

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Emmer Green Ward

App Ref: PL/25/0842 Householder planning permission

Address: 2 RUSSET GLADE, EMMER GREEN, READING, RG4 8UJ

Proposal: Construction of a single-storey rear extension extending 6.6m from the existing rear wall of the bungalow, incorporating a cross-roof design to replace the current gable configuration. Removal of existing side extension (currently used for garden storage and utility). Removal of existing rear conservatory.

Applicant: Mrs Vaishali Kothari

Received date: 09/06/2025

Target Decision date: 04/08/2025

Case Officer: Huimin Chen

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposed site is a corner plot bungalow, with a detached garage in the front garden and an existing rear conservatory. There is a spacious rear garden, which has an Electricity Sub Station adjacent to it. The property is located to the northwest of the junction of Marchwood Avenue and Russet Glade. The surrounding area consists of detached bungalows and two-storey properties, predominantly residential.

Additionally, the site is within TPO 33/02, which protects the woodland in the rear gardens, extending from Nos. 2-16 Russet Glade. This woodland, which is a high-suitability habitat for foraging and commuting bats, is surrounded by large, connected gardens with trees and Clayfield Copse (a Local Wildlife Site) is located 100m to the east of the application site.



Figs 1 & 2: Location plan submitted 09/06/25; Tree Preservation Order, dated May 2002

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is seeking permission for the erection of a single-storey rear extension to the existing bungalow and the removal of the existing side extension and rear conservatory. The proposal would extend 6.6m from the rear wall of the property, reconfiguring the existing gable roof into a cross roof. The new extension would have an eaves height of 2.7m and a total height of 4.6m, which would match the heights of the existing house. The proposed development also includes alterations to the fenestration of the house. The existing side extension, currently used as a garden store and utility room, would also be removed, as would the existing rear conservatory. Internal alterations would be made to reconfigure the layout, creating four bedrooms, one living room, one study, one family bathroom, one utility room, one storeroom, and a larger kitchen with a family space. One new rooflight lantern would be installed on each side of the new flat roof. All proposed materials would match those of the existing building.

Plans/documents considered:

- Arboricultural Report Including a tree survey, impact assessment and method statement, ref: MW.2503.EGR.AIA dated 13 March 2025, prepared by Mark Welby Consulting Arborists
- Tree Protection Plan MW.2503.EGR.TPP dated 13 March 2025
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report, ref: SPH/NP/PEA-25/11.03, dated 19 March 2025
- Drawing No. 10_P-10b – Proposed Plans
- Drawing No. 10_P-11b – Proposed Elevations
- Drawing No. 10_P-05 – Existing Plans
- Drawing No. 10_P-06 – Existing Elevations
- The Location Plan
- Block Plan

Received 9 June 2025.

- Foundations - Sketches_002160
- Foundations - Specification_002161
- Foundations - Clayboard_002162
- Foundations - Calcs F1-F6_002163

Received 23 July 2025.

- Response Planning Officer_002298 received 28 July 2025.



Fig 3: Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

Plans histories:

PL/25/0194 (PRE) - Erection of a single-storey rear extension and removal of the existing side extension (amended). Advice given 19 March 2025.

There have been a series of tree applications (consent under Tree Preservation Orders) in the past two decades.

3. CONSULTATIONS

- Ecology Consultations, Reading Borough Council – Response received 23 June 2025.

The application site is a detached bungalow in Emmer Green that may have features potentially suitable for use by roosting bats. It is proposed to extend the property by adding a large rear extension and removing the conservatory and utility store to the side.

The bat survey (Urban Tree Experts, March 2025, ref: SPH/NP/PEA-25/11.03) has been undertaken to an appropriate standard and concludes that the building is unlikely to host roosting bats. As such, since the proposals are unlikely to affect bats or other protected species, there are no objections to this application on ecological grounds.

- Trees - Planning Natural Environment, Reading Borough Council – Response received 28 July 2025.

The principle of piled foundations with heave protection, as indicated in the attached, is acceptable and sufficient to demonstrate that protection will be provided against further tree removal (as a result of subsidence/heave), as much as can be provided.

I note that the current rear conservatory is approx. 3m in length /depth and the proposed rear extension is more than double this at 6.6m. This brings living accommodation closer to the trees, which is not ideal, and given the bifold doors proposed it is almost a certainty that a patio will be added to the rear (not shown), thereby bringing areas used by residents even closer (and depending on the size of any patio, then potentially into RPAs). This runs the risk of future pressure to prune but in this case, on balance, it would not be a point appropriate to suggest refusal on. We would not necessarily look favourably on applications to prune based on proximity on the future. If this household would have PD rights to add anything else to the garden be that further footprint or a patio, then Informative 26 would be prudent.

We need a condition to secure tree protection in accordance with the document submitted and as this does not include any tree pruning, then Informative I15 would be appropriate.

In conclusion, I have no formal objections subject to the following conditions:

L2 Approved plans

L7A AMS compliance

Tailored condition for foundations

- Transport Development Control, Reading Borough Council – Response received 4 March 2025 under pre-application PL/25/0194.

The proposed extension does not change the existing on site parking provision. Submitted plans illustrate the existing single garage is to remain. No changes to the existing vehicle access from Marchwood Ave are proposed.

In principle based in the information presented Transport would not object to this application, however, please be aware that this is an officer response and is made without prejudice to the formal determination of any subsequent planning application by this Council, as the local Planning Authority.

