

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Norcot

App Ref: 230547/HOU

Address: 53 Cockney Hill, Reading, RG30 4HF

Proposals: Demolition of existing rear single storey extension and construction of new rear single storey extension

Case Officer: Marcie Rejwerska

Applicant: Caroline Marsh

Date received (valid from): 24 April 2023 **Target Decision date:** 19 June 2023

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site comprises a detached two storey dwelling on the north side of Cockney Hill. The property is set back from the road by way of a front garden. There is a paved driveway to the side of the property leading to a single garage positioned to the rear of the dwelling. At the rear, the property has a single storey extension although there is no formal planning history for this. The rear garden has a number of mature trees at the rear of the plot. Cockney Hill is a residential road characterised by mostly detached properties in varying character. The property is not listed nor in a conservation area.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Planning permission is sought for the removal of the existing single storey rear extension and replacement with a larger single storey rear extension. The proposal would measure 4.84m in depth across 9.37m width. The extension is a 1.83m increase from the existing in depth. The extension will have a combination hipped/flat roof, measuring 2.34m to the eaves and 3.36m in total height. Bifold doors and a new window are proposed at the rear elevation and a new external door and utility room window are proposed at the east side elevation.

Plans considered:

Site location plan, dated 24 April 2023, received 24 April 2023

L.408/SP Block plan, dated April 2023, received 12 June 2023

L.408/01 Ground floor plan as existing, dated April 2023, received 24 April 2023

L.408/03 Ground floor plan as proposed, dated April 2023, received 24 April 2023

L.408/02 First floor plan as existing, dated April 2023, received 24 April 2023

L.408/04 First floor plan as proposed, dated April 2023, received 24 April 2023

L.408/05 Elevations as existing, dated April 2023, received 24 April 2023

L.408/06 Elevations as proposed, dated April 2023, received 24 April 2023

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

51 Cockney Hill, Tilehurst, Reading, Berkshire, RG30 4HF

55 Cockney Hill, Tilehurst, Reading, RG30 4HF

No 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

National Planning Practice Guidance

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodlands)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

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 exceeds the recommended depth as per the Design Guide to House Extensions SPD, however it is not considered harmful in this case. The scale of the proposed replacement extension is considered acceptable. The extension appears subservient to the host dwelling and therefore poses no risk of harm to its character. The proposed extension will also not be visible from the street and therefore has no impact on the wider character of the area. A condition is recommended to restrict the use of the roof.

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.

- Privacy and overlooking;
 - No identified risk for new rear elevation windows. Proposed new side elevation window not considered harmful as not serving a habitable room.
- Overbearing effects;
 - No identified risk as the proposal is considered acceptable in scale. Cockney Hill is set on a slope so that the neighbouring no. 51 Cockney Hill is set at a higher ground level in relation to the application site. Any concern of the proposal appearing overbearing is therefore mitigated by this. There is also sufficient distance in excess of 1.5m on either side of the property boundary.
- Sunlight and daylight;
 - No identified risk as the proposal is set sufficiently off the property boundary with the neighbouring properties.

Trees

There are a number of mature trees to the rear of the plot. The proposed area to be built on is an existing hard surface patio therefore there are minimal risks identified to the root protection areas of those trees. The agent has supplied a Construction Exclusion Zone tree protection plan at the request of the LPA and this is considered sufficient to protect the existing trees.

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

GRANT PERMISSION

Recommended Conditions:

TL1

AP1

M1

PD5

L7A