIL Guidance + 123 List

NO RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways – Request further information
WBC CIL – CIL liable development
WBC Ecology Newts – No comments
WBC Ecology – No objection

External

None

REPRESENTATIONS

Winnersh Council	Parish	The Parish Council objects to the proposal on the grounds that the scale of the development would result in overdevelopment of the site. The size of the extension is considered out of keeping with the established character of the surrounding area. The PC also raises concerns about potential parking pressures and traffic safety in the area due to the reduction of parking provision.
Ward Member(s)		Cllr Prue Bray has objected to the application on the basis of its overbearing nature, impact on the street scene, and reduction in parking spaces despite increasing the number of bedrooms. The Cllr request the application to be determined at the Planning Committee in the event it was to be recommended for approval by Officers.
Neighbours		No comments received

APPRAISAL

Site Description: The application site is located within a residential area of Winnersh. This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension, a single storey rear extension, an L-shaped dormer to the rear, plus a hip to gable enlargement of the existing roof to facilitate a loft conversion.

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 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes clear that creating high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. The National Design Guide (NDG) Section I1, Paragraph 53, states that well-designed new development is influenced by the characteristics of existing built form...and local architectural precedents.

Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy requires developments to maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment. Core Strategy Policy CP3 states that planning

permission will be granted for proposals that, amongst other things, have a high quality of design.

The Borough Design Guide (BDG) states that any alteration and extension to an existing building should be well-designed, respond positively to the original building, contribute positively to the local character and street scene, and relate well to the neighbouring properties.

The proposed extension would create a footprint of approximately 54.6 sqm, more than doubling the size of the existing dwelling. Aside from a modest ground floor enlargement to the rear, the majority of this additional built form would be two storeys, significantly increasing the overall scale and massing of the property. Further bulk would be introduced through the hip-to-gable roof alteration and the addition of a substantial L-shaped rear dormer. While some degree of enlargement is anticipated and supported within residential areas, the scale of development in this instance is considered excessive. The enlarged dwelling would be markedly larger than any neighbouring properties along the row from No.29 to No.40 Allnatt Avenue, with the resulting impact being that the property would appear cramped within its plot and visually dominant within the streetscape. This impact would be particularly evident in views between the application site and No.30, where the prominence of the side extension would disrupt the established rhythm and character of the area.

In addition to the excessive scale outlined above, the design of the proposal is considered to cause significant harm. Both national and local planning policy place strong emphasis on achieving high-quality design, which this scheme fails to deliver. Particular concern relates to the two side and rear extension, where the incompatible roof form and overall massing would appear discordant with the host dwelling, resulting in an incongruous addition. Rather than reading as a clearly subordinate element, the extension rises to a height and bulk that competes with the original roofline, creating an unbalanced and visually intrusive profile. This lack of subservience undermines the principle of sympathetic residential additions, which is emphasised in the BDG.

Further harm arises from the clumsy and inharmonious configuration of intersecting roofs between the extension and the main property, demonstrating a lack of consideration for the relationship between ridge lines and further detracting from the appearance of the host dwelling.

The National Design Guide highlights the importance of detailing in achieving quality design. In this case, the proposal lacks such detailing, particularly on the front elevation of the side extension. The combination of an awkwardly positioned window and door with a large expanse of uninterrupted brickwork would create a stark and unattractive facade, at odds with the established character of surrounding properties.

Although not visible from public viewpoints, the design and form of the L-shaped rear dormer also raise considerable concern. Its bulk and lack of fenestration would result in an unsightly addition, clearly driven by the functional need for extra floor space rather than any regard for visual quality or integration with the host property.

While the hip-to-gable enlargement is not inherently objectionable and is often achieved under permitted development rights, its relationship with the other

components of the scheme has been poorly considered, compounding the overall design failings identified above.

Overall, the excessive scale of the extension, combined with the incongruous roof form and general design, would result in a visually dominant and inharmonious addition to the existing property and fails to respect the established character of the area, contrary to the NPPF, NDG, Core Strategy Policies CP1 & CP3, MDD Local Plan Policy CC01 and the Borough Design Guide.

It should be noted that both the Parish Council and a Local Councillor have objected to the proposed development, which are material considerations in the determination of this application.

Neighbouring Amenity: Given the substantial scale of the proposed rear extension, a formal loss-of-light assessment would ordinarily be expected; however, this has not been submitted. Notwithstanding this omission, the layout positions the two-storey element away from the adjoining property, which is likely sufficient to mitigate any significant loss of light or undue overbearing impact on the adjacent plot.

In terms of outlook, the proposed rear-facing fenestration would create more expansive views than currently exist. These would, however, remain largely oblique and are not considered to result in direct overlooking of neighbouring gardens. By contrast, the first-floor side-facing windows within the proposed side extension would afford clear views into No.30's private amenity space. While such impacts could theoretically be addressed through a planning condition, the perception of overlooking is inherently unneighbourly and represents a further shortcoming in the overall design.

Highway Access and Parking Provision: The proposal will induce additional demand for car parking, and the proposed provisions are insufficient to meet the council's parking requirements. Accordingly, WBC Highways have requested to see one additional alternative parking to be provided without obstructing the shared drive and free flow of traffic. Had the proposal been acceptable in other aspects, it is unclear whether a satisfactory parking arrangement could have been achieved, however, the failure to provide the requisite number of spaces represents yet another shortcoming of the overall scheme.

Ecology: A provisional roost bat assessment has been submitted alongside this application. WBC Ecology are satisfied that the survey effort and methodology are adequate for the Ecologist to conclude that currently the property has negligible bat roost potential. There are no ecological objections to the development as proposed.

Conclusion: In light of the above assessment, the proposal fails to comply with relevant planning policies and design principles. Accordingly, the application is considered unacceptable and is recommended for refusal.

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:	N/A
Recommendation:	Refuse
Date:	25 November 2025
Earliest date for decision:	28 October 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	25 November 2025

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

- *Major Development Location of Winnersh*
- *Bat Roost Habitat*