APPLICATION NO:
F/2002/7228

LOCATION:
145 Hilmanton, Lower Earley Reading.

APPLICANT:
Mr G Cox C/O Chamberlain Syrad Architecture

29/08

PROPOSAL:
Proposed two storey front extension to dwelling and single storey rear extension .

EARLIEST DATE FOR DECISION: **24/08/2002**

APPLICATION WILL HAVE EXPIRED ON:
20/09/2002

CASE OFFICER: **Phillip Taylor**

REFUSED

RAILEX
Marbleboard

WOKINGHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS

Notification of Refusal of Permission

Mr G Cox
C/O Chamberlain Syrad Architecture
66 Tilehurst Road
Reading
Berks
RG30 2JH

Application Number: F/2002/7228

Parish: **EARLEY**

Location: **145, Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading.**

Proposal: **Proposed two storey front extension to dwelling and single storey rear extension .**

The Wokingham District Council in pursuance of their powers under the above Acts and Regulations hereby **Refuse Permission** for carrying out the above development in accordance with the application and the accompanying plans submitted to the Council, the reason for which is specified hereunder.

Reason

1. The proposed two storey front extension by reason of its design, bulk, size and location on the dwelling would form an obtrusive and dominating feature in the street scene to the detriment of the character of the area. As such it is contrary to policy EN1 of the Berkshire Structure Plan, policies LBE1 and LBE2 of the Loddon Area Local Plan and to policies WBE1 and WOS3 of the Wokingham District Local Plan (Deposit Draft).

Informative

1. You are advised, in compliance with The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2000, that the following policies and/or proposals in the development plan are relevant to this decision:

Berkshire Structure Plan Policy EN1.
Loddon Area Local Plan Policies LBE1 and LBE2.
Deposit Draft Wokingham District Local Plan Policies WOS3 and WBE1.

T. G Watson

Trevor Watson
Development Control Manager
Date: 11/09/2002

Notice checked by: _____

If this notice grants permission to proceed with the proposal the applicant is reminded that it relates to planning permission only and does not constitute approval under any other legislation including Building Regulations.

Formal Decision

14. In exercise of the powers transferred to me, I dismiss the appeal insofar as it relates to the 2 storey front extension.

15. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension and I grant planning permission for a single storey rear extension at 145 Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. F/2002/7228, dated 25 July 2002 and the plans submitted therewith (so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted) and subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this decision.

    2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Information

16. A separate note is attached setting out the circumstances in which the validity of any of these decisions may be challenged by making an application to the High Court.

17. This decision does not convey any approval or consent that may be required under any enactment, by-law, order or regulation other than section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

18. Attention is drawn to the enclosed note relating to the requirements of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970, as amended.

INSPECTOR

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2003

By Gareth Isaac LLB Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State

The Planning Inspectorate
4/09 Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
e-mail: enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date

-1 APR 2003

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/A/02/1104224
145 Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr G Cox against the decision of Wokingham District Council.
- The application (Ref. F/2002/7228), dated 25 July 2002, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2002.
- The development proposed is a two storey front extension and a single storey rear extension.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed in part and is dismissed in part as detailed in the Formal Decision below.

Main Issue

1. From the written representations made, and from my inspection of the site and its surroundings, I consider the main issue in this case to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Planning Policy

2. The development plan for the area includes the Berkshire Structure Plan (BSP) 1991-2006 and the Loddon Area Local Plan (LALP) 1995. The general aim of Structure Plan Policy EN1 and Local Plan Policy LBE1 is to seek to ensure that new development is appropriate to the area of its location. LALP Policy LBE2 indicates that development proposals which are inappropriate or which would have an adverse impact on the character of an area, in a number of different respects, will not normally be permitted.

3. There is also an emerging plan for the area in the form of the Wokingham District Local Plan Deposit Draft (WDLP), and policies WBE1 and WOS3 of the WDLP have been drawn to my attention. The WDLP has been the subject of a public local inquiry and the Inspector's report has been published. The Inspector recommended some amendments to the plan, including amendments to Policy WBE1, and I am told that the Council has agreed modifications in the light of the Inspector's report. However, I have not been provided with the details of those modifications and as a consequence cannot be certain precisely what the eventual policy will be. In the circumstances, this limits the weight that I can attach to the policies of the emerging plan.

