

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Kentwood Ward

App Ref: PL/25/0808 Householder planning permission

Address: 979 OXFORD ROAD, TILEHURST, READING, RG31 6TN

Proposal: Demolition of garage and conservatory. Erection of a front porch, and part single-storey, part two-storey side and rear extensions. Alterations to fenestration and internal layout. (Amended)

Applicant: Neha Mohan

Received date: 02/06/2025

Target Decision date: 1/09/2025 (Extension of time)

Case Officer: Huimin Chen

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a large two-storey detached dwellinghouse with a pitched roof. It has a double garage, existing two storey side extensions set down from the original roof and set back from the main front elevation. There is also a rear conservatory extension. There is a spacious rear garden. There is a large driveway in front of the house. The surrounding area is characterised by large, detached properties and spacious front gardens.



Fig 1: View from the front of the property, taken 07/07/25;

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal seeks permission on the demolition of the garages and conservatory, the erection of a part two-storey, part single-storey side extension, a two-storey rear extension, a front porch, and fenestration alterations and the introduction of a roller shutter door for a workshop. The footprint of the house would be squared, and the roof would be cross gabled upon completion of the proposal.

The proposal includes the demolition of the existing garages to accommodate whole side extensions, which would project 4.4m from the main house. The width of the proposed single-storey side extension is 1.68m, with a sloped roof, aligned with the rear building line of the new rear extension. The proposed rear extension would have a total depth of 3m. The number of bedrooms would remain unchanged. Part of the existing gable ended front projection would be removed to make way for a front porch with a gable canopy. The arrangement of windows and doors would be altered.

According to the submitted proposed elevations and the agent's email dated 8th August 2025, all external walls are proposed to be constructed using Wienerberger Rudgewick Red Multi Brick or a similar alternative. Windows and rooflights would be black-framed, double-glazed casement units with decorative rendered surrounds, with the number of panes indicated on the elevation drawings. The roof is proposed to be finished with Marley Hawkins Clay Roof Tiles or similar, in a grey/blue colour. Two rear doors would be black-framed, and the front gable projection would feature black-framed, double-glazed panels. The two front pillars are proposed to be concrete, rendered to match the decorative window surrounds. The roller shutter garage door would be steel, with a colour finish to match the rendered surrounds.

Plans/documents considered:

- Planning Statement, prepared by The Market Design & Build, dated 05/2025, received 02/06/25.
- Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment, ref: ASW/SM/166/28/2025, prepared by ASW Ecology Ltd, dated 03/2025, received 02/06/25.
- Bat Emergence Survey, ref: ASW/SM/020/29/2025, dated prepared by ASW Ecology Ltd, dated 03/2025, received 02/06/25.
- Location Plan
- Drawing No. 240058-PL-D 0001 P1 – Block Plan
- Drawing No. 240058-PL-D 0001A P1 – Site Plan
- Drawing No. 240058-PL-D 0005A P1 – Proposed Roof Plan

As received by the Local Planning Authority on 2 June 2025

- Drawing No. 240058-PL-D-0002A Rev P2 – Ground floor proposed
- Drawing No. 240058-PL-D-0003A Rev P2 – First floor proposed
- Drawing No. 240058-PL-D-0008 Rev P3 – Front elevation
- Drawing No. 240058-PL-D-0009 Rev P3 – Rear elevation
- Drawing No. 240058-PL-D-0010 Rev P3 – Side elevation 1
- Drawing No. 240058-PL-D-0011 Rev P3 – Side elevation 2

As received by the Local Planning Authority on 27 August 2025



Fig 2: Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

Planning history

PL/24/1652 (PRE): Demolition of garage and erection of double-storey side and rear extensions. Advice Given 03/02/2025.

3. CONSULTATIONS

Transport Development Control, Reading Borough Council – response received 13/06/2025.

The application consists of the demolition of the garage and erection of a front porch, double-storey side and rear extensions. This will result in the loss of the garage parking spaces.

Local parking standards are set out in the RBC, Revised Parking Standards and Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which takes into account the accessibility of the site. In line with the adopted parking standards, two parking spaces must be retained for the residential dwelling.

The proposal will retain the existing driveway parking which provides off-street parking in excess of the Council's requirements. The proposals also include the widening of the driveway accessed from Oxford Road although no alterations are required to the existing dropped crossing.

In view of this, there are no transport objections to the proposal.

Informatives:
IF3 Highways

Ecology Consultations, Reading Borough Council – response received 09/07/2025.

