

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Caversham

App Ref: PL/25/1287 Householder planning permission

Address: 9 ST JOHNS ROAD, CAVERSHAM, READING, RG4 5AN

Proposal: Erection of a single-storey side and rear extension connecting to the existing garage outbuilding, conversion of the garage to habitable accommodation, and construction of a first-floor rear extension (amended).

Applicant: Robert Tucker & Catesby Rathbone-Tucker

Received date: 10/09/2025

Target Decision date (agreed extension): 11/02/2026

Case Officer: Sian Hickey

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site consists of a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with a pitched roof located on the west side of St Johns Road in Caversham. A single-storey rear extension is present, along with a detached garage positioned along the side and rear of the site. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with Caversham Hall located directly opposite the site. The site is located with Flood Zone 2 and 3.

Site visit date: 14/11/2025

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Planning permission is sought for a single-storey side extension that would wrap around to the rear of the property and adjoin the existing single-storey rear projection. The development would also connect the new extension to the existing detached garage. The proposal includes converting the garage into habitable accommodation to provide a home office and toilet. In addition, a first-floor rear extension is proposed to the main dwelling. The materials proposed would match those of the existing.

The original proposal included a two-storey side extension. However, officers raised concerns that this element would appear overbearing, and that, when combined with the proposed rear extension and the conversion of the existing garage into a habitable room, it would result in an excessive level of development. The two-storey side extension was considered harmful to the character of the host dwelling and the street scene, as well as having an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property at No. 11 St Johns Road.

Subsequently, revised plans were received removing the two storey side element from the proposal and introducing a smaller first floor rear extension instead.

Plans/documents considered:

Drawing No. 101 – Existing Floor Plans received 10 September 2025

Drawing No. 102 – Existing Elevations received 10 September 2025

Flood Risk Assessment received 4 November 2025

Drawing No. 103 rev C – Proposed Floor Plans received 3 December 2025

Drawing No. 104 rev B – Proposed Floor Plans received 3 December 2025

Drawing No. 100 rev B – Proposed Floor Plans received 4 February 2026

3. CONSULTATIONS

A site notice was displayed at the front of the property by the case officer on 14th November 2025 for a period of 21 days. No letters of representation have been received.



RBC Transport

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 proposed plan illustrates two parking spaces on the site frontage utilising the existing dropped kerb. However, in order to access the parking space across the site frontage, it should be noted that the boundary wall will need to be reduced to ensure vehicles can manoeuvre into the parking spaces (Aerial images from Google Maps indicate that the boundary wall and gate extend further than is illustrated on the submitted plan).

In view of this, there are no transport objections to the proposal subject to a condition to ensure all vehicle parking spaces are provided in accordance with the approved plans.

Planning Officer note:

It is noted that the Transport Officer advised that two parking spaces would be required for the proposal to comply with current parking standards. The agent initially illustrated two off-road parking spaces on the submitted plans; however, accommodating these spaces would require the removal of the existing garden wall and frontage, which is considered detrimental to the character of the property and would result in harm to the street scene.

In this instance, planning officers consider the proposed parking arrangement (with the original parking space retained at the front for one vehicle) to be acceptable. While the Transport Officer's comments are acknowledged, planning officers have reached a different judgement based on the specific circumstances of this application.

Ecology

As it is a fairly built-up area and we don't have any records of bat roosts in the area, a bat survey is not required in this instance.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

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.

5. 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)
EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network)
EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodland)
EN18 (Flooding and Sustainable Drainage)
H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)
H10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space)
TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle)

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. The submission version 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'.

6. 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 side extension would be single storey only and set sufficiently back from the front elevation of the main dwelling to ensure it remains a clearly subservient addition. A garage door would be positioned within the front elevation of the extension, and it would incorporate a hipped roof. As such, the proposed side extension is considered acceptable in terms of its design, appearance, and impact of the street scene. The remainder of the proposed development would be contained at the rear of the site. The existing garage would be converted into habitable space, with no change to its footprint, however, the roof form would be altered from a flat roof to a pitched roof to enhance its appearance.

The proposed first floor rear extension is considered fairly modest in scale and appropriately positioned, being well set away from both side boundaries. It would extend across the rear elevation of the dwelling at a width of 3.750m and would feature a pitched roof set significantly below the main roof ridge. The depth of the proposed extension would be 2.930m which is in line with the 4m guidance within the Design Guide to House Extensions SPD.

Overall, the proposals are not considered to cause harm to the character of the existing dwelling or the wider area and therefore complies with policies H9 and CC7.

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 two storey element of the proposed extension is considered acceptable in terms of scale and design and is sufficiently set away from both side boundaries, therefore, there are no identified risks in terms of overbearing effects or visual dominance. Furthermore, no first-floor side facing windows are proposed and therefore there are no identified risks in terms of loss of privacy or overlooking.

The rest of the development is single storey in nature only. Although the side extension is close to the shared boundary with no. 11 St Johns Road, it has a fairly modest eaves height of 2.930m and a pitch roof form sloping away from the boundary to reduce the impact to this neighbour. With regard to loss of light, there are windows in the side elevation at No. 11 St Johns Road, however, the property is positioned away from the shared boundary, and its rear extension set even further back. Additionally, the garage outbuilding at the application site is already in situ along this boundary. As a result, although some additional impact may arise, it is not considered to be so significant as to warrant refusal on this basis.

Flood Risk

Policy EN18 requires proposals within areas of flood risk to not reduce the capacity of the flood plain to store floodwater, impede the flow of floodwater or in any way increase the risks to life and property arising from flooding. Wherever possible, development should be designed to reduce flood risk, both on- and off-site.

As the proposal site is within flood zone 2 and 3, it is a requirement that a flood risk assessment should be completed using the advice for minor extensions. A minor extension includes a householder extension with a floor space of no more than 250 sqm.

The Flood Risk Assessment is considered acceptable, and a condition is attached to ensure that the development complies with all flood mitigation and protection measures as contained within the assessment.

7. 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.

8. RECOMMENDATION - GRANT

Recommended Conditions:

TL1 - Time Limit

AP1 - Approved Plans

M3 - Materials

SU9 – Flood Protection Measures