

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Caversham Heights Ward

App Ref: PL/25/1724 Householder planning permission

Address: 54 MATLOCK ROAD, CAVERSHAM, READING, RG4 7BS

Proposal: Proposed Single Storey Rear and Side Extension

Applicant: Mr Joel Coakeley

Received date: 01/12/2025

Target Decision date: 28/01/2026; EOT agreed until 22/4/2026

Case Officer: Ethne Humphreys / Mishga Marshall

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The site relates to a semi-detached property located on the north east side of Matlock Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with a mix of semi-detached and detached dwellings – many of which have been extended.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

This application seeks planning permission for a proposed single storey rear and side extension following demolition of detached garage structure and part demolition of outbuilding on shared boundary with No.56 Matlock Road.

The materials would match that of the host property.

Plans considered:

Proposed Block Plan Drawing No.001

Received 21 April 2026

Proposed Ground Floor Plan Drawing No.A100 dated March 22 2026

Proposed Roof Plan Drawing No.A101 dated March 22 2026

Proposed Front Elevation Drawing No.A102 dated March 22 2026

Proposed Right Side Elevation Drawing No.A103 dated March 22 2026

Proposed Rear Elevation Drawing No.A104 dated March 22 2026

Proposed Left Side Elevation Drawing No.A105 dated March 22 2026

Received 8th April 2026

Location Plan

Received 1st December 2025

3. CONSULTATIONS

Transport Development Control: Object, due to insufficient parking, discussed below.

A site notice was displayed. One neighbour letter received concerned with:

- Lack of notification
- Poor quality plans
- Impact on light
- Party wall agreement

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. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

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)

TR3 (Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters)

TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging)

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. 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.

The plans as originally submitted were poor quality and were not consistent (ie proposed floor plans did not match proposed elevation drawings, details were missing, proportions incorrect) and the plans were not considered to be enforceable, should they have been approved.

It was also not clear what was being proposed at the front of the site – it was hard to tell from the drawings whether this was a vertical gable end proposed or at an angle. The proposals appeared to lack appropriate integration with the host property, exacerbated by the forward projection of the side element, and not helped by the poor quality drawings.

Revised plans have now been received providing more detail (dimensions, fenestration placement etc). The applicant also advised the roof at the front was proposed as a hipped roof, pitched back towards the façade of the original house. It is considered that there is now sufficient detail to appraise the scheme.

There are no design concerns with regard to the loss of garage and outbuilding.

The proposals would essentially form a 'wrap-around' extension to the dwelling and the footprint would be relatively large. However, they would largely follow the footprint of the garage and outbuilding to be demolished. A large proportion of the existing garden would remain, and the proposals are not considered to result in a harmfully cramped appearance. The extensions would remain subservient, largely due to their single storey scale and the hipped roof at front, side and rear would assist in softening the impact of the proposals. There are a variety of side and rear extensions within the locality, both at single storey and two storey, and the proposal would fit with this character. Whilst the garage element would be sited close to the side boundary, the majority of the side extension would maintain a gap, which combined with the single storey scale would maintain a sufficient degree of spaciousness. The extension would project forward of the main façade of the existing building which would appear somewhat awkward and poorly integrated. However, this is not sufficiently harmful to the wider streetscene at this scale to warrant refusal.

It is acknowledged that the proposals may appear slightly contrived in appearance; however, given the above and noting the large scale additions that existing within the 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.

Policies CC7 and H9 apply.

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 56 and 52 Matlock Road located to the north and south of the site respectively.

With regard to the adjoining semi at no.56 Matlock Road, the proposal would be sited close to the common boundary. The applicant has confirmed that there would be no encroachment, with the proposed extension

contained entirely within the plot and Certificate A has been signed in this respect. Whilst clearly visible to occupiers of No.56, the depth would be relatively minimal at 2.2m past the existing rear projection to be demolished and largely in line with the neighbouring extension, noting that this is sited further away from the boundary. It is considered that the proposal would not harm outlook, daylight or result in overbearing effects to this neighbour. The proposals include removal of brick outbuilding sited between No.54 and No.56, with a dividing wall in between. It is proposed to demolish one half of the existing small outbuilding shared between No. 54 and No. 56. The applicant has confirmed replacement of the fence line between properties.

With regard to No.52 Matlock Road, the occupiers of this property raised concern that there was insufficient design detail with the proposal and that there should be more space between the properties (for urban wildlife as well as visual appearance). The occupiers of No.52 raised concern that light to a side kitchen window would be impacted. Since the original submission, revised plans were received providing more detail. These were also sent directly to the occupiers of No.52 31st March, and no further comment was received.

The proposed flank wall of the proposed extension would run for a significant length adjacent to the boundary with No.52. However, the majority (rearmost) would be set away by approximately 1m from the boundary and the roof would be hipped away to minimise the impact. No.52 has a canopy structure adjacent to the common boundary, behind their garage. Whilst clearly visible, the proposals are not considered to be sufficiently overbearing result in harm to neighbouring amenity or to warrant a refusal on this basis. Three windows are proposed on the side elevation facing towards No.52., Given the single storey nature, no significant overlooking is considered to arise.

Policies CC8 and H9 apply.

Transport/Parking

Policies TR3 and TR5 seek to address access, traffic, highway and parking related matters to development.

The proposals would remove the existing garage and the Council's Transport Officer has raised concern that there would be insufficient parking retained, particularly as the proposed garage element would not meet the minimum depth stated in the Parking Standards and Design SPD.

Whilst the above is acknowledged, it is not considered that the existing garage is particularly suitable for car parking. One car parking space would remain at the front of the site and the proposed garage, whilst not fully meeting dimensions, would likely still be able to accommodate a car. Given this, a reason for refusal due to insufficient car parking is not considered reasonable in this instance. The development is considered acceptable on highway safety and parking grounds.

Policies TR3 and TR5 apply.

Matters Raised in Representation

All material considerations have been considered in the above report.

With regard to comments about notification (lack of direct), Regulations require Local Planning Authorities to notify neighbours of planning applications submitted by either posting letters to neighbours whose boundary adjoins the application site or placing a notice on site. In this instance, a site notice was displayed.

With regard to your comments about the party wall agreement, this is separate from planning permission and is a civil matter between parties. A link with more information was provided to the neighbour querying this process.

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, subject to conditions