The application site is a detached house along the Oxford Road, close to the River Thames. The proposals include the demolition of the double garage and the addition of a two-storey rear and side extensions.

The Bat Survey reports (ASW Ecology Ltd, March 2025 and May 2025) include a bat roost assessment of the survey followed by a single dusk emergence survey in May 2025. No bats emerged from the building and the report concludes that the house is unlikely to host roosting bats. As such, there are no objections to this application on ecological grounds.

Planning Natural Environment, Reading Borough Council – response received 18/06/2025.

The site of 979 Oxford Road is located within an AQMA. Oxford Road is also a designated 'Tree'd Corridor', as described in the Tree Strategy.

With reference to the Report, Ref S1557-J1-R1, I note the following:

Section 2 states '*The scheme will require a few trees of low amenity value to be removed.*', however the report confirms the removal of G1, G2, G3, T4 and T7, along with other vegetation, totalling 16 trees.

Section 5.9 states '*Please see tree data table above for comments on the individual trees proposed for removal.*' However, in the tree data table, there is little reference to the trees to be removed. The proposed tree removals are later shown in the report schedule of tree work table (in 9.4), where Tree 7 is described to not be removed. There is a lack of clarity on the fate of T7.

Section 6.1 states '*Another tree in the rear garden is proposed removed for safety reasons*' – this is not clear. Tree 7 is the only tree, other than those being removed, that is identified in the schedule of tree work table, the work proposed is to 'reduce to 3m', which is not specific and doesn't suggest a removal. Tree 7 is also shown as not retained in the Tree Protection Plan, 24th April 2025, Ref: S1557-J1-P2 Rev: v1. Amendments required to ensure the report is consistent throughout.

The TPP also shows a leylandii hedge, common laurel hedge and hazel to be removed, which is not detailed within the report, as would be expected.

Indicative replacement tree planting shown on the TPP indicates 4 new trees which falls short of a net gain hence further consideration is required.

To conclude, the report needs amendment for consistency and clarity. The proposal is in theory, acceptable on tree grounds, however the submission of a landscape plan is required to demonstrate a more in-depth planting scheme to mitigate the loss of 16 trees. The current replanting shown in the report does not adequately mitigate the loss of vegetation, including 16 trees. There should be a net gain of trees to comply with EN14 and aims of the Tree Strategy. Being a 'Treed Corridor', replanting on the frontage is particularly important.

Planning Officer's note: Further to the discussion with the agent, two revised Tree Reports were received on 21st and 30th July 2025. The agent also confirmed that they would like to proceed with a decision subject to conditions to address potential issues relating to landscaping and biodiversity net gain. Accordingly, the Natural Environment officers provided the following follow-up comments:

With reference to the Report from John Cromar's Arboricultural Company Limited, Ref S1557-J1-R3, I note the following:

The previously raised concerns have been appropriately addressed within the report.

Section 5.9 details the replanting to mitigate the loss of 16no. trees which are being removed. The report proposes to replant; 3no. small-leaved lime (*Tilia cordata* 'Greenspire') and 1no. Lavallée hawthorn (*Crataegus x lavalleei*) on the frontage, 1no. variegated holly (*Ilex aquifolium* 'Handsworth New Silver' in the rear garden, and English yew (*Taxus baccata*) native hedging along the southern boundary. The proposed locations for replanting are shown in the TPP S1557-J1-P2, 21st July 2025, Rev: v2.

Whilst the report positively proposes to plant 4no. trees on the frontage, 3no. of these are the same species. The *Tilia* genus is already an abundant genus within the Borough and for biodiversity purposes, the use of different species would be more beneficial – providing a diverse species palette in a planting scheme is one aim of our adopted Tree Strategy. However, the species choice can be agreed via condition with indicative landscaping, as shown on the TPP, secured via a condition.

The changes to the landscaping (hard Vs soft) on the frontage are still not clear, however an appropriate condition will deal with this issue.

To conclude, I have no objections to the application and the following conditions are applicable as they will secure the replanting of the replacement trees and the indicative landscaping detailed in the report and associated TPP.

Recommended conditions:

Landscaping small scale (To Be Approved)

Arboricultural Method Statement (As Specified)

Site Notice

One site notice was displayed near the application site on 25 June 2025. The 21-day consultation period ended on 16 July 2025. No letters of representation have been received.



