

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Southcote Ward

App Ref: PL/26/0454 Householder planning permission

Address: 20 VINE CRESCENT, READING, RG30 3LU

Proposal: Proposed single storey front extension.

Applicant: Mr Sam Illingworth

Received date: 02/04/2026

Target Decision date: 28/05/2026

Case Officer: Ethne Humphreys / Mishga Marshall

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site relates to a two storey semi-detached property located on the south side of Vine Crescent. The property has been extended in the past, with additions including rear dormer window, single storey side and rear extensions. Some additions appear to have been undertaken through permitted development rights as well as planning permission. The location plan does not illustrate all additions. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and consists of similarly designed properties many of which have been extended.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

This application seeks planning permission for a single storey front extension. The materials would match that of the host property.

Plans and documents considered:

Drawing No: Site Location Plan 1522 099

Drawing No: Block Plan 1522 098

Drawing No: Proposed Floor Plans 1522 102

Drawing No: Proposed Elevations 1522 103

The extension would encroach on No.22 Vine Crescent; Certificate B has been completed and notice served on the neighbour in this respect.

3. CONSULTATIONS

The following were consulted:

Transport. No comments received, discussed below.

A site notice was displayed at the site; no neighbour letters of representation received.

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

20/0628/HOU Single storey side and rear extensions. New roof structure and bifold doors to existing single storey extensions (amended description).

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)

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 proposed extension would extend the width of the property. The Design Guide to House Extensions SPD states that *“planning permission will not normally be granted for front extensions that are excessive in size, height or depth relative to the host dwelling and neighbouring buildings. Where there is a prevailing building line, development should not project beyond it. Furthermore, proposals that extend across the full width of the frontage, fail to demonstrate a balance of proportions, or compromise symmetry—particularly in the case of semi-detached or terraced properties—will result in refusal.”*

With regard to the above, albeit the extension would extend the width of the property, it would not extend the width of the frontage. It would remain subservient to the host property due to its single storey nature and the materials would match to assist in integrated with the dwelling. It would not appear cramped due to the distance to the west boundary. It may appear slightly contrived due to the encroachment (discussed below) but this is not considered harmful in itself. There are a variety of front additions in the surrounding area, some of similar form, and it is not considered to be significantly harmful or overly dominant to the character of the host property or wider street scene to warrant a refusal.

The plans indicate an area of planting in front of the extension, and this would further assist in softening the impact of the proposed extension. Details of which will be secured by way of condition.

The house has had several extensions, and it is considered that any further additions would result in harm to the character of the property as well as a cramped overdevelopment of the site. A condition is proposed to be attached to remove permitted development rights relating to additions (Class A and D) in order to protect the amenity of the area.

The proposal is considered to be broadly in compliance with Policies CC7 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 22 and 18 Vine Crescent located to the east and west of the site respectively.

With regard to No.18, the extension would not extend closer to the common boundary than the existing dwelling. Given the distance to the common boundary and single storey nature, no amenity concerns are considered to arise.

With regard to No.22 the adjoining semi-detached property, the extension would be built over the boundary line. Certificate B has been signed on the application form and notice served on the occupiers of this property. The Party Wall Agreement would be required; however, this is not a planning matter in itself. The granting of planning permission does not override private land ownership matters or allow works to take place without the neighbours consent. The extension, whilst clearly visible to the occupiers of No.22 would have a relatively limited depth of 2.5m. The roof would be pitched to assist in minimising the impact. Whilst there may be some harm to the front window of No.22 (the 45 degree line has not been illustrated), given it is a full width window this would be limited. No windows are proposed on the flank elevation, and it is not considered to be so overbearing to warrant a refusal.

The proposal is considered to be broadly in compliance with Policies CC8 and H9.

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
Soft Landscaping
No Openings
PD Rights