

## **DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT**

**Ward:** Emmer Green

**App Ref:** 221050/HOU

**Address:** 24 Russet Glade, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8UJ

**Proposals:** Double storey rear extension and amendments to ensuite bathroom window

**Case Officer:** Marcie Rejwerska

**Applicant:** Mr Mark Jennings

**Date received (valid from):** 18 July 2022      **Target Decision date:** 13 January 2023 (ext.)

### **1. SITE DESCRIPTION**

The application site is a two storey detached dwelling on Russet Glade in Emmer Green. The property is set back from the road via a paved shared driveway. The property has an existing front porch, a double garage at the side property, and a conservatory at the rear. At the end of the rear garden there is a dense wooded area. Russet Glade is a residential road comprised of detached dwellings in similar character. The property is not listed nor in a conservation area.

### **2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

Planning permission is sought for a two storey rear extension, to measure 4m in depth across the width of the main dwelling. The proposed extension will have two pitched gable roofs, set 250mm down from the ridge of the main dwelling roof. New windows are proposed on ground and first floor rear elevation, and one set of new windows on the ground floor side elevation. Within the main dwelling, a new obscure glazed window is proposed on the first floor south-side elevation, the existing north-side first floor is proposed to be made smaller, and a new external door is proposed on the ground floor of the north-side elevation.

Plans considered

00207-001, Location and block plan, dated 15 July 2022, received 18 July 2022

00207-002, Existing plans and elevations, dated 28 June 2022, received 18 July 2022

00207-003, Rev. B, Proposed plans and elevations, dated 28 June 2022, received 7 November 2022

PB/VTA-22/10.12, Tree survey prepared by Urban Tree Experts, dated 8 November 2022, received 15 November 2022

SPH/NP/PEA-22/06.10, Preliminary ecological appraisal (bats) prepared by Urban Tree Experts, dated 19 October 2022, received 20 October 2022

24 Russet Glade: Foundation Design Proposal AMENDED, received 20 December 2022

### **3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

970861 - Erection of two storey and single storey rear extensions (single storey extension at rear of existing garage to be used as a consulting room for a Psychoanalytic Psychotherapist practice), single storey side extension and front porch. - Application refused on 18/9/1997

992393 - Two storey rear extension and front porch. - Application withdrawn on 16/11/1999

020250 - Single storey front, side and rear extensions. - Application permitted on 30/9/2002

## 4. CONSULTATIONS

### Internal consultations:

Ecology - The bat survey (Urban Tree Experts, October 2022, Ref: SPH/NP/PEA-22/06.10) has been undertaken to an appropriate standard and concludes that the risk of bats being affected by the proposals is minimal. There are therefore no objections to this application on ecology grounds.

Trees - This road has a disproportionately high incidence of tree related subsidence claims (as far as TPO trees are concerned) due to the clay soil, and this includes an unresolved claim next door at No. 26 which implicated one Cherry and one Oak at No. 24 (the specific Oak was not confirmed, i.e. TPO or non-TPO). As a result, we must have submissions to demonstrate that foundations are appropriate to the soil type and ultimate size of the Oak tree (with ref to NHBC guidance, 4.2) and that the extension will be appropriate tied in to the existing house to prevent future differential movement between the house and extension (normally the issue with subsidence cases) - this is likely to require both professional arboricultural and engineering input. Whilst it is appreciated that foundations are normally a matter left for Building Control, in this case, inappropriate foundations would have a direct impact on protected trees by risking their future retention, contrary to EN14 hence it is appropriate in this case to deal with the matter through the planning process and prior to a decision.

### External consultations:

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

26 Russet Glade, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8UJ  
18 Russet Glade, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8UJ  
22 Russet Glade, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8UJ  
20 Russet Glade, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8UJ

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)

### **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 rear extension is considered acceptable in terms of scale. Although not entirely subservient to the main dwelling, the pitched roofs at the back have been amended to be set down slightly to improve the appearance of the proposal being subservient. The size of the proposed extension is likely the largest that would be permissible on this application site. The siting of the property with sufficient distance between neighbouring properties, and the proposal being at the rear of the property mean that there is no harm identified to the character of the main dwelling nor the wider street. The proposed materials will match the main dwelling and the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design.

### **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
- Overbearing effects;
  - No identified risk
- Sunlight and daylight;
  - No identified risk.

## **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**

### **Application Permitted**

Recommended Conditions:

TL1

AP1

M1  
SOIL