Planning Officer's note: The proposal remains unchanged between the formal application (PL/25/0842) and the pre-application (PL/25/0194). Therefore, the transport comments still apply to PL/25/0842.

- Site notice:

One site notice was displayed near the application site on 8 July 2025. The 21-day consultation period ended on 29 July 2025. No neighbour letter of representation has been received.



Fig 3: Site notice photo

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.

4. 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 and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024
National Planning Policy Guidance 2014 onwards

Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)
CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)
H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)
H10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space)
EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network)
EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodlands)
TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging)

SPD

Design Guide to House Extensions SPD 2021
Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD 2011

Local Plan Update

The current version of the Local Plan (adopted in November 2019) turned five years old on Tuesday 5th November 2024. The Local Plan was reviewed in March 2023 and around half of the policies in the plan

are considered still up to date. However, the rest need to be considered for updating to reflect changing circumstances and national policy. A submission draft of the Local Plan was submitted on 9th May 2025.

Although there is a five-year period for carrying out a review of a plan after it is adopted, nothing in the NPPF or elsewhere says that policies automatically become “out of date” when they are five years old. It is a matter of planning judgement rather than legal fact whether a plan or policies within it are out-of-date. This will depend on whether they have been overtaken by things that have happened since the plan was adopted, either on the ground or through changes in national policy, for example.

Officer advice in respect of the Local Plan policies pertinent to this pre-application is that they remain in accordance with national policy and that the objectives of those policies remains very similar in the draft updated Local Plan. Therefore, they can continue to be afforded weight in the determination of a planning application where it to be submitted imminently and are not considered to be ‘out of date’.

5. 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 rear extension is large in scale in relation to the existing house, as the proposed depth would be 6.6m, which is only one meter less than the existing footprint and exceeds the guidance outlined in the Design Guide to House Extensions SPD 2019. However, the plot is large, and the roof line would be set down from the existing. This set-down ridgeline would make the rear extension more visually subservient to the main house than at present. In practice, the pitch of the roof should be shallower, in order to reduce the overall height. It is however considered that the plot is capable of accommodating this footprint of development in this specific instance. The proposal site is located at the junction of Marchwood Avenue and Russet Glade. The combined depth of the proposed rear extension and the host dwelling would appear substantial when viewed from Marchwood Avenue. However, the proposal is considered to benefit from the inclusion of two flat-roofed elements on either side of the rear extension, which could help to mitigate its visual impact on the street scene of Marchwood Avenue.

As the arrangement of windows and doors in relation to the host dwelling is appropriate in terms of size, scale, and placement, and all proposed materials would match those of the existing house. As such, whilst large, the proposed development is considered to sufficiently respect the character and appearance of the existing house and street scene in this specific instance.

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.

Considering that the application site is a detached bungalow with a spacious rear garden, the proposed extension is set off the boundary with No. 4 Russet Glade and the height of the extension closest to the neighbouring property has been minimised with a flat roof design, it is unlikely that there will be any significant adverse amenity issues regarding overbearing impact, or loss of sunlight and daylight to the neighbouring properties or private outdoor space. Although the proposal includes two side windows and one glazed side door facing No. 4 Russet Glade, it is not considered that this would give rise to privacy

concerns. The openings would face a shared boundary fence with an approximate 3m separation, and the overall distance between the two properties is around 5m.

Trees

Policy EN14 states that individual trees, groups of trees, hedges and woodlands will be protected from damage or removal where they are of importance, and Reading's vegetation cover will be extended.

The site is included within TPO 33/02, which protects the woodland located in the rear gardens extending from Nos. 2–16 Russet Glade. According to the Arboricultural Report (reference: MW.2503.EGR.AIA), dated 13 March 2025, the development is considered acceptable, as all works are located outside the RPAs and the trees can be adequately protected. However, this report alone does not address all the concerns. Section 1.5 acknowledges potential future issues in general terms and states:

'The assessment considers the proposal's impact on the constraints of trees retained within the site and those on adjacent land. Such impact can be caused directly through construction damage and indirectly from post-development resentment and pressure to detrimentally prune or remove the trees. The latter is often due to a poor juxtaposition between the proposal and the trees'.

To avoid further tree loss on the site, it is vital to ensure that foundations are appropriately designed to withstand future ground movement, whether due to subsidence or heave. Based on the foundation design documents and the response letter received from the applicant, the Natural Environment Officer has confirmed that the principle of piled foundations with heave protection, as indicated in the further submission, is acceptable. This is considered sufficient to demonstrate that protection will be provided against further tree removal resulting from ground movement, as far as reasonably possible. Conditions would be imposed to secure tree protection in accordance with the submitted documentation. Therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its impact on trees.

Transport

Policy TR5 states that development should provide car parking and cycle parking that is appropriate to the accessibility of locations within the Borough to sustainable transport facilities, particularly public transport.

The proposed extension does not change the existing on-site parking provision. Submitted plans illustrate the existing single garage is to remain. No changes to the existing vehicle access from Marchwood Avenue are proposed. Therefore, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy TR5 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

Ecology

As per the comments from GS Ecology, no issues are raised in this regard.

Overall, for current and future occupiers, the proposed development will provide additional ancillary accommodation on the plot, benefiting the occupiers and improving the overall quality of accommodation at the site.

6. CONCLUSION

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

7. RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

Recommended Conditions:

Approved Plans

Time Limit

Materials (To Match)

Arboricultural Method Statement (As Specified)

Foundations