

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Tilehurst
App Ref: 191415
Address: 51 Westwood Glen, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 5NW
Proposal: Single storey side extension.
Case Officer: Mr James Schofield
Applicant: Mr Danny White
Date received (valid from): 29 August 2019
Target Decision date: 31 October 2019 (extended from 24 October)

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to an semi-detached dwelling located on the eastern side of Westwood Glen. The site occupies the corner of the intersection of Westwood Glen and Lower Elmstone Drive. The site currently includes paved parking to the front and a substantial garden from front to rear around the side of the dwelling. There is a large verge between the garden and both roads. Wooden fencing runs the length of the property line ranging from approximately 1 to 2 meters in height. The entirety of the site is within a designated Green Link.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed development is for a single-storey side extension. The extension will provide a studio and WC accessible from the garden and house and a store room only accessible from the garden.

Plans considered;

Drawing No. 01 - Existing Plans & Elevations

Drawing No. 02 - Proposed Plans & Elevations

Drawing No. 03 - Plans

Received 29 August 2019

Drawing No. 02 - Proposed Plans & Elevations

Received 22 October 2019

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

140719: Erection of an attached three bedroom dwelling.
Permitted 17/8/2014

4. CONSULTATIONS

Neighbours

All adjoining neighbours were consulted by letter and a Site notice was displayed. No responses have been received.

Transport

Originally submitted plans did not include access for the studio through the house. Transport officers recommended seeing the studio as a separate business unit and conditioning approval upon the provision of three rather than the existing two off-street parking spaces.

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 Development Framework Core Strategy (2008)

CS7 (Design and the Public Realm)

Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012)

DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity)

DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

DM12: Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

7. APPRAISAL

7.1 Principle of development

The application seeks permission to extend and alter an existing residential dwelling. No change of use is proposed. Such domestic works are supported in principle by Policy DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the SPDP (2012) subject to a number of criteria ensuring the effects of such extension and alterations are not harmful. This will be considered in more detail in the followings sections.

7.2 Scale, appearance and design

Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy 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 DM9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it: respects the character of the house, respects the pattern of neighbouring properties, and does not present a large blank façade to public area.

The proposed single-storey side extension includes a hipped-roof and set-back rear corner. While these design elements differ from the gable ended roofline and strictly rectangular layout of 51 and 53 Westwood Glen, it is considered these new elements are not harmful. Materials and other details as provided thus far are consistent with the character of the dwelling and its context. In these regards, the scale, siting and design of the extension is not considered to result in any material harm to the immediate character or appearance of Westwood Glen and thereby accord with the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) and Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012).

7.3 Amenity

Policy DM4: ‘Safeguarding Amenity’ of the SPDP (2012) 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. The proposal includes a single-storey side extension which extends into the garden of the host dwelling.

The single-storey side extension is located a sufficient distance from neighbouring properties in order to prevent any material reduction in outlook or affect privacy in any way. The proposal would not result in any new views into adjoining gardens that would not already be possible. And ample outdoor amenity is retained for 51 Westwood Glen. As such, the proposal safeguards residential amenity in accordance with Policy DM4 of the SPDP.

7.4 Transport and Highway concerns

Policy DM12: ‘Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters’ of the SPDP (2012) states development will not have a detrimental impact on the functioning of the transport network. Transport officers recommended taking the view that the proposed studio would be a separate business unit and a condition requiring the provision of three rather than the existing two off-street parking spaces are in place prior to occupation of the development. However, conversations with the agent resulted in the submission of amended plans in order to incorporate a door from the dwelling directly to the studio. It is considered that this addresses these concerns and that requiring additional parking is no longer warranted; particularly given incoming local policy which will discourage dependence on private automobiles. In this regard the proposal, as amended on the 22 October 2019, is considered to accord with Policy DM12 of the SPDP.

8. CONCLUSION

In light of the above assessment the proposal is considered to accord with the requirements of the development plan and is therefore recommended for approval subject conditions.

9. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT

10. CONDITIONS

1. Standard time limit
2. Materials to match
3. Standard approved plans