

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Caversham Heights Ward

App Ref: PL/26/0035

Address: 226 KIDMORE ROAD, CAVERSHAM, READING, RG4 7ND

Proposals: Proposed front porch, demolition of the existing rear conservatory, rear extension, new pitched roof and internal alterations. (Amended Description)

Case Officer: Mishga Marshall

Applicant: Ms Sophia Cox

Date received (valid from): 16/01/2026

Target Decision date: 11/03/2026

Agreed EOT date: 05/05/2026

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two storey detached dwelling on Kidmore Road. The property is set back from the road by way of a paved driveway. There is an existing conservatory and extension at the rear. Kidmore Road is a residential area comprised of semi-detached and detached dwellings of mixed design, and height. The property is not listed nor in a conservation area. The site is located within an Air Quality Management Area.

Site visit date: 02/03/2026

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for the construction of a single storey rear extension to replace the existing conservatory and infill the existing gap between the existing conservatory and rear extension. As well as a single storey front extension and a new pitched roof on the existing rear extension and 4 new skylights and a new roof lantern (where?). The proposed extension will measure 6m in depth and 4m in height with different pitched roof styles (what are the eaves heights). The front extension will have a pitched roof with a max depth of 2m and height of 3.2m. Two new windows are proposed at either side elevations at ground floor and two existing windows on the existing side extension are proposed to be blocked up. Currently, there are 6 separate sets of door for access into the rear garden, these doors for the most part are proposed to be replaced by windows, and one line of 5 bi-fold doors to be added to the rear of the proposed extension and side of the existing rear extension for access in to rear area. A new patio with a retractable pergola is also proposed (this looks pretty permanent to me).

During the course of the application assessment, concerns were raised following consultation with the Highway/Transport Authority regarding the proposed increase in height of the front boundary wall. It was advised that the increased wall height could reduce visibility from the site access onto Kidmore Road, and that visibility splays would be required to demonstrate that sight lines would be no worse than the existing situation. The Highway Authority also advised that, should entrance gates be proposed, they would need to be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the carriageway edge to allow vehicles to fully pull clear of the highway while the gates are being opened.

In parallel, officers considered the proposal in the context of the existing character of Kidmore Road, noting that this section of the street is characterised by smaller, low front boundary walls of a generally uniform appearance. Officers advised that retaining this prevailing form would help preserve the established street scene and address the identified highway safety concerns. On this basis, officers recommended that the proposed front boundary development be removed from the scheme.

This recommendation was discussed with and agreed by the applicant, and amended plans were subsequently submitted which remove the proposed front boundary wall from the development. The following assessment is therefore based on the amended plans received on 24 April.

No development has been stated on site.

Plans submitted received 14th April 2026:

BS5837 TREE PROTECTION PLAN dated APRIL 2026

AIA/AMS 06971 / 2026 BS:5837 ARBORICULTURAL REPORT dated APRIL 2026

Plans submitted received 24th April 2026:

1197 PLA 001 B Location and Block Plan as Existing dated June 2025

1197 PLA 002 B Site Photos taken 20.05.2025 dated June 2025

1197 PLA 003 B Existing Ground Floor Plan dated June 2025

1197 PLA 004 B Existing First Floor Plan dated June 2025

1197 PLA 005 B Existing Roof Plan dated June 2025

1197 PLA 006 B Existing Elevations dated June 2025

1197 PLA 007 B Existing 3D Views dated June 2025

1197 PLA 008 B Existing 3D Perspective Views dated June 2025

1197 PLA 050 B Location and Block Plan as Proposed dated 14.04.2026

1197 PLA 051 B Proposed Ground Floor Plan dated 14.04.2026

1197 PLA 052 B Proposed First Floor Plan dated 14.04.2026

1197 PLA 053 B Proposed Roof Plan dated 14.04.2026

1197 PLA 054 B Proposed Elevations dated 14.04.2026

1197 PLA 055 B Proposed 3D Views dated 14.04.2026

1197 PLA 056 B Proposed 3D Perspective Views dated 14.04.2026

1197 PLA 057 B Proposed Interior Views dated 14.04.2026

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

PL/97/0562 - Erection or rear conservatory - Historical

PL/88/0165 - Extension to Existing Living Room of Granny Flat to The Rear Of House - Historical

PL/05/0729 - Single-storey rear extension to join existing 'granny-annexe' to house - Approved 13.10.2005

4. CONSULTATIONS

Site notice displayed on 23/01/2026



One neighbour letter of representation was received.

