

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Park Ward

App Ref: PL/26/0004 Householder planning permission

Address: 64 HAMILTON ROAD, READING, RG1 5RD

Proposal: Proposed single storey rear extension and an additional front Porch.

Applicant: Mr Uttam Rijal

Received date: 05/01/2026

Target Decision date: 02/03/2026; EOT agreed until 01/04/2026

Case Officer: Ethne Humphreys / Mishga Marshall

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The site relates to a two storey semi-detached property located on the west side Hamilton Road. The building is not listed; however, the site is within the South Park Conservation Area. The site also falls within an Article 4 Direction Areas which restricts the change of use from C3 dwellinghouse to C4 small HMO. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with similar sized plots and dwellings of varying design, many of which have been extend, including the adjoining property No.64a Hamilton Road.

It was noted at the site visit that the vegetation in the front garden had been removed, to facilitate car parking. A tree in the front garden had also been removed (as well as two in the rear garden) – however, this was agreed under a Tree Works Notice (see history below).

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

This application seeks planning permission for a proposed single storey rear extension and an additional front Porch. The rear extension would measure 4.7m width x 4.3m depth with an overall height of 3.7m. The porch extension would measure 1.4m width by 1.2m depth with an overall height of 3.4m. The materials would match that of the host property.

The block plan as originally submitted showed two car parking spaces on the frontage, despite the application form stating no change to parking arrangements (and changes to the frontage not included in the description of development). Revised plans were received omitting the car parking spaces.

3. CONSULTATIONS

Conservation Officer: No objection, subject to clarification in respect of materials, colour and front garden works. Discussed below.

Natural Environment: Removal of trees in the rear garden do not need to be dealt with under planning app. However, as applicant originally noted that tree removal at front of site was to facilitate car parking, it is reasonable for this to be dealt with as part of the planning application. Paving of front garden not desirable in Conservation Areas. Discussed below.

Transport Officer: Objection originally received due to proposed car parking on front garden, as no existing vehicle crossing – and any dropped kerb would be in conflict with speed calming cushion outside the front of the property. Discussed below.

A site notice was displayed and the application was advertised.

One neighbour letter of representation received in support of the proposals.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

26/0129 T1 (Chinese yellow wood tree): Fell to Ground Level. T2 (Scots pine): Fell to just above ground level. T3 (Douglas fir): Fell to just above ground level. Tree works agreed.

Neighbouring sites
64a Hamilton Road

25/0198 Proposed single storey rear extension. Permitted and implemented.

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 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority in the exercise of its functions to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

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 2014 onwards

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)
CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)
H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)
H10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space)
EN1 (Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment)
EN3 (Enhancement of Conservation Areas)
EN6 (New Development in a Historic Context)
EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodland)

SPD and other documentation

Design Guide to House Extensions SPD 2021
South Park Conservation Area Appraisal 2008

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’.

6. APPRAISAL

Design Considerations, Impact on Heritage Assets and Landscaping

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.

Policy EN1 states that all proposals will be expected to protect and where possible enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings, the historic character and local distinctiveness of the area in which they are located. Policy EN3 states that the special interest, character and architecture of Conservation Areas will be conserved and enhanced. Policy EN6 states new development will make a contribution to the historic character of the area by respecting and enhancing its architectural and visual qualities.

Policy EN14 requires trees, hedges and woodlands to be protected from damage and for Reading’s vegetation cover to be extended.

With regard to the front porch, this would be relatively small scale. Whilst clearly visible from the front elevation, it would remain a subservient feature, with materials to match which is appropriate. There are other front porch additions within the street scene. No harm to the character of the host property, street scene or wider Conservation Area is considered to arise.

With regard to the rear extension, whilst the overall height would be high, this would be similar in scale and appearance to the extension approved at the adjoining semi No.64a Hamilton Road. Similarly, albeit the depth would exceed that suggested in the Design guide to House Extension SPD, this would match that at No.64a. As such, it would not be out of keeping. The materials would match the host property which is appropriate. No harm to the character of the host property or wider Conservation Area is considered to arise.

The plans as originally submitted included car parking space on the site frontage. Furthermore, it was seen at the site visit that the vegetation of the front garden had been removed. This would also have required a a dropped kerb and changes to the front boundary treatment. Car parking was not included in the description of development, and the application form noted no changes to the parking arrangements.

The site is within a Conservation Area, with the Conservation Area appraisal noting the following:

“..key principles...the retention and enhancement of the area’s “open”, tree covered character”;

“..makes the area attractive and worthy of Conservation Area status. This is reinforced by the retention of many boundary walls and railings throughout the area which, together with mature tree cover, also give the area its coherence”;

“...typically bounded brick walls and railings and containing significant tree cover, provide a good setting for individual properties and the character of the Conservation Area as a whole”;

“semi-detached and terraced houses in spacious plots with mature trees and well stocked gardens”;

“plot frontages defined by brick walls and or railings”;

“..extensive tree coverage throughout, giving a verdant feel to the area of buildings and trees in harmony...trees therefore make a significant contribution to his suburban Conservation Area’s special character and sense of identity..”

“the retention of trees on the road frontages is important to the setting of the Conservation Area”

Further to the above, the CA appraisal specifically notes that features that make a positive contribution to the historic character and appearance of the conservation area are:

- Retention of original brick walls and/or railings (original and replacement) throughout the area;
- Good tree cover within the grounds of individual properties and throughout the area

It notes that features that have a negative impact on the historic character and appearance of the conservation area are:

- Loss of original brick walls and /or railings to create frontage parking

Given the above, the loss of front garden and replacement with car parking was not considered to be acceptable in visual amenity/heritage/tree coverage terms – nor in transport terms (discussed below). Revised plans were received omitting the car parking spaces, and with an annotation stating that there would be ‘no change to the front boundary walls and gate).

Given the vegetation already moved, a condition is proposed to be attached requiring details of soft landscaping and replacement tree planting – not only to mitigate against the loss of tree coverage following felling but also to assist with the site frontage preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the street scene and wider Conservation Area.

Subject to conditions, the proposal is considered acceptable. In compliance with Policies CC7, EN1, EN3, EN6, EN14 and H9.

Neighbour Amenity

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

The neighbouring properties potentially most affected by the proposals are No’s 64a and 62 Hamilton Road located to the south and north of the site respectively.

With regard to the front extension, given its small scale nature, combined with distances to side boundaries and hipped roof, no material loss of light, privacy or overbearing effects are considered to arise.

With regard to the rear extension and in relation to No.64a the adjoining semi, this property has the benefit of a single storey rear extension close to the common boundary which itself would minimise the impact. The proposed extension would not project past this. No material amenity concerns considered to arise.

With regard to No.62, this property has the benefit of a rear conservatory addition close to the common boundary, Whilst visible, given the distance of 1m to the common boundary, combined with the roof hipped away to minimise the impact, no material loss of light or overbearing effects are considered to arise. A window is proposed on the side elevation facing this property. The plans are annotated to state that this would be obscurely glazed to minimise privacy concerns. This will be secured by way of condition.

In compliance with Policies H9 and CC8 in particular.

Transport / Parking

As above, the proposed block plan originally showed two car parking spaces on the frontage. Notwithstanding concerns raised above, it was also noted that there was no existing vehicle crossing to facilitate the parking indicated. There is a speed calming cushion located outside the property and any dropped kerb would conflict with this (which could also result in vehicles being damaged as they enter or exit the site or damaging public highway).

Revised plans received omitting the parking spaces and noting no changes to the existing front boundary treatment. Further to which, no highway concerns.

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
Materials as Stated
Approved Plans
Obscure Glazing
Landscaping / Replacement Planting