

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Southcote Ward

App Ref: PL/26/0594 Full planning permission

Address: 7 GLENNON CLOSE, READING, RG30 3HT

Proposal: Change of use from Residential Dwelling (Class C3b) to Residential Care Home (Class C2)

Applicant: K Ahmed

Received date: 05/05/2026

Target Decision date: 17/08/2026 (agreed extension of time)

Case Officer: Marcelina Rejwerska

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling with an existing two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension, and a standalone garage. The property is located at the end of a close and shares a driveway with the neighbouring no.6 Glennon Close. The surrounding area is residential, characterised by a uniform appearance. The property is currently vacant.



Front of the site taken by case officer on 18 June 2026.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Full planning permission is sought for the proposed change of use from a supported living residential dwelling for 2 children with up to 3 staff (Class C3b) to a residential care home for 3 children with up to 6 staff, one overnight (Class C2). No external or internal alterations are proposed.

2.1. Information submitted:

Location Plan

Block Plan

Existing and Proposed Floor Plan and Elevations

Planning Statement
Sustainable Travel Policy
Missing Child Protocol and Police Liaison Strategy
Local and National Needs Assessment
Waste Management Plan
Care Management Plan
Noise and Anti-Social Behaviour Mitigation Plan
Received 5 May 2026

Operational Response
Received 6 August 2026

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- PL/26/0314 - Change of use to a Class C2 Childrens Home. Application withdrawn.
- PL/23/0797 - Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed use as a Residential Childrens Care Home for up to 2 children looked after by 3 staff (C3(b) Use Class). Certificate granted.
- PL/12/0283 - Two storey side extension to form granny annexe and single storey rear extension. Application permitted.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The following were consulted:

- **RBC Transport Development Control** - The applicant has stated that there may be up to 6 staff on site during the day, this in itself would require 6 parking spaces. Even with 4 staff on duty, 4 spaces would be required. Unless the applicant is able to demonstrate a parking layout that meets the standards Transport would not support this application.
- **RBC Waste Operations** – Care homes are not subject to household waste collections by RBC. As such, the developer will have to arrange a private refuse collection service.
- **RBC Brighter Futures for Children** – Proposal supported due to the demonstrated need in the Borough.
- **RBC Environmental Health** - The neighbour feedback is concerning, I am not clear how these issues would be controlled. It does not seem an appropriate location, on a fairly constrained quiet street in a semi detached house. How can or will they avoid the previous issues with anti social behaviour if the controls are the same as what was proposed previously? As a minimum they will need to submit further management measures to address neighbours' concerns. I would also want information on the standard of insulation of the party wall to ensure noise will not transfer to the next door property.
- **Thames Valley Police Designing Out Crime** – No information submitted regarding existing/proposed security measures; suggested measures set out.

A site notice was erected at the front of the site on 18 June 2026 in the public interest. A total of 7 letters of objection were received (including multiple comments from single addresses) citing the following concerns:

- Noise, disturbance and anti-social behaviour were issues relating to the previous use of the property which were not addressed.
- Parking congestion on Glennon Close.
- Residents feeling unsafe due to anti-social behaviour and noise levels.

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'. However, the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making (NPPF paragraph 12).

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2026)

DM3: Determining development proposals
S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
HO1: Assessing the need for homes
HO7: Meeting the need for homes
HO9: Specialist forms of accommodation
TR3: Locating development in sustainable locations
TR4: Street design, access and parking
TR6: Assessing transport impacts
P3: Living conditions and pollution

National Planning Practice Guidance (2014 onwards)

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC1: PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
CC6: ACCE

SSIBILITY AND THE INTENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT
CC5: WASTE MINIMISATION AND STORAGE
CC7: DESIGN AND THE PUBLIC REALM
CC8: SAFEGUARDING AMENITY
H6: ACCOMMODATION FOR VULNERABLE PEOPLE
H7: PROTECTING THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK
TR5: CAR AND CYCLE PARKING AND ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING

Supplementary Planning Documents

Revised Parking Standards and Design (2011)

Reading Childcare Sufficiency Assessment Early Education and Childcare 2026

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 was submitted to the Secretary of State on 9th 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 remain 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’.

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.

6. APPRAISAL

6.1 Land use matters

Policy HO7 of the NPPF states *“In applying the policies in this Framework, substantial weight should be given to the benefits of providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community, as identified through needs assessments prepared for the area of the local planning authority and other relevant evidence. This includes, but is not limited to, homes needed for different groups assessed under policy HO1.”* Policy HO7 states *“Development proposals to address specialist housing needs should provide living conditions and access to services which are appropriate to the needs of their residents and users.”*

Policy H6 states that *“where development would result in a loss of general housing, it must meet identified needs in the most up-to-date Housing Strategy and be able to accommodate at least an equivalent number of people; developments within residential areas will be designed to respect the residential character of their surroundings...”* Policy H7 is also relevant and states that *“planning permission will not be granted for any loss of residential accommodation or land unless there are exceptional circumstances.”* As the proposed use falls within the Class C group, there is no considered loss of residential accommodation.