Fig 2: 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

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

Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019)

Policy CC7 – Design and the Public Realm
Policy CC8 – Safeguarding Amenity
Policy H9 – House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation
Policy H10 – Private and Communal Outdoor Space
Policy EN12 – Biodiversity and the Green Network
Policy EN14 – Trees, Hedges and Woodland

Others

Design Guide to House Extensions SPD 2021

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 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 this planning application 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 two-storey rear extension would feature three lower gable roofs at the rear, which would form a cross roof with the host dwelling upon completion. The part two-storey side extension would be set down from the existing ridgeline and set back from the frontage of the host dwelling, along with the proposed single-storey side extension. Overall, the proposed developments are considered to be subservient to the main house. Additionally, the alteration to the front gable projection, combined with the new gable roof canopy, is considered to retain and enhance the existing architectural detailing, respecting the original design.

The proposed fenestration alterations are considered acceptable in terms of scale, proportion, and siting. All new windows and doors would incorporate double-glazed units with black frames. External walls are to be constructed in red brick, and the roof finished with Marley Hawkins Clay Roof Tiles (or similar), in a grey/blue tone. The roller shutter door serving the new workshop would be colour-matched to the decorative rendered surrounds, as well as the front gable projection and canopy.

Although the existing property features white-painted external walls and window frames, all materials and finishes would be replaced as part of the proposal. The development would therefore present a cohesive and unified appearance. Given the prevalence of red brick properties in the surrounding context, the proposed materials and design are not considered to detract from the character or appearance of the area.

Overall, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding environment.

Residential Amenity

Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not result in an overbearing impact on neighbours. Policy H10 states that dwellings will be provided with functional private or communal open space. 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.

There are no identified risks of privacy, overbearing, or loss of light, as all side windows would be obscured, the house is detached, and the neighbouring properties are not staggered. To protect the privacy of

neighbouring properties, a condition is recommended to restrict the insertion of any new openings in the side elevations without prior approval from the Local Planning Authority. The proposal site boasts a spacious rear garden, which would continue to provide sufficient private outdoor space upon completion of the development. Therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

Natural Environment (Tree)

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 quality of waterside vegetation will be maintained or enhanced.

The application site lies within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and along a designated 'Treed Corridor' as identified in the Reading Borough Council Tree Strategy. According to the arboricultural reports, the proposed development involves the removal of a total of 16 trees, including a group of pollarded lime trees (G1), two dying English elms (G2), two Norway maples of poor form (G3), and a clipped variegated holly (T4), along with additional vegetation such as leylandii hedges, common laurel, hazel, ivy, and viburnum. The updated arboricultural report (Ref: S1557-J1-R3), received on 30th June 2025, has addressed previous concerns raised by Natural Environment officers, including clarification on the fate of Tree 7 (purple plum), which is now proposed to be reduced to 3m in height and spread due to poor form and decay. The report also confirms the removal of other vegetation not previously detailed.

Although the trees proposed for removal are of low amenity value, the overall loss of vegetation is notable. The submitted Tree Protection Plan (TPP) and Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) outline appropriate mitigation measures and tree-friendly construction practices to safeguard retained trees during development. The replanting scheme includes four new trees on the frontage: three small-leaved lime (*Tilia cordata* 'Greenspire') and one Lavallée hawthorn (*Crataegus x lavalleei*) on the frontage. One variegated holly (*Ilex aquifolium* 'Handsworth New Silver') in the rear garden, and native English yew (*Taxus baccata*) hedging along the southern boundary. While the replanting is positive, concerns remain regarding species diversity, particularly the use of three lime trees of the same cultivar. A more varied species palette would better support biodiversity and align with the aims of the Tree Strategy, though this can be addressed through a landscaping condition.

In conclusion, the proposal is considered acceptable on tree grounds, subject to conditions securing a detailed landscaping scheme to demonstrate net gain and appropriate species selection, implementation of the AMS and TPP, and ongoing maintenance and replacement of planting. The development presents an opportunity to enhance the site's environmental quality through thoughtful replanting and long-term tree management, contributing positively to the character of the Treed Corridor.

Transport

The proposal complies with the RBC Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD, which considers site accessibility. Two parking spaces are required for the residential dwelling, and the existing driveway provides off-street parking exceeding this requirement. The proposed widening of the driveway accessed from Oxford Road does not necessitate changes to the existing dropped kerb.

As such, there are no transport objections to the proposal.

Ecology

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

6. 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.

7. RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

Recommended Conditions:

Approved Plans

Time Limits

Materials (As Specified)

Landscaping small scale (To Be Approved)

Arboricultural Method Statement (As Specified)

No New Openings

No demolition of walls other than as shown on plans