

## DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

**Ward:** Tilehurst

**App Ref:** PL/25/0135 Householder planning permission

**Address:** 39 CRESCENT ROAD, TILEHURST, READING, RG31 5AH

**Proposal:** Single Storey Rear and Two Storey Side Extension

**Applicant:** Mr & Mrs RAY CARTER

**Received date:** 27/01/2025

**Target Decision date:** 25/03/2025

**Case Officer:** James Schofield

---

### 1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is a semi-detached dwelling which has had a conservatory added to the rear. The proposal site is a pie-shaped corner plot.

The northern side of Crescent Road was development between 1910 and 1930. It is typical of early car facilitated suburban dwellings and the dwellings have a significant amount of charm owing to their arts & crafts architectural style. This includes prominent use of contrasting brick details, arches, bays, decorative chimney pots, and stained-glass features in doors and transoms. Front gardens are reasonably large and provide a great deal of amenity to the street through low garden walls, small decorative trees, hedges, etc. Many of these have turned over a larger proportion of this space to car parking. Rear gardens of these sites are relatively long and large.

By contrast the southern side of Crescent Road resulted from the redevelopment of nursery sometime between 1961 and 1967 and are in a typical post-war utilitarian modernist style. Utilising stucco, pebble-dash, and brick with minimal use of ornamentation. The proposal site is typical of these developments.

**Site visit date:** 11/12/2024 (for previous recent application)

**Site visit photos:**





## 2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposed development is for a single-storey 5.5 metre deep rear extension at a height of approximately 3 metres along the shared boundary. This would project beyond the end of the rear extension of the attached neighbour's rear extension by approximately 1.5 metres. The two-storey side extension would be around 3.4 metres wide, would be set back and down from the main dwelling, and would maintain a gap between the proposal site and the non-attached neighbour at number 41. Plans considered;

Dwg No 8AC.MP01 Rev A Existing Plans & Elevations

~~Dwg No 8AC.MP02 Rev C Proposed Plan & Elevations (superseded)~~

As received on the 27<sup>th</sup> of January 2025

Dwg No 8AC.MP02 Rev D Proposed Plan & Elevations

As received on the 17<sup>th</sup> of March 2025

## 3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

**App Ref:** PL/24/1419 Householder planning permission

**Proposal:** Single Storey Rear and Two Storey Side Extensions

**Decision:** Withdrawn on 14<sup>th</sup> of January 2025

## 4. CONSULTATIONS

The site notice was posted on the 7<sup>th</sup> of February 2025 and the following addresses were consulted by letter:

- 41 Crescent Road, Tilehurst, READING, RG31 5AH
- 37 Crescent Road, Tilehurst, READING, RG31 5AH
- 18 Lyme Grove, Tilehurst, READING, RG31 5AJ

No letters of representation have been received.

### Ecology

The Ecology Officer was consulted on the recent application for a similar proposal, and she indicated that no bat survey was required.

### 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)

### **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.

Application PL/24/1419 was withdrawn as due to the excessive scale and form of the two storey side extension, it was considered to result in an incongruous addition, out of keeping with the host property and visually dominant addition within the street scene.

The two storey side extension proposed has been reduced in width and incorporates a roof form that would integrate appropriately with the host property. The extension would be set back from the front elevation at first floor level and set down from the main roof. The width, design, and scale of the two-storey side extension is considered to not be sufficiently harmful in this instance because the architectural elements of the proposed extension combine with the size and shape of the plot to ensure the proposal remains subservient to the host dwelling. The addition of similar sized windows to that present in the existing front elevation will help to add to the symmetry within the fenestration plan. Due to the orientation of the dwelling in its plot and its relationship with No.41 Crescent Road, the extension would still project forward of the building line of properties to the west. However, given the above, it is not considered to be so harmful to either the character of the host property or street scene such to warrant a refusal.

The rear extension as originally proposed was considered overly high, almost to the height of the first floor windows, and therefore not a subservient enough addition. Revised plans lowered this height and on balance, given that the extension is not visible to the public, albeit large, it is not considered unacceptable. It proposes similar materials to the existing dwelling and is largely sited within the footprint of an existing

conservatory. Its exceptional depth is mitigated by the fact the attached neighbour has extended to the rear along the shared boundary and the single-storey height of the proposal.

In summary, the appearance of the proposed two-storey side and rear extension are sufficiently sympathetic to the host dwelling such that no detrimental impact to its character would result. Further to the above analysis, 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 rear extension at approximately 5.5 metres in depth is longer than normally permitted in Reading. The Design Guide encourages designs to stay at 4 metres and under in depth. However, it would appear it does not fall within the 60-degree line discussed in 7.1.1 of the Design Guide to House Extensions. Furthermore, the dwellings to either side have both extended to the rear, and the attached dwelling, number 37, has a 4-metre-deep rear extension which would reduce the impact of this proposal for them to around 1.5 metres near their shared property-line. The height of the rear extension at 3 metres is relatively typical of such extensions and would not be overbearing for the outdoor amenity space of number 37 Crescent Road. It is noted that a condition removing the ability to convert the roof of the flat roof to a balcony or similar structure would be prudent, as it could avoid the introduction of severe privacy and overlooking issues.

The proposed two-storey side extension includes no side-facing windows. And it located almost entirely forward (north) of the closest most likely affected neighbour at number 41 Crescent Road. The location of proposed development relative to the neighbouring dwellings and the path of the sun ensure there would be no significant loss of light for the host dwelling or neighbours. Similarly, no first-floor windows serving habitable rooms are proposed looking into rear gardens, and as such, no loss of privacy is considered likely to result from the proposal.

Further to the above analysis, the design and siting of the proposed two-storey side and rear extension would ensure the avoidance of any loss of privacy, light, or overbearingness. Further to this analysis, the proposal is considered to meet the aims of local policies H9, H10, and CC8.

### **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. No conversion of flat roof without permission