

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Emmer Green

App Ref: PL/24/1526 Householder planning permission

Address: 16 BURNHAM RISE, EMMER GREEN, READING, RG4 8XJ

Proposal: Single storey rear and double storey side extension including the demolition of existing double garage and replacement of single glazed timber windows with triple glazed UPVC

Applicant: Mr & Mrs D Keen

Received date: 18/11/2024

Target Decision date: Originally 13/01/2025; EOT agreed until 28/01/2025

Case Officer: James Schofield

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is a semi-detached dwelling on a large plot at the end of a cul-de-sac. The attached neighbour has had a rear extension.

Site visit date: 23/01/2025

Site visit photos:



2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposed development is for a two-storey side and rear extension as well as a single-storey rear extension. Plans considered;

Dwg No 24579-101 Existing Plans and Elevations

Dwg No 24579-102 Site & Location Plans

Dwg No 24579-103 Proposed Plans and Elevations

As received on the 18th of November 2025

Bat Survey

As received on the 20th of January 2025

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The site notice was sent to the agent and was duly posted.

No letters of representation have been received.

Transport

The Transport Officer noted the proposal would result in the loss of a detached garage, but that sufficient parking would remain on site to meet policy requirements.

Trees

The Natural Environment Officer noted there are trees with Tree Protection Orders on site, but that they are some distance from the dwelling itself. Informatives regarding the TPOs were suggested.

Ecology

The Ecology Officer noted that the Bat Survey was undertaken to an appropriate standard and that the risk to bats was minimal.

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 2019 onwards

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network)

EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodland)

TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPD 2021

6. APPRAISAL

Character and Appearance

Policy H9 states that alterations to a house will be acceptable where it respects the character of the house in terms of location, materials and design and respects the character and pattern of neighbouring properties and the street as a whole. Policy CC7 also sets out relevant considerations for design.

The proposed design of the two-storey element would result in a sympathetic addition due to roof form, set back from front elevation and set down from main roof ridge. The extensions are considered to be in proportion with the existing house and following demolition of garage, the overall footprint would not be excessive. The proposals would not appear cramped and sufficient amenity space would remain. There are no design related concerns regarding the loss of the garage and as above, Transport officers are satisfied that sufficient parking would remain. the Transport As such, the proposal satisfies the character considerations of local policies H9 and CC7.

Residential Amenity

Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not harm the privacy amenity of neighbouring sites. Policy CC8 states alterations to a house will be acceptable where they will not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties.

The neighbouring properties potentially most affected are No's 15 and 17 Burnham Rise located to the east and west of the site respectively.

With regard to No.17, this property has windows on the flank elevation. No new side facing windows are proposed on the extension and an existing bathroom includes obscure glazing. In the interest of maintaining the privacy amenity of the dwelling and neighbouring sites, a condition requiring no new side facing windows is proposed. Give the distance from the extensions to the common boundary, combined with orientation of the dwellings and hipped roof to minimise the impact, no material overbearing effects are considered to arise.

With regard to No.15, the single-storey rear extension is proposed to be 3 metres in depth (in compliance with SPD) and No.15 also have a similar rear extension adjacent the boundary. No overbearing effects are considered to arise.

Owing to the flat roof nature of the rear extension proposed, it is considered necessary to include a condition stipulating that the flat roof area shall not be used as a roof terrace, and any access out onto this area shall be for maintenance/means of escape purposes only.

Further to the above analysis, the design and siting of the proposed extensions would ensure the avoidance of harm to residential amenity. As such, the proposal is considered to meet the aims of local policies H9, H10, and CC8 provided the discussed condition is included.

Natural Environment – trees and ecology

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 rear part of the garden is subject to a Woodland TPO. However, given the distance from the proposals to this area, the Natural Environment Officer has confirmed that there are no concerns in respect of these protected trees. Informatives are proposed to be attached reminding the applicant of the TPO in terms of tree work and avoiding work related activity near trees.

A Bat Survey was undertaken and submitted, and it was the view of the Ecology Officer that this had been performed to an appropriate standard and that the risk to bats was minimal.

The proposal is not considered likely to result in a net loss of biodiversity or harm to protected trees or species. As such the proposal is considered to accord with the biodiversity and sustainability considerations of Policies H9, EN12 and EN14 of the local plan.

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:

1. TL1 Standard time limit
2. AP1 Approved plans
3. M1 Materials to match
4. Flat roof condition
5. No new side facing windows