The commentor raised concerns about the proximity of the proposed rear extension to the shared boundary, particularly whether access to adjoining land would be required during construction. They also seek reassurance that measures will be in place to prevent damage to solar panels on an adjacent outbuilding.

Officer comment: The matters raised in relation to construction access and potential damage to neighbouring property are not material planning considerations and instead fall under separate civil legislation, including the Party Wall etc. Act 1996. It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that any works are carried out without causing damage to adjoining land or property. Notwithstanding this, the proposed development

has been assessed in terms of its physical impact on neighbouring amenity, including outlook, overbearing impact and potential disturbance, and is considered acceptable in these regards (as discussed below).

RBC Natural Environment - originally the Natural Environment Officer advised that insufficient information had been provided to assess the impact on nearby trees. Further details were required, including the plotting of trunk positions, canopy spreads and Root Protection Areas for all trees within 15 metres of the proposal, alongside any proposed removals or pruning. A Tree Protection Plan was also required, and an Arboricultural Impact Assessment was considered to necessary, particularly given the proximity of a tree on adjacent land. Upon the receipt of the requested information Natural Environment Officer had no further objection. Recommendation has been made for additional condition and informative to be included.

RBC Transport Development Control - The Transport Development Control Officer raised concerns that the proposed front boundary wall and gate could adversely affect visibility from the site access. Visibility splays were required and any gates were required to be set back at least 5 metres from the carriageway. While parking provision was acceptable, the proposal was considered to conflict with Local Plan Policy TR3, and the Highway Authority objected pending submission of the requested information. This was discussed with the applicant, and the proposed front boundary wall was removed from the proposal plans. Transport Development Control was notified, and no further objections were raised.

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)

CC1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)

CC2 (Sustainable Design and Construction)

CC3 (Adaption to Climate Change)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodlands)

TR3 (Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters)

SPD

Design Guide to House Extensions SPG 2021

Revised Parking Standards and Design Supplementary Planning Document (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 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

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.

Kidmore Road is characterised by detached dwellings of a broadly consistent appearance. The proposed rear extension, whilst relatively deep at approximately 6 metres, is single storey in scale and located to the rear and set in from the side, where it would not be visible from the public realm. It is noted that, as outlined within the design guide to house extensions SPD a rear extension of this depth is likely to not be supported. However, in this instance, the neighbouring property benefits from a rear extension of a similar depth, and the proposed extension would still sit marginally behind that neighbouring extension. As such, the depth is considered acceptable in this specific context. The development also proposes a permanent timber-framed retractable awning. Given its size and location, the awning is not considered to detract from the site or its character. Furthermore, the proposed material, timber, is considered appropriate.

The proposed pitched roof forms are considered to sit comfortably within the property. The introduction of a pitched roof to the existing rear extension is considered a clear improvement over the existing flat roof, resulting in a more coherent and visually appropriate form. The roof would be pitched away from the neighbouring property, further reducing any perceived impact.

The front extension is modest in scale, projecting approximately 2 metres, and is considered proportionate and acceptable within the street scene. Amendments to remove the proposed front boundary wall ensure that the established character of the street, represented by low boundary treatments, is preserved. In all preserving the existing character to the front and from public view.

The proposed fenestration, including the rationalisation of multiple rear doors into a more cohesive arrangement, is considered acceptable. The proposed materials are also considered to be in keeping with the host dwelling and would preserve and, in places, enhance the overall character of the property.

As such, the development is considered acceptable, in compliance 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 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 proposed rear extension would project approximately 6 metres; however, it is noted that the adjoining neighbouring property, No. 224, already benefits from a rear extension of a similar depth. The proposed extension would sit broadly in line with, and marginally behind, this existing built form and would be set in from the boundary. In this context, the development would not appear unduly prominent or result in a materially increased sense of enclosure when viewed from the neighbouring properties. In addition, the proposed retractable pergola would be a light weight timber structure, open on either side, as such, is not considered to cause under harm in terms of an increased sense of enclosure or overbearing. On this basis, no concerns are raised in respect of this relationship.

