

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Tilehurst

App Ref: 211543/HOU

Address: 120 Chapel Hill, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 5DH

Proposals: First floor extension and enlargement of bungalow

Case Officer: Tom Hughes

Applicant: Mr & Mrs C. O'Connor

Date received (valid from): 16 September 2021

Target Decision date: 11 November 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

The application site comprises a detached chalet bungalow, located to the northern side of Chapel Hill. The property is set within a sizeable plot, with large front and rear gardens. Chapel Hill rises in an easterly direction, with the site topography sloping away to the rear. The surrounding area is residential in character, comprised of detached properties of various styles and design.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for the first floor extension and enlargement of the bungalow. The proposal would broadly replicate the form of the existing property, increasing the ridge height by 2.6m. Existing brickwork would be rendered, with the upper floor to be timber clad. The roof would comprise grey slate tiles. Roof lights would be inserted to the existing single storey rear projection.

The agent supplied the following, received on 17/09/21:

Drawing No: 01 - Site Location

Drawing No: 02 - Proposed Site Plan

Drawing No: 03 - Existing Floor Plans and Elevations

Drawing No: 04 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Drawing No: 05 - Proposed First Floor Plan

Drawing No: 08 - Proposed Roof Plan

Drawing No: 06 - Proposed Front and Side Elevations

Drawing No: 07 - Proposed Side and Rear Elevations

Drawing No: 09 - Existing/Proposed Front Elevation

The original proposal was for a slightly larger first floor extension, including an element above the existing garage. The agent was advised of officer concerns with this part of the proposal, due to the adverse impact that would be caused to the residential amenities of 122 Chapel Hill in terms of visual dominance and overbearing effects. The agent was invited to supply amended plans, reducing this part of the proposal. The agent was also advised that tree protection measures would be necessary, due to trees of amenity value being located with 15m of the proposed extension.

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received on 09/11/21:

Drawing No: 02 Rev. A - Proposed Site Plan

Drawing No: 04 Rev. A - Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Drawing No: 05 Rev. A - Proposed First Floor Plan

Drawing No: 08 Rev. A - Proposed Roof Plan

Drawing No: 06 Rev. A - Proposed Front and Side Elevations

Drawing No: 07 Rev. A - Proposed Side and Rear Elevations

Drawing No: 09 Rev. A - Existing/Proposed Front Elevation

Drawing No: TP1 - Tree Protection

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

010684/FUL - Installation of dormer windows and provision of pitched roof to existing extension - Permitted 17/01/01
050379/FUL - Single storey front extension and alterations to fenestration - Permitted 23/12/05

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter:

118 Chapel Hill, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 5DH
122 Chapel Hill, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 5DH
79 Westwood Glen, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 5NW
81 Westwood Glen, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 5NW

4.2 Two letters of representation have been received, with regard to the following:

- Concerns with regard to the impact of the extension on natural light to the rear of 122 Chapel Hill
- Concerns with regard to loss of privacy by overlooking to 79 Westwood Glen, by virtue of the additional height of the property and size of the proposed windows

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)
Policy EN14 - Trees, Hedges and Woodland
H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

Design Guide to House Extensions SPD (2021)

6. 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; The proposals broadly reflect the design of the existing bungalow, with features such as the double bay window frontage to be retained. Given the extent of the first floor extension, the proposals cannot be considered a subservient addition, but the overall design is not considered to be harmful in terms of its overall appearance. Importantly, the existing bungalow is set within a sizeable plot and is considered capable of accommodating a building of the size proposed. The upward extension would be consistent with building heights in the locality, and the selected materials are considered to be of good quality that would not result in a poor quality appearance
- reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree; No, the property is set within a sizeable plot, with large areas of amenity space to the front and rear to be retained
- require the loss of trees in the garden or put significant trees at risk; No, subject to a condition requiring the implementation of tree protection measures, the trees within 15m of the proposed development would not be significantly harmed during the construction process

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 amendment addresses the concerns raised with regard to the first floor element above the existing garage. As a result of the amendments, the first floor elements would be located several metres from sideward boundaries. Accordingly, the proposals are not considered to cause any significant light loss to neighbouring properties
- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; No, while the proposal creates additional height, and larger windows to the rear elevation, no proximate direct overlooking would occur of neighbouring properties. A distance of approximately 30m would be maintained from proposed rearward windows to the site boundary with 81 Westwood Glen. This accords with Policy CC8, which requires a back-to-back distance of 20m between dwellings
- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; No, as above, the site is considered capable of accommodating a building of the size proposed. The properties in the vicinity are of various styles and design, many of which have been extended. While the proposals will significantly alter the appearance of the site, no significant harm is considered to be caused to the character of the area
- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; No, the materials selected are considered to be of high quality and would not detract from the character of the area

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:

- Privacy and overlooking; **No, see above**
- Access to sunlight and daylight; **No, see above**
- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development; **No, the upper floor would be located a sufficient distance from sideward boundaries, and is not considered to result in any significant visual dominance or overbearing effects**
- Noise and disturbance; **No**
- Artificial lighting; **No**
- Vibration; **No**
- Dust and fumes; **No**
- Smell; **No**
- Crime and safety. **No**

7. CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed and the proposed works are considered to be in accordance with the above relevant policies and planning permission can be granted.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

Application Permitted