

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Tilehurst

App Ref: 211176/HOU

Address: 51 Westwood Glen, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 5NW

Proposals: Single storey side extension

Case Officer: Tom Hughes

Applicant: Mr Danny White

Date received (valid from): 15 July 2021

Target Decision date: 9 September 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling, located at the junction with Lower Elmstone Drive. The sideward site boundary curves from front to rear, abutting a wide grass verge. The dwelling is clearly visible from public areas, to the front, side and rear. The surrounding area is residential in character, of a mix of styles and design. The site topography slopes gradually in a northerly direction.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for a single storey side extension, extending at a width of 8.2m and projecting the full depth of the original dwelling. The extension would have a pitched roof form, with a ridge height above the eaves of the existing dwelling. Garage doors and a window would be located to the front elevation, with single doors and a window to the side and rear. External materials would match those of the existing dwelling.

The agent supplied the following, received 19/07/21:

Drawing No: 01 - Site Location, Block Plan, Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

The agent was advised on 19/08/21 of significant concerns held with the proposal, and that the application was subject for refusal.

Following discussions the agent supplied the following, received 08/09/21:

Drawing No: 01 - Site Location, Block Plan, Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

131319/CLP - Use of no. 51 & no. 53 Westwood Glen as one property - Permitted 08/11/13

191415/HOU - Single storey side extension - Permitted 31/10/19 *Officer note: the originally proposed extension was approximately 3m wider (at its widest point) than the approved extension*

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter:
53 Westwood Glen, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 5NW

4.2 Letters of representation have been received as follows:
None.

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)

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPD (2021)

6. APPRAISAL

The case officer was able to make a full assessment of the proposal using Google Maps data.

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 amendment sufficiently addresses the concerns raised. The proposal is of the same width as the extension approved 191415/HOU, but with a squared rather than tapered flank elevation. Though still a sizeable addition, the proposal achieves an appropriate degree of subservience to the original dwelling and would not significantly detract from its appearance**
- reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree; **No, though the proposal would occupy a large portion of the plot, a sufficient amount of outdoor amenity space would be retained to the rear**
- 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 proposal is a sufficient distance from neighbouring properties, and no light loss would be expected to occur**

- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **No, the proposal is a sufficient distance from neighbouring properties, and no overlooking would be expected to occur**
- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **No, the amendment sufficiently addresses the concerns raised. Though the proposal would be clearly visible from public areas, it achieves a sufficient degree of subservience to the original dwelling. The reduction in height and width serve to reduce the overall bulk of the extension. This, in combination with the variety of property styles in the vicinity of the site, ensure that no significant harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area**
- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **No, materials would match those of the existing dwelling, which is deemed acceptable**

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 proposal is a sufficient distance from neighbouring properties, and no visual dominance or overbearing effects would be expected to occur**
- Noise and disturbance; **No**
- Artificial lighting; **No**
- Vibration; **No**
- Dust and fumes; **No**
- Smell; **No**
- Crime and safety. **No**

7. CONCLUSION

The amendments sufficiently address the concerns raised with the original proposal, and are broadly similar to that approved under 191415/HOU. The proposal has been assessed and found to comply with the identified policy and guidance.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

Application Permitted