

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Coley Ward

App Ref: PL/26/0319 Householder planning permission

Address: 11 ARGYLE ROAD, READING, RG1 7YL

Proposal: Single storey rear and side extension

Applicant: Mr Adil Iqbal

Received date: 10/03/2026

Target Decision date: 27/05/2026; EOT until 19/06/2026

Case Officer: Ethne Humphreys / Mishga Marshall

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the south side of Argyle Road. The property is set back from the road by way of a front garden and paved driveway. The property has a detached garage outbuilding to the rear/side of the dwelling. Argyle Road is a residential road comprised of detached and semi-detached dwellings of similar character. The property is not listed nor in a conservation area.

A number of mature trees of amenity value are located both within the site and on adjacent land, including several 'B' category trees situated within neighbouring gardens. Notably, a 'B' category Yew tree is located on the boundary with No.9 Argyle Road. The site is within an Air Quality Management Area where the retention and enhancement of trees and soft landscaping are of particular importance.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear and side extension following partial demolition of the existing garage outbuilding.

The extension as originally proposed was with a depth of 5.5m along the boundary with No.9 Argyle Road. Following submission of revised plans this is now a depth of 4m. The side element would project approximately 2.1m from the side elevation to the boundary, with a depth of approximately 8m.

The roof would be flat with a height of approximately 3m.

Materials would comprise white render, upvc windows and doors and grey flat roof.

Plans considered:

Location and Block Plan Drawing No.08925-07 Rev C

Received 18th June 2026

Proposed Ground Floor Plan 08925-03 Rev E

Proposed Elevations 08925-04 Rev D

Received 4th June 2026

Tree Protection Plan Rev A

Arboricultural Impact Assessment Rev D

Received 11th June 2026

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

25/0826 Single storey rear and side extension following the demolition of existing garage and store + proposed detached out building. Refused.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Natural Environment Officer: Following submission of AIA and TPP, no objection subject to tree protection and landscaping to be secured by way of condition. Discussed below.

Transport Officer: Following confirmation of Highways licence for dropped kerb, no objection subject to submission of plans to illustrate parking and access. Discussed below.

A site notice was displayed 14th April 2026. 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.

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)

EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodland)

EN15 (Air Quality)

TR3 (Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters)

TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging)

SPD

Design Guide to House Extensions SPG 2021

Revised Parking Standards and Design Supplementary Planning Document 2011

Tree Strategy 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 surrounding area contains a mix of single storey rear and side additions, many of which incorporate flat roof forms. As such, whilst flat roofs generally fail to enhance the appearance of a dwelling, it would not be out of keeping with the wider area. The side element would be visible from the street scene; however, given the set back from the front elevation it is not considered to be harmful. Whilst relatively large, the extension would be set away from both side boundaries and given its single storey nature would be a subservient addition.

The proposed floor plans and elevations are annotated to state that the garage outbuilding would be partially demolished. However, it is not shown at all on the proposed block plan, and it is not clear how much of it would be demolished. Notwithstanding, the proposed floor plans and elevations suggest the extension would adjoin the garage outbuilding. This is considered to result in an overly deep overall addition that would be disproportionate to the host property and result in a cramped appearance. It is considered appropriate to condition that no part of the extension approved shall be first occupied until the existing detached garage outbuilding has been removed in its entirety.

As discussed below, the access has been widened and the frontage of the site paved for car parking. This results in a stark appearance. A landscaping condition will be attached to secure soft landscaping.

Neighbouring 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 neighbouring properties potentially most affected by the proposals are No’s 9 Argyle Road and 13 Argyle Road located to the east and west of the site respectively.

With regard to No.9, the adjoining semi, the originally proposed depth of 5.5m close to the common boundary was considered to result in an unneighbourly overbearing effect, exacerbated by the change in site levels. The revised depth of 4m is more appropriate and complies with the guidance within the Council’s Design Guide to House Extensions SPD. The extension would be slightly off set from the

boundary, and the roof would be flat to minimise the impact. Whilst visible to occupiers of No.9 it is not considered to be so overbearing to warrant a refusal.

With regard to No.13, the side element of the extension would be relatively deep adjacent the common boundary. However, it would be set away from the boundary 0.7m and the roof would be flat to minimise the impact. Whilst visible, to occupiers of No.13 it is not considered to be so overbearing to warrant a refusal.

No windows are proposed on the flank elevations and as such there would be no loss of privacy.

As above, the proposed floor plans and elevations are annotated to state that the garage outbuilding would be partially demolished. However, it is not shown at all on the proposed block plan, and it is not clear how much of it would be demolished. Notwithstanding, the proposed floor plans and elevations suggest the extension would adjoin the garage outbuilding. This is not considered appropriate, resulting in a much deeper addition overall that in combination could be overbearing. It is considered appropriate to condition that no part of the extension approved shall be first occupied until the existing detached garage outbuilding has been removed in its entirety.

Owing to the scale and flat roof nature of the 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.

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. Policy EN15 states that development should have regard to the need to improve air quality and reduce the effects of poor air quality.

The application was originally submitted without sufficient Arboricultural information to demonstrate the acceptability of the development in terms of its impact on tree within and adjacent the site. During the course of the application a tree protection plan (TPP) was submitted which confirmed no tree removals, with tree pruning undertaken as per the TPP. The Council's Natural Environment Officer has confirmed that there are no root protection areas (RPAs) that would be impacted by the proposals. However, the ground works were undertaken prior to the trees being surveyed, protection being implement (and planning granted). The Natural Environment Officer considers that this will likely have impacted tree health.

Given the above, and as the site is within an Air Quality Management Areas, it would be appropriate for the proposals to provide new tree planting for the increased development. This is also noting that the front of the site has been paved and loss of grassed area to facilitate the widened access. This will be secured by way of condition. Subject to this, and securing tree protection measures by condition, there are no objections on Natural Environment grounds.

Parking/Highways

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

The proposals would result in the loss of garage parking. However, plans illustrate 2 off street car parking spaces at the front of the site. Furthermore, it was confirmed during the course of the application that the Highways Team have issued a licence to widen the crossing (to facilitate the parking).

The front of the site comprised boundary walls, steps and differing levels. The Transport Officer confirmed no objection subject to revised plans illustrating the parking spaces in the above context along with the access, to be secured by way of condition. It is noted, however, that the access has already been widened and the above-mentioned frontage features removed. Given this, it is not considered necessary to condition submission of further plans in this respect.

7. CONCLUSION

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
Small Scale Landscaping
Outbuilding Removed
No New Openings