

Ward: Norcot

Application No.: 191757/FUL

Address: 10 Pegs Green Close

Public Representations

1.1 Five statements have been submitted by local residents, which they ask to be taken into consideration. This is in lieu of public speaking, which is currently suspended.

1.2 The statements have been received from the following neighbouring households:

- 3 Pegs Green Close - Debra Little
- 5 Pegs Green Close - Malcolm & Carole Taylor
- 6 Pegs Green Close - Annie Gedye
- 8 Pegs Green Close - Yalini Neguleashwaran & Ashley Cooper
- 9 Pegs Green Close - Richard Picken

From No. 5 Pegs Green Close

Once again we must make an objection to above application on a number of issues. The original plan was turned down by your committee and was also rejected on appeal.

The appeal adjudicator gave a long and detailed report on all the Reasons for dismissal. It would appear that with this second application hardly anything has been changed, such as the loss of the gap between no.8 and no10 and the loss of privacy and light to no 9.

Also the new Front Porch would look totally out of character. It would appear that the proposed footprint would be 100 percent more than the current footprint which we understand goes totally against guidelines.

Also the Double side extension would not be in keeping with the rest of the close, and would present an eyesore.

The proposal also includes an application for a drop curb, which would take a parking space from the close which already has limited parking

Please take our objections into consideration when making you decision.

Many thanks

Malcolm & Carole Taylor

From No. 3 Pegs Green Close

The extension would be detrimental to the close in that it would appear dominating and wouldn't be in keeping with the character of the close/neighbouring houses. The appeal application/plan doesn't appear to have been amended significantly and some of the original issues still remain.

The house has, in the past, been rented out to multiple occupants with at least a dozen people living there at one time. My worry is that the addition of an extension will allow this situation to reoccur, on a larger scale. If the planning does get the 'go ahead', I would strongly suggest including a clause that prohibits the house being used as an 'HMO'. This shouldn't be a problem if the owner is going to be residing there, as he has intimated.

The scale of the extension would mean loss of light and privacy to the neighbouring properties. In addition, the loss of No. 10's garage and the majority of the driveway could mean that the owners have to park on-road within the cul-de-sac which is already tight on space. I notice that the amended plans indicate that there will be two off-road parking spaces in the front garden but we cannot be sure how many vehicles will belong to No. 10 - two may not be enough. If there is to be a drop kerb, that would be another parking space (or two) lost within the close.

I hope that you will take my thoughts and comments into consideration.

Kind regards

Debra Little

From No.6 Pegs Green Close

1) Our Concern. We wonder why this amended application has got this far, being so similar to planning application 191757; and still containing the same grounds for refusal as the original plan 190357 regarding the double side extension and front porch. In our understanding, the new Amended plan has not addressed all the concerns of the Planning Committee who initially refused permission, nor the dismissed Appeal.

2) Double Side Extension

Amendment changes are virtually only cosmetic – side 1st floor loses a mere 6“, plus 11” off the front, (1 brick is 12”). In relation to the overall plan it's almost unnoticeable and does not diminish loss of gap. If approved, this contradicts

- i) the Planning Committee Member's objections in the last meeting to loss of GAP, giving a terraced look, and
- ii) the dismissed Appeal(see No.(8)). This (and the porch) were major considerations in refusal previously by the Committee and Appeal.

ANY double storey side extension will lose the gap.

Referencing Planning Guidelines, it would be acceptable to have a single storey side extension and a rear 3m double extension.

- 3)** Drop Kerb.
 a) Transport Development Control's letter suggest a drop kerb: to be shown on the plans, which it is not. Please amend.
 b) We strongly object to losing 1 of only 6 parking spots that no residents have exclusive use of, why should No.10 take one?
- 4)** Objection to New Front Porch. Totally out of keeping with the Close architecture, rejected previously by Committee and Appeal No.(6), No.(8)
- 5)** Footprint. The plan is over 100% - doubling existing house footprint, (30% is usual policy)

Online www.planningportal.co.uk extension guidelines	Amended 191757
<i>a) Extensions of more than one storey must not extend beyond the rear wall of the original house* by more than three metres,</i>	a) 4.5m beyond the rear wall
<i>b) Maximum eaves height of an extension within two metres of the boundary of three metres</i>	b) side extension GF is 12"/300mm from No.8 boundary and is more than 3m high with double stored
<i>c) Side extensions to be single storey with maximum height of four metres.</i>	c) Double storey

We cannot understand why a planning application which so blatantly fails to follow policy guidelines or previous decisions, is being reconsidered.

Policies protect neighbours from inappropriate building extensions, and we as residents look to planners to respect and abide by the very policies they have put in place for this reason.

- 6)** Loss of privacy and light. The double 4.5m rear extension is now only 2.7m from No.9's habitable living area and will totally exclude all summer sunlight in these rooms which are very short of light, being north facing, plus it will be imposing on the garden, cutting out a great deal of natural light and sky.
- 7)** HMO consideration. We are deeply worried about this possibility. Owner previously rented present 1 bathroom/3bedroom property to 15 people by utilizing the lounge and dining rooms as bedrooms. This amended plan could be used to rent 8/9+ bedrooms.

