

DELEGATED REPORT

Application No. 231584/HOU

Site Address: 69 Church End Lane, Tilehurst, Reading

Proposal: Two storey side, part single, part double storey rear extension and front porch following demolition of rear outbuilding (Part retrospective)

Target Date: Originally 2/1/24; Extension of Time agreed until 26/04/24

Site Description

The application property is a two storey detached dwelling located in a residential area. The surrounding properties vary in style and there is a primary school opposite the application site. The property is set back from the street and has a detached outbuilding in the rear garden. The property is not a listed building, nor does it fall within a conservation area.

Proposal

The proposal comprises of a part two storey side, part two and single storey rear extensions and front porch addition following demolition of rear outbuilding.

Materials comprise grey render, to include rendering the whole house, and clay tiles.

Works have started on site and have largely been completed and hence this application is part retrospective in nature.

Documents Submitted

Plans and Elevations P1391-02 Rev C

Received 9th April 2024

Location and Block Plan P1391-01

Received 7th November 2023

Relevant Planning History

230818/HOU - Proposed single storey rear extension and two storey side extension and front porch - Permitted.

230191/HPA - Rear extension measuring 6m in depth, with a maximum height of 3.10m, and 2.8m in height to eaves level. Notification of the construction of an extension under class A Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 - Prior Approval Not Required.

230186/HOU - Proposed 2 storey rear extension - Permitted.

230185/HOU Proposed single storey rear extension, 2 storey side extension and porch extension - Permitted.

Consultations

Internal Consultees

Comments received under recent application 230818/HOU:

RBC Transport

There are no Transport objections to this application; the submitted block plan illustrates 2 parking in tandem formation on the front drive. If any alterations to the existing vehicle access are proposed, a license from the Highways Department will be required.

Ecology

The application site comprises a detached dwelling located in Tilehurst. The proposals include the addition of two storey side extension which will require demolition of the nearby garage.

The Bat Survey report (Collington Winter, May 2023) concludes that the garage is unlikely to host roosting bats. As such, since the proposals are unlikely to affect bats or other protected species, there are no objections to this application on ecological grounds.

Public Consultation

Nearby neighbouring properties were consulted by letter and a site notice was displayed.

1 neighbour letter of representation raising the following:

- Eaves height raised
- Side extension not subservient, is overbearing to adjacent property
- Loss of chimneys
- Proposals not minor amendments, represent an attempt to deceive

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.

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 2023

National Planning Practice Guidance 2014

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7: Design and the Public Realm

CC8: Safeguarding Amenity

H9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation
H10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space
TR3: Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters
TR5: Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging
EN12: Biodiversity and the Green Network
EN14: Trees, Hedges and Woodland

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Design Guide to House Extensions (2021)
Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD (2011)

Appraisal

Design Considerations

Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) states: All development must be of high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area of Reading in which it is located.

Policy H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation): Extensions must respect the character and appearance of the house in terms of scale, location, materials. The design should also respect the character and pattern of neighbouring properties and appearance of the street as a whole in terms of scale, location, materials and design, the arrangement of doors, windows and other principal architectural features and any important existing building line.

Concern has been raised that the proposals are out of keeping with the street scene. Previous applications at the site have approved a number of similar elements proposed under this application, some elements of which appear to have been implemented, and the proposed combined extensions are large in scale. However, the plot is large, and it is considered capable of accommodating extensions and resultant dwelling of this size without resulting in a cramped appearance or overdevelopment of the plot.

There has been an increase in the eaves height of the main house, although the overall ridge height is lower. The 2 storey side extension no longer incorporates a set down from the main roof ridge. However, it is no higher than the main ridge. The porch extension, which is proposed to be reconstructed as per the proposed plans and not that which is currently in place, would be relatively small scale and, given the significant set-back from the road, the extensions are not considered to be so incongruous so as to result in harm to the visual amenities of the street scene or wider area. The rear extensions would not be readily visible from the street scene.

The materials would not match the host property and, indeed, the whole house has been rendered. However, there are a variety of extensions in the surrounding area and a variety of materials used. The road does not have a uniform character, style or scale of property and the proposals are not considered to disrupt the overall street scene or appear so

substantially out of keeping with surroundings to a degree that would warrant refusal of the application.

The 2 chimneys on the south elevation have been removed. Whilst regrettable, this in itself does not require planning permission.

In design terms, there should be a first floor window above the porch on the front elevation. However, given the height of the porch, a window in this location would not sit comfortably and nor would it align with either of the two existing first floor windows. The lack of window is not considered to result in such an incongruous front elevation to warrant a refusal, again in part due to the significant set back from the main road.

The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in relation to Policies H9 and CC7.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

Policy H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not result in an overbearing impact on neighbours. Policy 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.

The neighbouring properties potentially most affected by the development are Nos. 67 and 71 Church End Lane, to the north and south of the site respectively.

With regard to No.67, although the side extension is higher than that previously approved, the increase in scale is not considered to be so significant so as to result in any material overbearing effects. No. 67 Church End Lane has a living room, which is linked to a large full width rear extension kitchen/dining area served by bi-fold doors and a back door and window. The living room itself is also served by an (assumed to be) original side facing window, which prior to the rear extension would have been and continues to be a secondary window. The main daylight and sunlight to this space is from the rear. Therefore, it is considered that although there would be some additional impact from the side extension with regards to outlook and loss of light, it is not considered to be significantly detrimental to warrant refusal on this basis. No first floor windows are proposed on the flank elevation facing No.67 and as such there would be no material loss of privacy.

In relation to No.71, given the distance to the common boundary, combined with the proposals side to the north, no significant material overbearing effects are considered to arise. No first floor windows are proposed on the flank elevation facing No.71 and as such there would be no material loss of privacy.

Whilst clearly visible to occupiers of adjacent properties, the proposals are not considered to cause significant additional harm to that of the previously approved schemes in terms of overbearing effects. It is also not considered that the proposals would significantly reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight for the neighbouring properties.

As such the proposal is considered acceptable in relation to neighbouring amenity, in accordance with Policy CC8.

Impact on Parking/Highways

Policies TR1 (Achieving the Transport Strategy), TR3 (Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters) and TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging) seek to address access, traffic, highway and parking relates matters relating to development.

There is sufficient space at the front of the site to accommodate two vehicles. Therefore, there are no transport objections. In accordance with Policy TR3.

Ecology

Policy EN12 (Biodiversity and The Green Network) requires that new development should provide a net gain for biodiversity where possible and should incorporate biodiversity features into proposals where practical.

No objection was raised on ecology grounds under applications 230185 and 230186. Given how recently these applications were determined (and with bat surveys submitted and reviewed at the time), circumstances on the site have not changes significantly. There are therefore no objections to this application on ecology grounds.

As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in relation to Policy EN12.

Other matters raised in representation

Concern has been raised that the submission, proposal and plans are inaccurate and misleading. It is acknowledged that the application is part retrospective. The case officer has, during the application process, sought to clarify the proposals and secured revised plans. A site visit was undertaken and the proposals have been assessed accordingly. The porch shown on the plans differs from that constructed and would remain unauthorised. The applicant confirms that they are aware of this.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed as set out above and is considered to be acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION:

GRANT