With specific regard to No. 224, the proposal would not result in a significant change to the existing relationship. The footprint and overall form of the existing rear extension would remain largely unaltered, with the primary change being the introduction of a pitched roof in place of the existing flat roof. This alteration is not considered to materially worsen the impact on this neighbouring occupier.

The extension is single storey in scale with a maximum height of approximately 4 metres. The introduction of a pitched roof, including to the existing rear extension, is considered to improve the overall form of development. Importantly, the roof would be pitched away from the neighbouring boundary, which serves to reduce any potential overbearing impact and minimise the perception of bulk when viewed from adjacent land.

Given the scale, siting, and relationship with neighbouring properties, the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable loss of outlook or create an overbearing impact.

In terms of privacy, the proposed rooflights and roof lantern are positioned to allow light ingress and are not considered to facilitate harmful overlooking. The proposed side windows are located at ground floor level and would not give rise to significant privacy concerns. To further protect the privacy amenity of the surrounding neighbours a condition will be attached which will restrict new openings from being created, without prior consent from the LPA.

Therefore, the development is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of all adjoining neighbours and on the occupiers of the application dwelling, complying with Policies CC8 and H9.

Natural Environment

Policy EN14 states that individual trees, groups of trees, hedges and woodlands will be protected from damage or removal where they are of importance, and Reading's vegetation cover will be extended. The quality of waterside vegetation will be maintained or enhanced.

The Council's Natural Environment Officer was consulted on the application and initially raised concerns that insufficient information had been provided to fully assess the impact of the development on nearby trees. Further details were requested, including the plotting of trunk positions, canopy spreads and Root Protection Areas for all trees within 15 metres of the proposal, as well as clarification on any proposed removals or pruning. A Tree Protection Plan was also required, and it was advised that an Arboricultural Impact Assessment would be necessary, particularly given the proximity of a tree on adjacent land.

Following the submission of the requested information, more specifically the Arboricultural Report and the Tree Protection Plan, the Tree Officer confirmed that no objections were raised to the proposal. Subject to appropriate planning conditions and informatives, the development is considered acceptable in arboricultural terms; and therefore, considered compliant with Policy EN14.

Transport

Policy TR3 requires development proposals to provide safe and suitable access arrangements for all users and to ensure that they do not result in unacceptable harm to highway safety or the efficient operation of the road network; developments should avoid creating congestion, unsafe conditions or conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, incorporate appropriate visibility, turning and servicing arrangements, and where necessary include mitigation measures or highway improvements supported by proportionate transport evidence to address any identified impacts.

The Council's Transport Development Control Officer was consulted and initially raised concerns regarding the proposed front boundary wall and gate, advising that these could adversely affect visibility from the site access onto Kidmore Road. It was recommended that visibility splays be demonstrated and that any gates be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the carriageway edge. While parking provision was considered acceptable, the proposal was initially considered to conflict with Local Plan Policy TR3, and an objection was raised pending further information.

Following discussions with the applicant, the proposed front boundary wall and gate were removed from the scheme. The Transport Development Control Officer was reconsulted on the amended plans and confirmed that no further objections were raised.

As amended, the proposal would not result in any changes to the existing access arrangements or visibility splays, and is not expected to generate a material increase in vehicle movements. The development is therefore considered acceptable in highway safety terms and compliant with Policy TR3.

7. CONCLUSION

The proposed development, as amended, is considered acceptable and would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the wider area. The scale and form of the rear extension, whilst notable, is considered acceptable in the context of the surrounding built form.

The proposal would not give rise to a significant detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity, including in relation to Nos. 224 and 228, and is therefore compliant with Policy.

Matters raised by the Natural Environment and Transport Officers have been satisfactorily addressed through the submission of additional information and amendments to the scheme.

Subject to conditions, the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

The proposal is therefore compliant with the relevant policies and is recommended for approval.

8. RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Conditions:

Time Limit

Materials

Approved Plans

No New Openings

L7A Arboricultural Method Statement (as specified)

Use of Roof Restricted