

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Emmer Green Ward

App Ref: PL/25/1839 Householder planning permission

Address: 25 COURTENAY DRIVE, EMMER GREEN, READING, RG4 8XH

Proposal: Single storey rear extension and associated works and renovation to the existing garage roof (Amended Description)

Applicant: Mr M Tarrant

Received date: 22/12/2025

Target Decision date: 16/02/2026

Case Officer: Ethne Humphreys / Mishga Marshall

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site relates to a two storey detached property located on the south side of Courtenay Drive. The surrounding area is predominantly residential. The building is not listed and nor is the site within a conservation area. The site is adjacent to a Green Link connected with Clayfield Copse to the north.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension and renovation to the existing garage roof. The extension would link the garage to the house.

The materials would match those of the host property, and a green roof is proposed.

Plans and documents considered:

Proposed Plans (Block and Roof) 211 Rev B

Proposed Elevations (Front and Rear) 221 Rev B

Proposed Ground Floor Plans 212 Rev B

Proposed Elevations (Side) 222 Rev B

Design and Access Statement

Received 7th April 2026

Arboricultural Report prepared by David Randall Tree Consultancy dated March 2026

Tree Protection Plan dated March 2026

Green Roof Specification System Summary - BAUDER

Green Roof General Maintenance Watering Guide - BAUDER

Received 16th March 2026

Location Plan

Existing Elevations EO1

Existing Floor Plans F01

Existing Section S01

Preliminary Roost Assessment Ref. R3080_PRA-A

Received 22nd December 2026

3. CONSULTATIONS

The following were consulted:

- Transport Development Control – no objection, discussed below.
- Ecology Consultations – on objection, discussed below.

Two site notices were displayed (one following submission of amended plans). No neighbour letters of representation have been received.

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)

EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodlands)

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.

The proposed extension would be relatively large. However, the garden is deep and can accommodate the extension without resulting in a cramped appearance. It would remain single storey in nature with materials to match the host property to assist with its integration, and particularly with the existing garage. The bulk of the proposals is contained to the rear of the property and whilst the change from hipped roof of the existing garage to flat roof would be visible from the front elevation, the garage is set well back into the site and its appearance not considered to be harmful.

There are a variety of rear additions within the vicinity and whilst large, the proposals are not considered to be harmfully out of character. Furthermore, a biodiverse green roof is proposed which is welcomed and will help to increase biodiversity as well as assist in softening the impact of the proposals.

In compliance with Policies CC7 and H9.

Neighbour Amenities

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 23 and 27 Courtenay Drive, located to the east and west of the site respectively.

With regard to No.27, whilst the extension would be sited close to the common boundary, there would be a significant distance to the house of No.27 itself, in part due to the intervening substation. No.27 also has a detached outbuilding located close to the common boundary which would assist in minimising the impact. Given the distance, combined with flat roof nature, no overbearing effects or loss of privacy are considered to arise.

With regard to No.23, the plans as originally proposed appeared to show encroachment (overhang) of this property. Amended plans, proposing flat roof, remove this overhang and the applicant has confirmed no encroachment (and Certificate A has been signed to this effect). No.23 is set further back in its plot than No.25. Whilst the proposal would link the main house of No.25 to the garage, the garage element would be no closer to the common boundary than existing. Whilst the existing roof garage is hipped which minimises the impact, the flat roof, whilst visible to the occupiers of No.23 due to increase in height, is not considered to result in any harmful overbearing effects significantly over and above the existing situation and there would be no loss of privacy.

Owing to the flat roof nature and expanse of the rear extension proposed, it is considered necessary to include a condition stipulating that the flat roof area shall not be used as a roof terrace, and any access out onto this area shall be for maintenance/means of escape purposes only. This is in order to prevent any detrimental impacts of overlooking and/or noise and disturbance of the neighbouring properties.

Given the single storey nature and distance to other neighbouring properties, no harm would arise.

In compliance with Policies CC8 and H9.

Natural Environment – Trees, Landscaping and 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 enhance features of biodiversity interest.

Given the trees and vegetation on site, an arboricultural report and tree protection plan has been submitted. The removal of the neighbouring palm tree (No.27) which was close to the proposed extension, after the tree surveyor's survey, is acknowledged.

It is considered that the trees to be removed are relatively small ornamental specimens and their removal would not harm the visual amenity of the area. However, the existing garden benefits from significant other tree and shrub planning and this remaining planting should be protected during the course of the development to preserve the vegetated character of the wider area. A condition securing tree protective fencing to be installed in accordance with the submitted TPP and Arb. Report is recommended to be included in the decision notice.

A bat survey has been submitted with the application and whilst it concludes that the main dwelling has moderate potential to host roosting bats, the garage was assessed as being of negligible potential to host roosting bats. The Council's Ecologist agrees with the conclusion that these specific proposals would be unlikely to have any adverse impact on roosting bats and has confirmed that no further surveys are required. Any future works to the main house may require an emergence survey, but that is not currently what is being proposed.

As noted elsewhere in this report, the provision of green roof is a positive feature and is welcome. Whilst watering details have been provide, along with sedum system details, no actual planting detail has been provide. A condition is recommended to require this details.

In compliance with Policies EN12 and EN14.

Transport/Parking

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

The proposal would retain the existing driveway for parking which provides two car parking spaces in accordance with the Parking Standards and Design SPD. No highway or parking related concerns.

In compliance with Policies TR3 and TR5.

7. CONCLUSION

Overall, 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
No Use of Flat Roof
Tree Protection
Green Roof