Reasons

Effect on character and appearance

4. No. 145 Hilmanton is a large modern 2 storey detached house with an integral double garage, located in a residential estate. It occupies a prominent position in the street, on a bend, facing one of the several small cul-de-sacs leading off from the larger cul-de-sac in

which it is situated. The immediate surrounding area contains similar family sized detached dwellings, although there are a number of different house types and designs. All of these properties are constructed of similar facing brickwork with rendered panels or half timbering at first floor level. This gives the area a distinctive character.

5. The proposal involves two separate and distinct elements. The proposed 2 storey front extension would be approximately 3.5 metres wide and would project from the front of the house so that it would be in line with the existing garage wall. The existing front gable roof would be enlarged and altered from a barn end to a hipped gable, with the ridge set approximately 2 metres higher than at present. The proposed rear extension would be a single storey construction with a flat roof. It would occupy a position to the rear of the existing utility room, although not to its full width, and would extend to a point in line with the rear wall of the house.

6. The proposed single storey rear extension would not be visible from the street. It would be a small addition to the property and the Council has indicated that it has no objection to this part of the proposal. In my opinion, the proposed rear extension would not have any adverse impact on the character or appearance of the area. However, in contrast, by virtue of its location, the proposed extension to the front of the property would be particularly noticeable. The projection containing the proposed extension would be larger than the existing structure and although the roof would be about 0.5 metre lower than the ridge of the main roof, the scale of the proposal is such that it would still add significant bulk and mass to the building. Although efforts have been made to minimise its impact, in my opinion, the proposed front extension would neverthless, be a prominent new feature in the street.

7. At the time of my site inspection, I saw that there were a number of different house types and designs in the surrounding area. I agree that the mixture of house types contributes to the character of the area. Of the houses with front gable projections, some have full gable ends and others half hipped and barn gable ends. I accept that when viewed purely in terms of design, the proposed front extension would not be out of keeping with other nearby houses. However, it is also necessary to consider the implications of the proposal in relation to its siting and size.

8. In my opinion, the position of the properties in relation to one another and to the street contributes significantly to the character and appearance of the area. It seems to me that this aspect of the development was treated as an important consideration when the estate was originally designed and built. A balanced blend of the different styles of property, in appropriate locations was achieved. Any significant alteration to the front of the property has to be considered with this in mind. I did see one example at no. 127, of a property which had been extended to the front, although this extension was quite different from that proposed at the appeal site. I also saw a property at no. 111, where a gable end, as originally built, projects to a point close to the highway. However, although the proposal at the appeal site would be in line with the existing projection, it would result in a larger structure at the front. In any event, the proposal needs to be viewed in the context of the impact that it would have on the part of the street where it is located.

9. By virtue of its scale and size, the proposed front extension would, in my view, be obtrusive and dominant. In my opinion, the additional bulk of the proposed extension, in this particular location, would result in an unacceptably prominent feature in the street.

I consider that it would have a detrimental and harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. I conclude that it would be inappropriate in relation to its location. I also conclude that it would be in conflict with Local Plan Policies LBE1 and LBE2 and Structure Plan Policy EN1. However, I consider that the proposed single storey rear extension would not have any adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and that it would therefore not be in conflict with either Local Plan or Structure Plan policies. Accordingly, I intend to dismiss the appeal insofar as the front extension is concerned but allow the appeal only in relation to the rear extension.

Other Matters

10. I have considered the fact that the appellant has lived at the appeal site for 16 years and that he and his family do not wish to move but find the existing house too small for their requirements and therefore wish to enlarge the existing accommodation. However this does not justify a proposal that would materially detract from the character and appearance of the area. I have also noted the suggestion that the appellant proposes to provide additional car parking space at the front of the property but this does not alter the reasons that I have identified in concluding that the proposed front extension would be unacceptable. I have also considered the suggestion that the Council did not refer to the single storey front extension in its decision notice. However the original application did not differentiate between any of the aspects of the proposed front extension.

