

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Norcot
App Ref: 192020
Address: 3 Windrush Court, Windrush Way, Reading, RG30 2NF
Proposal: Proposed ground floor side extension, floor plan redesign and all associated works.
Case Officer: Mr James Schofield
Applicant: Mr Saleem Sheikh
Date received (valid from): 19 December 2019
Target Decision date: 3rd March 2020

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

3 Windrush Court Chapel Hill is located at the end of a court including four detached residential dwellings facing a shared road. The site is not within a conservation area and there are no protected trees on site. The site backs on to a car park for a nearby “Kingdom Hall Of Jehovah’s Witnesses.”

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks permission for single storey side extension. The proposal would provide increased accommodation at the ground floor of a family home.

Plans considered:

Location Plan (Ref: TQRQM19346122846117)
Drawing No: 20229 - 101 Existing Ground Floor Plan
Drawing No: 20229 - 102 Existing Roof Plan
Drawing No: 20229 - 103 Proposed Ground Floor Plan
Drawing No: 20229 - 104 Proposed Roof Plan
Drawing No: 20229 - 201 Existing Elevations
Drawing No: 20229 - 202 Existing Elevations
Drawing No: 20229 - 203 Proposed Elevations
Drawing No: 20229 - 204 Proposed Elevations
Drawing No: 20229 - 301 Existing Section
Drawing No: 20229 - 302 Proposed Section
Drawing No: 20229 - 401 Block Plans
As received 19 December 2019

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Neighbours

All adjacent neighbours were consulted by letter; no response was received.

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

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

7. APPRAISAL

7.1 Principle of development

Residential extension and alterations are supported in principle by Policy H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the Local Plan (2019) subject to a number of criteria ensuring the effects of such extensions and alterations respect its context and are not harmful. These considerations will be examined in more detail in the following sections.

7.2 Character and scale

Policy CC7 of the Local Plan states that, development must be of a high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area in Reading in which it is located. Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it: respects the character of the house, the pattern of neighbouring properties and building lines.

The proposed side extension in many respects is more similar to a rear extension due to the character and layout of the dwellings on Windrush Court. 3 Windrush Court has an "L" shaped layout results in those parts further from the corner of the dwelling directly facing on to the court behave like a rear elevation in many respects. As such, the proposed side extension is considered to be more similar to relatively standard 4 metre rear extension than a large side

extension (see appendix for photographs). Furthermore, the design detail, as shown in the plans, are considered to demonstrate a proposal which demonstrate adequate respect for the character of the dwelling and the wider area.

For the reasons discussed above, the development is not considered to cause any harm to the character or appearance of either the dwelling or the wider area, and therefore, accords with the aims of Policy CC7 and the design considerations of Policy H9.

7.3 Amenity

Policy CC8 requires development to refrain from causing a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties or unacceptable living conditions for residents. And Policy H9 compliments these aims by indicating that acceptable development will not present an overbearing impact on neighbours or public areas.

The proposal would not obstruct views for residents of neighbouring properties.

The ground floor elements of the side extension are deemed to avoid any concerns about detrimental impact on neighbour's privacy, sunlight or overbearingness by virtue of being a single-storey structure.

The site enjoys a moderate sized garden and the proposed development would leave over half the plot undeveloped.

Subsequent to the above analysis, whilst constituting a relatively large nominal side extension to the dwelling, in this instance and based on the sites individual circumstances, the proposed development is deemed to accord with Policy CC8 and the overbearingness considerations of Policy H9.

7.4 Biodiversity and sustainability

Part 'b' of Policy EN12 indicates that all development sites should not result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. These aims are supported by Policy H9 which states that an extension will only be acceptable where it does not result in the loss of biodiversity within gardens.

The site does not have any protected trees or identified Green Links which could be negatively impacted by the specifics of the proposed development under consideration.

The proposal is not considered likely to result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity as it only pertains to areas currently covered in hardstanding or grassy lawn. As such the proposal is considered to accord with the biodiversity and sustainability considerations of Policies H9 and EN12 of the local plan.

8. CONCLUSION

In light of the above assessment the proposal is considered to accord with the requirements of the development plan. As such, the proposed development is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

9. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT

10. CONDITIONS

1. TL1 Standard time-limit
2. AP1 Standard approved plans
3. M3 Materials as specified

APPENDIX

Site Photos

Photographs taken in the course of a site visit conducted on the 14th of February 2020.













