

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Whitley

App Ref: 211125/HOU

Address: 62 Whitley Wood Lane, Reading, RG2 8PP

Proposals: Rear conservatory

Case Officer: Tom Hughes

Applicant: Oakley Green Conservatories Limited

Date received (valid from): 6 July 2021

Target Decision date: 31 August 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling. The dwelling benefits from a rear conservatory. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, comprised of properties of various styles and design.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for the erection of a rear conservatory. The existing conservatory would be demolished to facilitate the proposal.

The plans originally supplied with the application related to an address in Amersham. Unfortunately this error was not picked up during the validation of the application. Officers noticed the error upon first assessment of the application on 16/08/21, alerting the agent on this date. Subsequently, the agent supplied the following on 16/08/21:

Site Location

Block Plan

Existing and Proposed Floor and Roof Plans, Elevations and Section

Officers were able to make a full assessment of the proposals using Google Maps images.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Following the receipt of plans relating to the site as described on the application form, neighbours were re-consulted for a period of 21 days. This consultation ran till 07/08/21.

4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter:

Unit 5, Woodside Business Park, Shore Road, Birkenhead, CH41 1EP

64 Whitley Wood Lane, Reading, RG2 8PP

60 Whitley Wood Lane, Reading, RG2 8PP

4.2 No letters of representation have been 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)

A 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; **No, the proposal is sufficient in its design and proportion that it would not significantly detract from the buildings original appearance**
- reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree; **No**
- 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, though the proposal would project to a depth slightly in excess of 4m (as recommended by the Design Guide SPD to be the limit of acceptable depth for rear extensions), it would be set slightly away from the sideward boundary with no.64. This, in combination with its glazed external facades, would help to ensure that no significant light loss would occur to the neighbouring property**
- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **No, the proposal would replace an existing conservatory, which is an established feature of the property. Though the proposed conservatory would project to a slightly greater depth than the existing, it is not deemed to cause a significantly greater degree of overlooking of no. 64**
- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **No, many of the neighbouring properties have been variously extended, including the provision of large conservatories. The proposal would not be clearly visible from public areas. The proposal would not cause**

significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area on this basis

- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **No, the erection of a conservatory is a common feature across the Borough, and though of a different appearance to that of the existing dwelling, is not considered to cause harm to its character and appearance**

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, while the occupants of no. 64 will notice the additional depth of the proposal, it replaces an existing similar structure. The slight set away from the boundary helps to mitigate the impact of the proposal on this neighbour. No significant visual dominance or overbearing effects are expected to occur as a result**
- 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