

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Peppard

App Ref: 211948/HOU

Address: 6 Chalgrove Way, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8SJ

Proposals: Single storey side and rear extensions. Hip to Gable roof extension and loft conversion with dormer windows to rear.

Case Officer: James Schofield

Date received (valid from): 3 December 2021 Target Decision date: 18/2/22

1. INTRODUCTION

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the south-eastern side of Chalgrove Way. There are TPOs to the end of the garden and part of the garden is within a Green Link as identified under Policy EN12. Other properties have extended, including within the roof.

Existing plans and elevations



2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Demolish existing rear conservatory, rear lobby and wc, and remove rear chimney, and erect:

- Single storey mono-pitched and hipped extension of 1.39m wide for the full depth of the existing house
- Flat roofed rear extension 2.9m high, 8.1m wide and 5.5m deep with roof lights & lantern.
- Hip to gable roof extension, loft conversion and 2 flat roofed rear dormers.
- Matching materials.

Plans considered, received 3rd December 2021.

- Proposed Plans - Drawing no: AL 01560 04
- Proposed Elevations - Drawing no: AL 01560 05
- Site Plan [Proposed] - Drawing no: AL 01560 06

Proposed Elevations



Proposed Plans



3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 Neighbours

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

7 Chalgrove Way, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8SJ
 1 St Benets Way, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8SZ
 5 Chalgrove Way, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8SJ

No letters of representation have been received.

4.2 Natural Environment Officer - no objection - TPO trees (156/01) on the rear boundary.

I note the proposal includes creation of an additional parking space within the front garden which will result in the loss of some soft landscaping, albeit there is nothing of particular merit. The conversion of front garden to hard landscaping, although only partly in this case, is a pity due to loss in amenity and green area, especially when there is plenty of on-street parking. On the

assumption that the parking space is accepted, it would seem prudent to request an amended Proposed Site Plan that makes it clear the remainder of the soft landscaping is to be retained (this is not currently labelled).

Planning Officer note: Changes to the front would be permitted development, therefore a requirement to retain soft landscaping is not considered reasonable in this context.

4.3 Ecology - A bat survey would be required.

Planning Officer Note: The hip to gable element of the proposal is likely to be permitted development, therefore an informative will be included regarding bats.

5. 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. 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 Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

National Planning Practice Guidance

Reading Borough Local Plan (adopted 2019)

CC7 Design and the Public Realm

CC8 Safeguarding Amenity

EN12 Biodiversity and the Green Network

H9 House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

H10 Private and Communal Outdoor Space

SPD

Design Guide to House Extensions SPD (adopted 2021)

7. APPRAISAL

H9 states: An extension to a house will be acceptable where it:

A. Respects the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design;

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- detract from the appearance of the original building through the use of ill-matching materials and by not fitting in with the design, scale and proportions of the original building; ***NO, the overall scale of the proposal is considered to be subservient to the original dwelling. Although the rear extension is 5.5m deep and greater than the Design Guide advises it would only project by a small amount beyond the neighbouring property's existing single storey extension and it is not considered harmful. It would be matching materials.***

- reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree; ***NO, a good sized garden would remain.***
 - Require the loss of trees in the garden or put significant trees at risk; **NO**
- B. 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; Respects neighbour's amenities and does not present a large blank façade to public areas.

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- significantly reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight enjoyed by neighbouring properties; ***NO. The rear extension is sufficiently away from no. 5 and only just extends beyond the existing single storey extension at no.7, and therefore, there would be no detrimental effect, with respect to daylight and sunlight.***
- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; ***NO, there is a proposed second floor side facing window to serve the proposed staircase for the loft room, which would be a similar arrangement to the first floor side facing window. It is not considered that the proposed window would cause a significantly differing effect on loss of privacy compared to the existing first floor window.***
- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; ***NO, the change to the roofscape from the hip-to bale would change the appearance from the street, but there are other egs of roof extensions, and it is also likely that this change would be permitted development.***
- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **NO**

CC8: Safeguarding Amenity 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.

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties in terms of: **NO**

- Privacy and overlooking;
- Access to sunlight and daylight;
- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development;
- Noise and disturbance;
- Artificial lighting;
- Vibration;
- Dust and fumes;
- Smell;
- Crime and safety.

8. RECOMMENDATION

Grant

9. CONDITIONS

1. Standard time limit (TL1)
2. Standard approved plans (AP1)
3. Materials to match (M1)