The Reading Children in Care Sufficiency Strategy 2024-2026 states *“While [Brighter Futures for Children] is a member of the South-Central Framework consortium, home availability on the framework has largely been at lower levels than can meet need; but improvements have been seen here. However, this does not meet Brighter Futures for Children’s need to meet local sufficiency needs as the framework has placements nationwide; all local authorities in the consortium also state they are unable to find high numbers of homes on the framework for their children and young people with the most complex needs.”*

Currently, there is insufficient capacity within the Borough to meet the demand for places for children requiring to ‘care’ and as a result a significant number of children in care are being placed outside of the area. There is also a clear need to increase local capacity to enable repatriation of some of the young people currently placed out of borough back into Reading. Increasing local provision would help fill this gap, allowing more children to remain close to home.

It is also important to note that the existing use of the property falls under Class C3(b) as established by a Certificate of Lawfulness issued in 2023. However, there is a distinct difference between Classes C3(b) and C2, particularly regarding the level of care provided to occupants, which is greater under Class C2. As such, the proposed use would be a material change of use from the existing use.

Overall, it is considered that the principle of the change of use to Class C2 in itself is sufficiently justified as it will meet an identified need in the Borough for accommodation for vulnerable children, however, it is not considered acceptable overall, due to conflicts with other material considerations as discussed below in this report.

6.2 Design matters

Policy CC7 aims to preserve or enhance the character of the area in which a development is in terms of layout, landscape, density, scale, height, massing, architectural detail and materials.

The proposal does not include any external alterations, and as such it is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the character of the dwelling nor the wider street scene. However, the number of staff

attending the site would present an intensification above what would be expected of a dwelling in a residential area, which poses risks related to amenity and transport.

6.3 Residential amenity

Policy P3 of the NPPF states that development should *“Not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site.”*

Policy CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan requires that *“Development will not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties or unacceptable living conditions for new residential properties, in terms of:*

- *Privacy and overlooking;*
- *Access to sunlight and daylight;*
- *Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development;*
- *Harm to outlook ...”*

Additionally, policy EN16 states that *“development will only be permitted where it would not be damaging to the environment and sensitive receptors through land, noise or light pollution.”*

Several objections have been raised in relation to noise and disturbance associated with the previous use of the property. The previous Certificate of Lawfulness was granted for 2 children and 3 members of staff; therefore the proposal represents an intensification of this previous use. The submission documents state that future occupants may present with emotional and behavioural difficulties, and as such in the interest of protecting the amenity of the neighbouring residents, officers have sought additional information regarding management of noise and additional acoustic insulation to party walls to manage these concerns. While the applicant has offered to provide additional acoustic insulation (via condition), the submitted noise management statement provides generalised measures and lacks details regarding how complaints regarding noise would be managed, and whether the individual needs of the children to be housed would be adequately managed to prevent disturbance in what is a secluded residential street.

Although the number of children would be limited to 3 at any one time, the proposed staffing levels are proposed to be up to 6 members of staff during the daytime. This is a material intensification of the use of the property which would present its own challenges with the comings and goings of staff throughout the day and the associated noise and disturbance.

Overall, insufficient information has been provided at this stage to demonstrate that the risk of harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents would be adequately managed.

6.4 Transport and parking

Policy TR6 of the NPPF states *“Development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety; taking into account any mitigation measures proposed as well as any wider network improvements, including measures to support sustainable patterns of movement.”*

Policy TR5 requires that the development should provide car parking and cycle parking that is appropriate to the accessibility of locations within the Borough to sustainable transport facilities, particularly public transport.

It is noted that the Council's adopted parking standards do not include consideration of a Class C2 children's home. The nearest, as considered by RBC Transport, is a nursing home, the standards for which

are that 0.5 spaces are provided per Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staff, and 1 per 4 residents. Given that the proposal is for a children's facility, parking spaces for residents would not be appropriate, however visitor parking should be provided at the same ratio i.e. 1 per 4 residents. The property has an existing paved driveway which can accommodate 2 off-road parking spaces.

The applicant has stated that there may be up to 6 staff on site during the day, and this in itself would require 6 parking spaces. Even with 4 staff on duty, 4 spaces would be required. The applicant has stated that staff would be encouraged to use public transport, however, this is not considered sufficient to address the shortfall in parking provision and it is likely, therefore, that there would be pressures on-street parking, where this is already very limited. As such, the development would fail to accord with policy TR5.

7. CONCLUSION

While there is a demonstrable need for children's residential homes in the Borough, the proposal at present, based on the submitted information, is considered to pose a significant risk of harm to residential amenity of neighbouring residents and would fail to provide an acceptable level of parking for staff and visitors. These concerns outweigh the public benefit of the provision of one children's residential home. In accordance with Policy DM3 of the NPPF, the application is recommended for refusal as the concerns cannot be resolved through the use of conditions and would be contrary to Policies TR3, TR4, TR6 and P3 of the NPPF and local policies CC8 and TR5 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION

Due to the following reasons:

1. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the risk of harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring residents through noise associated with the intensification of use and the comings and goings of staff and residents has been sufficiently assessed and addressed through practical measures, contrary to Policy P3 of the NPPF 2026 and Policies CC8 and EN16 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

2. The development would fail to provide a policy compliant level of on-site parking based on the stated staffing levels of up to 6 members of staff during the daytime and any visitors, resulting in pressure to on-road parking in the surrounding area, contrary to Policies TR3, TR4 and TR6 of the NPPF 2026 and Policy TR5 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.