

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Coley Ward

App Ref: PL/26/0064 Householder planning permission

Address: 61 TRELLECK ROAD, READING, RG1 6EN

Proposal: Single storey rear extension and garage conversion

Applicant: V Clarke

Received date: 21/01/2026

Target Decision date: 18/03/2026

Case Officer: Huimin Chen

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with an attached garage and a single-storey rear extension. It is located on the south side of Trelleck Road, leading into the cul-de-sac. Coley Recreation Ground lies to the northeast of the application site. The surrounding area is predominantly residential.



Fig 1: Front view of 61 Trelleck Road, taken 12/02/2026

Part of the bottom of the application site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3, see Fig. 2.



Fig 2: Flood Zone Map of the Application Site: Extract from the Flood Map for Planning (16/03/2026)

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal seeks permission to convert the existing garage into a fourth bedroom and to construct a new single-storey rear extension behind the existing garage, projecting approximately 2.3 m. The extension is intended to be used as a shower room. The two elements would be linked, featuring a flat roof and measuring approximately 2.8 m in overall height, which is around 52 cm higher than the existing structure. No side windows are proposed; meanwhile, the scheme includes a double window to the front and another to the rear. According to the application form, all proposed bricks, roof materials and windows are to match those of the existing dwelling.

Plans considered:

- PL.3725-A-101 - Existing plans and elevations
 - PL.3725-A-102 - Proposed plans and elevations
 - PL.3725-A-103 - Block plan
 - Location Plan
- Dated 05/25, received 21/01/2026.



Figures 3-4: Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

3. PLANNING HISTORY

PL/21/1860 - Single storey and double-storey side and rear extension. Bin and Cycle storage at the front. Withdrawn 05/12/2022.

4. CONSULTATIONS

- *RBC Transport Development Control:*

Application seeks to convert the existing single garage into additional accommodation ancillary to the main dwelling. This will result in the loss of one parking space. In accordance with the Councils current parking standards 2 on-site parking spaces would be required. Plans have not been submitted illustrating 2 on site parking spaces and access arrangements.

Trelleck road is an unrestricted road with parking occurring on both sides of the road, Transport would not support an increase in on street parking.

Please ask the applicant to submit revised plans illustrating 2 on-site parking spaces and vehicle access. If the existing vehicle access needs widening to facilitate any new parking layout a license from the Highways team will be required.

Any trees on site will need to be illustrated on plans and the Natural Environment officer consulted.

- *RBC Ecology Consultations – No objections.*

The application site comprises a semi-detached house where it is intended to convert the garage into a bedroom and shower by adding a small one storey extension to the garage.

Although the site is located within an area of good habitat for roosting bats with the Holy brook adjacent to the rear of the property along as well as Fobney and Kennet Valley Meadows Local Wildlife Site, the building appears to be in relatively good condition as viewed on Google Maps and the works do not include alterations to the main roof.

As such, it is considered unlikely that the proposals will affect roosting bats and as such there would be no objections to the application.

- Lead Local Flood Authority Consultations – there is no comment was received during the consultation period from 29/01/2026-19/02/2026.
- Site Notice: A site notice was displayed near the application site. The 21-day consultation period was from 12 February 2026 to 5 March 2026. No letters of representation have been received.



Fig 9: Site Notice photo

- Communications with the Agent:

The Transport consultation requested that the application provide one more on-site parking space, as the proposal would result in the loss of the garage. However, the internal dimensions of the garage are approximately 2.2 m × 5.3 m, which do not meet the minimum requirement for a parking space (2.4 m × 4.8 m). As such, Planning Officers requested confirmation from the agent regarding

the actual use of the garage. The agent confirmed via email dated 09/03/2026 that “the garage is used for storage only. It is too small for a modern car to be used as a parking space.”

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 (NPPF)

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

SPD

Design Guide to House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (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 pre-submission draft was submitted to the Secretary of State on the 9th of May 2025 and is currently at examination.

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 listed above 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 appraisal below and are not considered to be ‘out of date’.

6. APPRAISAL

Background of the Existing Garage

The existing garage was not part of the original property. No planning history was found for its construction. However, according to the Council's GIS database, its construction dates back to around 2002. Therefore, it can be confirmed that the garage is immune to enforcement action, as it has existed for more than 10 years.

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 proposal is considered acceptable in terms of character and appearance, given that it is small in scale and all proposed materials would match the existing dwelling. Although the overall height of the side extension would be greater than that of the existing garage, it is not considered to result in a significant alteration to the appearance of the host dwelling or the streetscene.

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. Policy H9 also requires that ancillary accommodation will only be acceptable where it would not be capable of operating as a separate dwelling which could be let or sold separately.

There are no identified privacy risks, as no side windows are proposed. Although the proposal would increase the height of the existing single-storey side extension by approximately 50 cm, it would not result in a significant loss of light to No. 59. This is because the structure would remain below 3 m in height, and the obstruction angle is less than 25° (based on the *Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight*) when taken from the closest ground-floor window at 59 Trelleck Road. The proposal primarily relates to the garage conversion and a modest single-storey rear extension of approximately 2.3 m in depth following the line of the existing garage. The overall height is ca. 2.8m. Therefore, it is not considered that the development would result in an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property.

Other matters – Ecology, Flooding Risk and Transport

The Ecology Officer has confirmed that there is no objection on ecological grounds.

On the other hand, the Transport Officer requested a revised plan to illustrate two on-site parking spaces, as the proposal would result in the loss of one parking space due to the garage conversion. However, based on the measurements of the existing garage and the agent's confirmation, the garage is currently used solely for storage as it cannot accommodate a modern car. The existing front driveway can accommodate one parking space and any other parking is occurring on the highway. Therefore, the Planning Officer does not consider the proposal would materially result in the loss of an actual parking space and the existing situation would, therefore, be maintained.

Finally, although part of the rear garden of the application site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3, a Flood Risk Assessment is not considered necessary. This is because the proposed development is small in scale and is not itself located within the flood zone.

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

Approve with conditions

Time Limit

Approved Plans

Materials (To match)