

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Church Ward

App Ref: PL/24/1413

Address: 88 BIRDHILL AVENUE, READING, RG2 7JU

Proposals: Proposed single storey rear extension

Case Officer: Mishga Marshall

Applicant: Mr Cheng William Lam

Date received (valid from): 24/10/2024

Target Decision date: Originally 24/12/2024; EOT agreed until 24/01/25

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a single storey semi-detached property with pitched roof, located on the corner of Birdhill Avenue. It is not a listed building, nor does it fall within a conservation area. The surrounding area is residential, with a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings.

Site visit date: 16/12/2024

Site visit photos:



2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for the construction of a single storey rear extension. Revised plans were received change the flat roof to hipped roof and reducing the depth from 4.36m to 4m. The materials are proposed to match the existing. The proposal would have 2 windows to the rear and a door to the side.

Plans submitted:

~~P1575-01 LOCATION & BLOCK PLAN OCT 2024~~

~~P1575-02 PLANS AND ELEVATIONS OCT 2024~~

P1575-01 Rev A Location and Block Plan

P1575-02 Rev A Plans and Elevations (Existing and Proposed)

Received 25th December 2025

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

N/A

4. CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

86 Birdhill Avenue READING RG2 7JU

89 Birdhill Avenue READING RG2 7JU

One letter of representation has been received.

No address specified - concerned about any alterations to the current waste drainage system that may come about with the proposed new extension.

Officer comment - this would be a building control matter and not within the remit of Planning.

A 14 day re-consultation period was undertaken due to changes in the plans. No further neighbour letters of representation 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 2024

National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 onwards

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

SPD

Design Guide to House Extensions SPG 2021

6. APPRAISAL

Character and Appearance

Policy H9 states that an extension to a house will be acceptable where it respects the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design and 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. Policy CC7 also sets out relevant considerations for design.

The extension as originally proposed had a flat roof; however, the roof was higher than the eaves of the existing property and as such was not considered to integrate well. Revised plans were received proposing a hipped roof which integrates better and, as it would still be below the main roof ridge, would remain a subservient enough feature with materials to match which is appropriate. Due to the orientation of the property within the plot, it would be glimpsed from the street scene. However, the above techniques mean that it would not appear as an obtrusive feature.

Given the size of the application dwelling and garden, although the size of the rear extension is large in relation, the development is considered to be subservient and sympathetic to both the existing dwelling and surrounding area and its character and is not believed to detract from it nor result in a cramped form of development. As such, the development is considered acceptable, in compliance with Policy H9 and CC7.

Residential Amenity

Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not result in an overbearing impact on neighbours. Policy CC8 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.

Regarding 86 Birdhill Avenue to the west of the site, there is a slight change in site levels and No.86 is at a slightly lower level than No.88. Given the orientation and separation distance, no overbearing effects are considered to arise. The extension would be oriented towards the common boundary; however, it would largely be obscured by the fence and existing outbuilding. The extension was reduced in depth to 4m (in line with SPD guidance) and whilst clearly visible and acknowledging the slight change in site levels, it is not considered to result in material loss of privacy such to warrant a refusal.

In regard to 89 Birdhill Avenue, the other half of the semi-detached pair to the north-east revised plans reducing the depth mean that the extension does not significantly breach 45 degree line to nearest habitable room window. Given the offset from the boundary and that the roof would be hipped away to minimise the impact, whilst visible it is not considered to result in any significant material overbearing effects.

Therefore, the development is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of all adjoining neighbours and on the occupiers of the application dwelling, complying with Policies CC8 and H9.

7. CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed as set out above and is considered to be acceptable on that basis, subject to the following conditions.

8. RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Conditions:

Time Limit

Materials

Approved Plans