

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Church

App Ref: 221262/HOU

Address: 15 Maple Gardens, Reading, RG2 7NB

Proposals: Demolition of existing conservatory to the rear of the property and proposed erection of a single storey rear extension.

Case Officer: Ryan Allen

Applicant: Mr Wei

Date received (valid from): 24 August 2022 **Target Decision date:** 19 October 2022

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

Site visit date: 07/09/2022

Site visit photos:



2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal site is a single-storey terrace dwelling, situated on Maple Gardens in the Southeast of the Reading borough. Maple Gardens is a cul-de-sac comprising of solely residential properties, all of similar character and design. The property is not listed nor is it in a conservation area.

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing conservatory to the rear of the property and the erection of a single-storey rear extension. The proposed extension would measure approximately 4.3m in width, 5m in depth and stand at approximately 3m in height, with a sloped flat roof design. The proposal shows the existing kitchen to be moved into the extension, alongside an additional bedroom and 2x en-suites to be included in the internal work to the dwelling.

Plans considered:

Site Plan - Drawing No. - PL002 rev. B

Existing and Proposed Floor Plans - PL100 rev. B

Existing and Proposed Front and Rear Elevations - PL200 rev. B

Existing and Proposed Left and Right Elevations - PL201 rev. B

Received on 19/09/22

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

4 Hazel Crescent, Reading, Berkshire, RG2 7ND
6 Hazel Crescent, Reading, RG2 7ND
16 Maple Gardens, Reading, RG2 7NB
14 Maple Gardens, Reading, RG2 7NB

Letters of representation have been received as follows:

None.

a) Summary of discussions with applicant/agent:

An e-mail was sent to the agent on **14/09/22** detailing officer concerns with aspects of the proposal. Officer concerns were with the proximity of the proposal to the side boundary. This was seen to conflict with policies CC8 & H9 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019). It was advised that amended plans were submitted in order for the proposal to be deemed compliant with said policies and lessen the potential harm on neighbouring residences. Revised plans were then received and accepted on **19/09/22**.

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
National Planning Practice Guidance

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)
CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)
H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)
EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network)
EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodlands)

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.

Whilst the surrounding street-scene comprises of dwellings of similar character and design, the proposed extension is not front facing and therefore not visible from the street. This reduces the visual harm in terms of the lack of adherence to a uniform design with the existing and neighbouring properties. In relation to this, the aforementioned uniform pattern isn't as present at the rear of the neighbouring properties as much as it is to the front, as single-storey rear extensions of similar designs are present. The existing dwelling also currently benefits from a 5m deep conservatory which is to be demolished and replaced with the proposed. It is considered that the existing inclusion of a sizeable conservatory that is situated close the neighbouring boundary has more potential for harm in terms of scale than the proposed extension. The proposed extension fills in the gap to the neighbouring boundary that currently exists with the conservatory, however this is considered negligible and is not seen to pose harm; particularly as the extension proposes a decrease in depth in the extension that is closer to the boundary from 5m to approximately 3.3m. Furthermore, the materials are to match the existing dwelling, enhancing the compliance to policies H9 & CC7.

Residential Amenity

Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not result in an overbearing impact on neighbours. Policy H10 seeks to ensure that the amenity of gardens and other outdoor areas are not compromised. 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 revised plans submitted addressed officer concerns regarding the potential impact on neighbours due to the depth of the initial proposal and the proximity to neighbouring boundary. The initial proposal included the infill to the neighbouring boundary with a depth of 5m, the depth matching the existing conservatory. This proposal was considered to be unneighbourly and in conflict with policy H9 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019). Revised plans submitted and accepted addressed this issue by reducing the depth of the proposed extension to approximately 3.3m and stepping the proposal in by approximately 1.9m from the neighbouring boundary. This reduces the potential for any overbearing effects on the neighbouring dwelling and reduces the scale of the proposal in contrast to the existing conservatory.

Trees

It is not considered that any trees of value are in the vicinity of the proposed. There is a tree present in the neighbouring dwellings rear garden. However, it is not considered that this tree will be effected in the construction of the proposed. All considered, the proposal is considered compliant with policy EN14 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019).

Ecology

The proposal is not considered to have detrimental effects on the biodiversity of the area. The proposed work would take place on ground where patio paving is present, therefore no loss of greenspace is anticipated, thus deemed compliant with policy EN12 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019).

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

Recommended Conditions:

Time Limit (Standard)

Approved Plans

Materials (To Match)