

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Church

App Ref: PL/25/0693 Householder planning permission

Address: 164 STAVERTON ROAD, READING, RG2 7JY

Proposal: Ground floor rear extension and internal re-configuration.

Applicant: Karol Partyka

Received date: 09/05/2025

Target Decision date: 12/08/2025

Case Officer: James Schofield

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is a semi-detached dwelling on Staverton Road. The attached dwelling, number 166 Staverton Road is immediately to the south. The other nearest adjacent dwelling is number 162 Staverton Road which is on an irregularly shaped plot at the intersection of Staverton Road and Cornwood Gardens has its rear elevation facing the rear garden of the proposal site..

Site visit date: 03/07/2025

Site visit photos:



2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposed development is for a single-storey rear extension at a depth of 6 metres, for the full width of the dwelling, at a height of 3.1 metres. It would include a flat roof with skylights. Plans and considered;

Design & Access Statement
Site Location Plan
Drwg No 0264/PP/FR/01 Ground and First Floor Fire Strategy Drawing
Drwg No 0264/PP/GE/01 Front and Rear Elevations
Drwg No 0264/PP/GS/01 Side Elevation & Section AA
Drwg No 0264/EX/GE-GS/01 Side Elevation & Section AA
Drwg No 0264/EX/GA/01 Ground and First Floor General Arrangement Plans
Drwg No 0264/EX/GE/01 Front and Rear Elevations
As received on the 9th of May 2025

Block Plan
As received on the 13th of May 2025

Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement
As received on the 23rd of June 2025

3. **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

No relevant site history found.

4. **CONSULTATIONS**

The site notice was posted on the 3rd of July 2025 and the consultation period ran through to the 24th of July 2025. No letters of representation have been received from the public.

5. **LEGAL AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT**

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.

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 2024
National Planning Practice Guidance 2019 onwards

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)
CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)
EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network)
EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodland)
H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPD 2021

Tree Strategy 2021

6. APPRAISAL

Character and Scale

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

The proposed extension would be large and the scale would be disproportionate to the host property, with a significant increase in the footprint of the property. It is recognised, however, that the host property (and others in immediate vicinity) is not very deep and it is acknowledged that a smaller scaled extension would likely also be disproportionate. The garden is capable of taking an extension of the proposed scale without appearing cramped and it would not be readily visible from the street scene. The flat roof design and use of materials is considered acceptable. Notwithstanding concerns raised below about impact on neighbouring amenity, it is not considered that the scale of the proposal is so harmful in design terms to cause harm.

Residential Amenity

Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not harm the privacy amenity of neighbouring sites. Policy CC8 states alterations to a house will be acceptable where they will not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties.

The neighbouring properties potentially most affected by the proposals are No's 162 and 166 Staverton Road located to the north and south of the site respectively.

The extension would be deep at 6m. In relation to No.162, whilst the extension would be visible, it would largely be screened by the existing outbuilding of No.162, as well as established tree planting along the boundary. Given this and that it would also be set away from the boundary, no significant material overbearing effects are considered to arise.

In relation to No.166, the extension would be sited immediately adjacent the common boundary. Whilst the 45 degree line has not been illustrated on the plans, the extension would clearly breach a 45 degree line to the nearest habitable room window. The extension, due to its depth and height in close proximity results in a dominant and unneighbourly overbearing impact with consequent harm to the amenities of the occupiers of No.166 Staverton Road.

Therefore, the development is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours, and not in compliance with Policies CC8 and H9 nor the Design Guide to House Extensions SPD.

Biodiversity and Sustainability

Part 'b' of Policy EN12 indicates that all development sites should not result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. These aims are supported by Policy H9 which states that extensions and alterations will only be acceptable where it does not result in the loss of biodiversity within gardens.

An Arboricultural Impact Assessment was submitted with the application. It is noted that a plan to protect the well-established tree in the rear garden of number 162 Staverton Road was submitted. It is also noted that this tree is not formally protected by any order. However, given its maturity and visibility this plan was

considered both prudent and sufficient. Should the application have otherwise been considered acceptable, tree protection would have been secured by way of condition.

As such the proposal is considered to accord with the biodiversity and sustainability considerations of Policies H9 and EN12 of the local plan.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed as set out above and is considered to be unacceptable on that basis. The recommendation is that this application is REFUSED.

8. RECOMMENDATION

Reasons for refusal:

1. Proposal would harm the amenity of adjacent dwelling.