

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Abbey

App Ref: PL/25/0849 Householder planning permission

Address: 75 Russell Street, Reading, RG1 7XG

Proposal: Single storey rear extension to ground floor, internal alterations and new dormer extension on Second Floor.

Applicant: Mr Jonathan Rood

Received date: 09/06/2025

Target Decision date: 04/08/2025

Case Officer: Gary Miles

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site comprises a bay fronted semi-detached property, laid out across three floors, located on the easterly side of Russell Street. The property is constructed from red brick and slate tiled pitched roofs. The property has a striking gable frontage. A number of the doors and windows have been replaced over the years with modern upvc rather than something more appropriate for the conservation area. The property has a large easterly facing rear garden, and benefits from existing hardstanding to the front which is used for off-street parking. The property is served by an existing dropped kerb. Russell Street is predominantly residential. Several neighbouring properties have been subject to alterations and single storey rear extensions. The property whilst not listed, is located within the Castle Hill / Russell Street / Oxford Road conservation area.

Site visit date: 26th June 2025



Front elevation.



Rear elevation.



Rear garden/aemity space.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension, internal alterations and new dormer extension on second floor. The revised single storey rear extension will have a projection of 4.5m, an eaves height of 3m and a pitched roof ridge height of 4.5m. The extension will create a new dining area/snug along with internal alterations creating a new kitchen. The extension will be constructed from brick, with a tiled pitched roof. The single storey element will have Bi-Fold doors to the rear elevation, a new full height window to the southern elevation, and 6 rooflights. The application includes a new dormer extension to the 2nd floor with skylights and a side facing window, 2 new skylights in the north facing 2nd floor roof

slope. Air Source Heat Pump positioned adjacent to the new dining area on the southern elevation adjacent to the new plant room which is accessed internally only.

Plans and documents considered:

Drawing no: MAB-C5138-001-Plans-Location, dated March 25

Drawing no: MAB-C5138-111-Plans-Ground & First Level-Existing GA, dated March 25

Drawing no: MAB-C5138-141-Plans-Second & Roof Level-Existing GA, dated March 25

Drawing no: MAB-C5138-180-Rev A-Elevations-Existing GA, dated April 25

Drawing no: MAB-C5138-051-Rev B-Plans-Site-Proposed GA, dated May 25 (superseded)

Drawing no: MAB-C5138-211-Plans-Ground Floor & First Level-Proposed GA, dated May 25 (superseded)

Drawing no: MAB-C1538-241-Rev A-Plans-Second & Roof Level-Proposed GA

Drawing no: MAB-C5138-280-Rev A-Elevations-Proposed GA, dated May 25 (superseded)

Planning Design and Access Statement (C5138) dated June 25

Drawing no: SPH/TPP-25/15.05-Tree Protection Plan, dated May 25

Tree Survey BS 5837:2012 Ref: SPH/5837-25/20.05 (Urban Tree Experts) dated 2nd June 25

Arboricultural Impact Assessment Ref: SPH/AIA-25/20.05 (Urban Tree Experts) dated 6th June 25

Received by the Local Planning Authority on 9th June 2025

Drawing no: MAB-C5138-051-Rev C-Plans-Site-Proposed GA, dated July 25

Drawing no: MAB-C5138-211-Rev B-Plans-Ground Floor & First Level-Proposed GA, dated May 25

Drawing no: MAB-C5138-280-Rev B-Elevations-Proposed GA, dated July 25

Received by the Local Planning Authority on 14th July 2025





3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

PL/24/0484 - Wooden Garden Room at the rear of the garden – Approved June 2024

PL/24/0311 – 1x Sycamore Tree removal – Permitted April 2024

PL/24/0109 - Pre-application advice for change of use from a guesthouse to residential. No external work is intended to be carried out – Observation sent April 2024

PL/23/0600 – 1x T1 Sycamore Fell as preventing erection of fencing to secure this sheltered housing property – Permitted June 2023

4. CONSULTATIONS

Internal

- RBC Trees - Planning Natural Environment

The site of 75 Russell Street is located within a Conservation area which are priority areas for tree retention and planting, as part of our adopted Tree Strategy. With reference to the BS5837:2012 Tree Survey, 2nd June 2025, Ref: SPH/5837- 25/20.05, I have no objections on tree grounds. I note that from your Site Visit Photographs, 26th June 2025, there is a small tree/shrub in the neighbour's property that is growing into the proposed development area. It is assumed this will need to be pruned or removed to facilitate the development, which has not been recognised in the Tree Survey or the plans. Clarity on this is required. As Conservation Areas are priority areas for new planting, if the existing small tree/shrub is be removed, the applicant could consider replanting a replacement to mitigate for the loss.

*With reference to the Plans - Site - Proposed GA drawing, Ref MAB-C5138-051 Rev B, I note that there appears to be no change to the landscaping in the rear garden. Confirmation there is no change to hard landscaped areas of the garden (apart from those in direct conflict with the development) is required. If the hard surfaced area was extended, it is likely to fall within a RPA. This is also to ensure the amount of hard landscaping does not become overbearing. **To conclude there are no objections on tree grounds or landscaping grounds** but clarity on the above is required.*

Planning Officer comments: the agent confirms the tree in between the 2 properties is a small shrub which will need to be pruned to facilitate the extension. Officers worked with the agent to advise to pull

the single storey extension away from the boundary with no. 73 – i.e. not to encroach but also reduce pressures on the shrub. The agent submitted revised plans taking these points into consideration.

