

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Abbey Ward

App Ref: PL/26/0074 Householder planning permission

Address: 16 STANLEY STREET, READING, RG1 7NY

Proposal: Proposed Part First Floor Rear Extension

Applicant: Mr. Rajan Lamichhane

Received date: 23/01/2026

Target Decision date: 23/3/26; EOT agreed until 20/04/2026

Case Officer: Ethne Humphreys / Mishga Marshall

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site relates to a two storey mid-terraced dwelling located on the north side of Stanley Street, opposite the junction with Derby Street. The building is not listed and nor is the site within a conservation area. The site is within an air quality management area.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

This application seeks planning permission for a first floor rear extension. The roof would be pitched with a gable end. The materials would match that of the host property.

Plans considered:

Location and Site Plan Drawing No. PL/A720/05 Rev. A

Proposed Ground, First Floor and Roof Plans Drawing No. PL/A720/03 Rev. A

Proposed Elevations Drawing No. PL/A720/04 Rev. A

Received 23rd March 2026

Existing Elevations Drawing No. PL/A720/02

Existing Ground, First Floor and Roof Plans Drawing No. PL/A720/01

3. CONSULTATIONS

No internal consults.

A site notice was displayed at the front of the site. Given the changes to the rear, it was necessary to display a second site notice to the rear along Great Knollys Street. This expired 20th April 26. No neighbour letters of representation received.

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 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)

EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network)

SPD

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’.

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.

Due to the nature of the proposals, there would be no increase in the actual footprint of the property. However, the extension as originally proposed, which was an extension to the existing two storey rear addition, would result in a 6.2m deep rear addition that would be disproportionate to the host property, unbalance the rear terrace and would be out of keeping with the local area. Due to its design, it would also present an approx. 3m blank façade along the boundary with No. 18 Stanely Street. Policy H9 also states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not present a large blank façade to public areas. There were also concerns that the resultant bedroom would not comply with space standards in

respect of bedrooms size at 6.95m². This in itself, was not a deciding factor and it was not suggested that this should be increased given the above.

Further to the above, revised plans were received reducing the depth of the first floor extension. A reduction in depth by half had been suggested. Whilst it is not quite half (slightly less than), nevertheless, the reduction assists in minimising the amount of blank façade. It is acknowledged that it would likely appear slightly contrived in appearance, given the flat roof element at ground floor. However, it is not unusual for the backs of these terraces to have a stepping down towards the rear. The materials would match the host property which would assist in the extension integrating and whilst there are no similar extensions in area, it is not considered to be so significantly harmful or obtrusive to the character of the host property or wider area to warrant a refusal on this basis.

Broadly in compliance with Policies H9 and CC7.

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.

With regard to No.18 Stanely Street to the west, whilst visible, given the position of the extension, there would be no material loss of amenity in terms of loss of light, privacy or overbearing effects. A condition will be attached to state no new openings on the west elevation, to protect privacy.

With regard to No.14 Stanley Street to the east, the depth of the extension as originally proposed is likely to have breached a 45 degree line to the nearest habitable first floor window of this property. The reduction in depth minimises the impact and combined with the hipped roof, whilst visible, it is not considered to result in such significant material loss of light, privacy or overbearing effects to warrant a refusal on this basis. As above, a condition will be attached to state no new openings on the east elevation, to protect privacy.

There is currently no window on the rear elevation at first floor level. The proposals include a first floor window on the rear elevation which could also potentially access the ground floor flat roof rear element. Given the significant distance to the properties along Great Knollys Street to the rear, no harmful overlooking is considered to arise. A condition will be attached to prevent use of this roof as a balcony, terrace area or roof garden, to protect neighbour amenity from overlooking.

In compliance with Policies H9 and CC8 in particular.

Natural Environment –Ecology

Policy EN14 requires trees, hedges and woodlands to be protected from damage and for Reading's vegetation cover to be extended. Policy EN12 requires proposals to not result in a net loss of biodiversity and protect and wherever possible enhances features of biodiversity interest.

There are no trees of significance on site. However, there is a tree within the garden of No.18, close to the common boundary. Given the nature of the first floor extension and distance to tree, no harm is considered to arise. An informative is recommended to advise not to use soft ground in rear garden for construction related activities to protect the trees.

Given the felt roof nature of the single storey ground floor element this is unlikely to host roosting bats.

In compliance with Policies EN12 and 14.

7. CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed as set out above and on balance 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

No New Openings

No Use of Flat Roof