

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Battle Ward

App Ref: PL/25/0728 Householder planning permission

Address: 94 TILEHURST ROAD, READING, RG30 2LU

Proposal: Proposed hip-to-gable loft extension including 2x rear dormers.

Applicant: Mr Edward Day

Received date: 16/05/2025

Target Decision date: Originally 11/07/2025 EOT agreed until 10/07/2026

Case Officer: Ethne Humphreys / James Schofield

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two storey detached property with pitched roof, located on the northern side of Tilehurst Road. It is not a listed building, nor does it fall within a conservation area, however, is in an Air Quality Management Area. The property boasts a large rear garden, and currently has no on-site car parking. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings. There is a change in site levels, and the land slopes down to the rear of the site.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

This application seeks planning permission for a hip-to-gable extension and two rear dormer windows. The proposals also include solar panels on the front roof slopes, and the removal of 3 chimneys.

The materials would match those of the host property.

Plans and Documents Considered

Emergence Survey

Received 29th June 2026

Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment

Received 2nd October 2025

Location Plan

Location and Block Plan Existing 020_A

GA Plans Existing (Basement and Ground) 021_A

GA Plans Existing (First Floor and Roof Plan) 022_A

Existing Elevations (front and Rear) 023_A

Existing Elevations (Side) 024_A

Existing Elevations (Side) 025_A

Existing Section A-A 026_A

Existing 3D Views 027_A

Existing 3D Views 028_A

Location and Block Plan Proposed 060_A

Proposed GA Plans (Basement and Ground) 061_A

Proposed GA Plans (First Floor and Loft Plan) 026_A

Proposed Elevations (Front and Rear) 063_A

Proposed Elevations (Side) 064_A

Proposed Elevations (Side) 065_A

Proposed Elevations (Side) 066_A

Proposed 3D Views 067_A

Proposed 3D Views 068_A

Proposed Interior Views 069_A
Received 16th May 2025

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

24/1470 Proposed raised parking area to provide 2x off road parking spaces and new front boundary wall. Refused and Dismissed at Appeal.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Ecology: Further to submission of preliminary bat roost assessment and emergence survey reports, no objection.

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.

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)
TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging)

SPD

Design Guide to House Extensions SPG 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

Design Considerations

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.

Due to the nature of the proposals, there would be no increase in the actual footprint of the dwelling. Hip to gable roof extension are uncommon in the area and the roof extension, which would incorporate a significant change to the overall roof height, would be somewhat top heavy, changing the appearance of the dwelling in the street scene. Indeed, whilst it has a currently modest roof form and height, it would have the appearance of a 4 storey building, particularly from the rear. The changes to the front would also be pronounced given the more modest height of No. 96 Tilehurst Road to the west. However, it is recognised that there are a variety of room forms along this part of Tilehurst Road and the neighbouring property No.92 also comprises a large roof extension at the rear, and there are larger properties (in both height and roof form terms) to the east.

The two rear dormer windows would sit comfortably within the roof slope, well below the main roof ridge and in from the sides and would largely align with the windows below. Whilst the roof extension itself would be large, the dormer windows would not dominate the roof slope.

The materials would match those of the host property which would assist its integration and on balance, whilst the loss of the modest proportions of the existing property, along with the attractive chimneys is regrettable, it is not considered to be so significantly harmful to either the character of the host property or street scene to warrant a refusal on this basis.

No design concerns in respect of the solar panels on the roof slopes.

Impact on 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 92 and 96 Tilehurst Road, located to the east and west of the site respectively.

With regard to No.92, whilst there would be a visible change to the roof form, the house itself would be no closer to the common boundary than existing, and it is not considered to result in any significantly harmful overbearing impact. A roof window is proposed on the flank elevation facing No.92. This is shown on the

plans to be obscurely glazed. Given this would serve a stair well, this would be reasonable and would be secured via condition. As such, there would be no material loss of privacy.

With regard to No.96, as above, whilst there would be a visible change to the roof form, the house itself would be no closer to the common boundary than existing. No. 96 is a smaller scale two storey property and as such the changes would likely be more visible. However, given the distance from No.94 to No.96 itself, it is not considered that there would be any significant material overbearing effect or impingement on this property. Two roof windows are proposed on the flank elevation facing No.96, These are shown on the plans to be obscurely glazed. One would serve a shower room, and one would be a secondary window to a bedroom. As such, obscurely glazing these windows would be reasonable and would be secured via condition. AS such, there would be no material loss of privacy.

No other nearby occupiers are considered to be impacted by the proposals. The proposed dormer windows would face down the application site. Given the significant distance of over 20m to the rear gardens of properties of Gloucester Road to the north, and given the intervening tree screening, there would be no harmful overbearing effects or harmful loss of privacy.

Given their nature and position, the solar panels are not considered to result in any loss of amenity to any neighbouring property.

Impact on Ecology

The building was considered to have features potentially suitable for roosting bats (gaps under tiles, eaves, soffits etc) and due to the nature of the works to the roof and removal if chimneys, it was considered that the proposals could affect roosting bats. As such, a bat survey was requested during the course of the application. Given the seasons for such reports, the application was held in abeyance so the report could be undertaken. A preliminary bat roost assessment report was submitted October 2025 which stated that further emergence survey reports should be undertaken. This was submitted June 2026 and concluded that there would be no adverse impacts on bats from the proposals. This was reviewed by the Council's Ecologist who confirmed agreement with the report's conclusions and confirmed no objection on ecology grounds.

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.