Officers confirmed that the rear garden had been significantly landscaped, lots of new beds and lawn areas introduced, since visiting the property the year before in relation to application PL/24/0484.

- Conservation Area Advisory Committee Consultations

No comments received, at the time of preparing this report.

- RBC Conservation Officer

It is unfortunate that the front elevation of the building has uPVC fenestration that is a threat to the historic character of the conservation area. I noted that there would be no alteration to the front elevation.

The proposed rear extension would have a traditional roof form with slate tiles, and an external finish of red brick in stretcher bond, which is acceptable. The dormer would also constitute a gable roof and be finished with lead cladding.

I find two new elements to be subordinate and subservient additions to the host building and would have little harm to the character of the conservation area. Given the use of traditional roof forms and materials, I think this impact would be reduced to acceptable levels.

The only thing is the proposed materials for the fenestration. I assume they would be uPVC again, which is not appropriate for a conservation area. Although they would not be visible from the public realm.

Less than substantial harm at the lowest level on the character of the conservation area. No public benefit, the benefit is only for the applicant and their living conditions.

External

- A planning notice was attached to the nearby streetlamp column on 26th June and left in place for a minimum of 21 days for the statutory consultation period.

No letters of representation have been received.

5. EQUALITY ACT 2010

In determining this application, the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. However, there is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application. Therefore, in terms of the key equalities protected characteristics it is considered there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

6. LEGAL AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Material considerations include relevant policies in the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) - among them the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework
National Planning Practice Guidance

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)
CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)
H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)
EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodlands)
EN1 (Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment)
EN3 (Enhancement of Conservation Areas)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

7. APPRAISAL

Character and Appearance

Policy H9 states that an extension to a house will be acceptable where it respects the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design and respects the character and pattern of neighbouring properties and the street as a whole in terms of scale, location, materials and design, and any important existing building line. Policy CC7 also sets out relevant considerations for design.

The proposed single storey ground floor extension has been reduced from 5.3m to 4.5m to be more in keeping with the property and its surroundings. The original proposal for a 5.3m projection, was felt too large for the plot and too different to other nearby single storey extensions recently approved. The revised proposal is considered more subservient to the host property now that it has been reduced in depth and pulled away from the adjoining boundary.

The proposed single storey rear element and 2nd floor dormer are considered contemporary in design. The extensions have been sympathetically designed to match the original property. Proposed materials will match the existing property i.e. red bricks and grey slate tiles. The 2nd floor roof dormer is to be constructed using traditional materials, whilst the design is similar to existing dormers on neighbouring properties in the vicinity. By reducing the proposed projection, the proposal respects the rear building line.

In terms of scale, location, materials and design it is considered compliant with policy CC7 and H9 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

Residential Amenity

Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not result in an overbearing impact on neighbours. Policy H10 seeks to ensure that the amenity of gardens and other outdoor areas are not compromised. Policy CC8 states an extension to a house will be acceptable where it will not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties.

The proposed single storey rear element has been designed with consideration to neighbours. Furthermore, the extension has been pulled away from the boundary with no.73 Russell Street. It should be noted that existing windows from the host property and the detached property at no.75 Russell Street currently look onto one another – only segregated by a timber fence, along the side garden access. The proposed single storey element will be set back from the rear elevation of the neighbouring property. The

new extension introduces one new window along the southerly elevation, which will look out onto the dividing fence line but not beyond. The new window on the southern elevation is not considered to be harmful to neighbouring amenity. The structure will have a max eaves height of 3m and be positioned from the boundary with the detached property by 1.25m. The new dormer at 2nd floor level overlooks the existing roof of the detached neighbour – the dormer is not considered detrimental to neighbouring amenity. The proposed development is not considered overbearing. The garden retains a large garden for socialising and outdoor amenity use.

The proposal is considered compliant with policy CC8 and H9 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019, apart from the Air Source Heat Pump which will be conditioned for the purposes of approving the wider application.

Noise from ASHPs

Further information is required regarding the impact of noise from the ASHP. An MCS noise assessment could be submitted to demonstrate that it meets the 42 dBA noise limit, <https://mcscertified.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/MCS-020.pdf>.

Tree matters

The tree officer confirms there are no objections. The ground floor extension has been pulled away from the boundary, reducing pressure to prune the shrub on the adjoining boundary. The ground floor extension is far enough away from the root protection zone of the large mature tree in the rear garden.

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of tree, and therefore complies with policy EN14 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019

Conservation matters

Due to the proposed works taking place at the rear of the property, and in the upper roof slope of the 2nd floor the proposed development is out of site of the public highway, and for this reason the proposal is not considered harmful to the public realm.

The proposal is considered acceptable with policy EN1 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

8. CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed as set out above and is considered to be acceptable on that basis, subject to the following conditions.

9. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT

TL1
AP1
M3
L6