From No8 Pegs Green Close

"We, Ashley & Yalini of 8 Pegs Green Close, would like to object to the planning application for 10 Pegs Green Close for the following reasons:

1. The plans are overbearing and unnecessarily large in character and appearance and this is not in keeping with the spacious look and feel of the close. It results in loss of symmetry with attached no.9 and ruins the terminus viewpoint up the close. It is neither modestly proportioned nor in line with planning guidelines with regards to increase in footprint.

The renewed application addresses very little of the concerns and breaches of policy that were highlighted during the previous rejection and appeal with regards to the harmful effect it will have on the character and appearance of the host building and the close. We believe that the current proposal would still be in breach of the policies previously quoted: DM9 of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework -Sites and Detailed Policies Document, policy CS7 of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework - Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and guidance within the -A design guide to house extensions (Supplementary Planning Guidance)(SPG), adopted May 2003; which all seek, amongst other aims, to achieve high design quality.

2. Proposed porch does not align with any of the other properties in the close and would further the damage incurred to the look and feel of the close by the proposed side extension.
3. Loss of privacy & light to our garden and home due to:
 - The proximity of the proposed side extension to our boundary.
 - The height of the side extension in comparison to the existing fence which will result in loss of light.
 - The length of the extension reaching far into no.10s garden and therefore, overlooking far into our garden which is currently very private and peaceful and the reason we fell in love with and bought our property just last year.
4. The applicants have rented the property out like a HMO previously without adhering to appropriate legislative requirements and this extension will allow them to do that again. If approved, we request a condition specifying that the property cannot be as a HMO and may only be let out as a whole.
5. Most of the properties within the close have been underpinned due to subsidence. We have serious concerns that a project of this size and nature could potentially cause further issues with neighbouring properties and, it will result in us at no.8 being unable to use our driveway.
6. The detrimental effect to the living conditions for Richard Picken of no.9 Pegs Green Close with regards to loss of light and privacy due to the 1 story side extension that borders his property. The dining room and kitchen already receive low levels of light due to the way they face, and this extension would reduce that significantly.
7. The loss of parking spaces due to the proposed dropped curve and loss of the driveway to the side extension."

From no.9 Pegs Green Close

My first thoughts, observation and objections to the above Planning Application to 10 Pegs Green Close are, setting aside my objections connected with my own property for the moment, is the general aspect and concerns it will have on the 'Close'.

The property this objection refers to (PA191757) had a very similar planning application (PA190357) submitted in March 2019. This planning application was rejected by the Councils Planning Committee.

An Appeal by the owner was made to the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. On this occasion a Mr. James Taylor BA (Hons) MA/MRTPI. In his report (Ref. APP(E0345/D/19/3236058) this appeal was dismissed.

On comparing this planning application (PA191757) and the previous planning application (AP190357), apart from the removal of the Single Storey rear extension and changes to the front garden there appears very little differences. The Front Elevation in both cases are practically identical apart from the top storey being reduced by 300mm.

This being said, one of the reasons the Secretary of State's report (Reason 5) for dismissing this appeal was that the Front Elevation, to quote, 'be a bulk of development that would be out of keeping with the spacious character of the Cul-de-sac.

Most planned extensions permitted by the Council have been single storey, having had no real detrimental, visual or otherwise effect on the 'Close'. If this planning application is given the go ahead what I have just said will completely destroy the 'Close' as we residents know it, and in my opinion not for the better. A two Storey extension is not within keeping as things are at the present.

On a personal note and looking carefully at the plans I came to the following conclusions. The proposal of a two Storey extension to the rear of the house, being only 2.7ms away from my boundary line and 4.5ms in length, will completely dominate and overlook the back of my house and will be very intimidating.

There is also a 'light' aspect I feel should be taken into account. The way the proposed extension extends into their garden and the height of it, even though it appears to be within the 45-degree line, will virtually mean the light to the Dining room will be drastically reduced, as well as putting it in complete shadow for most of the day.

I do have another concern and that is the value of my property. At the present time the value of houses in the 'Close' are very much dictated by the kind of houses they are, in a very desirable part of town. This does not mean that change must not happen as we know by the number of single storey extensions that have been allowed. As I have said previously this type of planning application is completely out of character with the rest of the 'Close' and as you come up the 'Close' will be more than noticeable for what I consider the wrong reason. I do not know if this issue is taken into account by the Planning Office but I am sure if this planning application is allowed this will have a detrimental effect on their value.

The planning application shows how large the extension could be, taking up a high proportion of the existing drive for this purpose. I do realize that you would not have any idea how many vehicles there are likely to be connected with this house in the future but it is only a small 'Close' and parking, with outside users as well as residents, space becomes very difficult.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to reply to this Planning Application.

Yours faithfully

Richard Picken