11. I have considered all of the other matters raised including the representations suggesting that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the living conditions of occupiers of nearby property. Taking into account all of the circumstances, I do not consider that this part of the proposal would lead to the occupiers of either nos. 144 or 148 being more overlooked or suffering any significant loss of light or sunlight. Neither do I consider that the rear single storey extension would have any adverse impact in terms of overlooking or loss of light on the occupiers of those or any other nearby properties. I have also considered the representations suggesting that there may have been problems regarding parking and noise at the appeal site, but those matters have not influenced my decision. Neither these nor any of the other matters raised is of such significance as to outweigh the considerations that have led to my conclusions on the main issue.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council, having regard to the comments made on behalf of the appellant and the advice contained in Circular 11/95. It would not, in my view, be reasonable or appropriate to impose the conditions relating to the garage accommodation or parking and turning space at the property in the light of the dismissal of the appeal in respect of the front extension. However, insofar as the rear extension is concerned, I agree with the Council that it would be appropriate to impose a condition that the materials used should match those of the existing house. I have altered the suggested wording of this condition to reflect the wording of the model condition in Circular 11/95. I also agree that the normal condition regarding the commencement of the development should be imposed.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed only in part but otherwise dismissed.

Formal Decision

14. In exercise of the powers transferred to me, I dismiss the appeal insofar as it relates to the 2 storey front extension.

15. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension and I grant planning permission for a single storey rear extension at 145 Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. F/2002/7228, dated 25 July 2002 and the plans submitted therewith (so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted) and subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this decision.

    2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Information

16. A separate note is attached setting out the circumstances in which the validity of any of these decisions may be challenged by making an application to the High Court.

17. This decision does not convey any approval or consent that may be required under any enactment, by-law, order or regulation other than section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

18. Attention is drawn to the enclosed note relating to the requirements of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970, as amended.

INSPECTOR

ROGER PRING & SONS.

26, Easby Way Lower Earley,
Reading, Berkshire, RG6 3XA.
Telephone no.; 0118 935 3385.
Facsimile no.; 0118 935 3385.

ARCHITECTURAL & SURVEYING CONSULTANTS

714-93

PCL
DC
28 JUL
FILE:

JAM – Minor amendment?

Planning Services,
Environmental Services Department,
P. O. Box 157,
Wokingham District Council,
Shute End,
Wokingham,
Berkshire,
RG40 1WR.

25, July 2003

Dear Sirs/Madam,

Re; Planning application no. F/2002/7228
Single storey side extension to form breakfast area at
145, Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading, Berkshire.

Enclosed, herewith, are 2 copies of my drawings nos. 03/436/10 which shows the proposed extension with a simplified roof. Could you please confirm that these this revision can be considered sufficiently minor for the amendment to be approve under the original application.

For your information, because several extensions were included under one application, this was actually refused but permitted under the Appeal Decision of the 1, April 2003, ref. APP/X0360/A/02/1104224.

I look forward to hearing from you shortly,

Yours faithfully,

Roger Pring.

Copy to Mr. & Mrs. G. Cox.

Tel: (0118) 974 6442 (Direct Line)
Fax: (0118) 974 6484
Email: Julia.Mountford@wokingham.gov.uk
Date: 01 September 2003
My ref: JM/BP/71493/Earley
Your ref:

Mr Pring
26 Easby Way
Lower Earley
Reading
Berkshire
RG6 3XA

Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
P.O. Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR
Tel: (0118) 974 6000
Fax: (0118) 974 6486
Minicom No: (0118) 974 6991
DX: 33506 – Wokingham

Dear Mr Pring

PROPOSED ALTERATION TO APPLICATION F/2002/7228, 145 HILMANTON, LOWER EARLEY

I refer to your letter and drawing number 03/436/10 received by the Local Planning Authority on the 28 July with reference to the above. I confirm that the reduction in the massing of the roof as shown on drawing 03/436/10 would be acceptable and a new planning application will not be required.

Should you require any further information, please contact Julia Mountford on the above direct dial number.

Yours sincerely,

B POLNIK (MRS)
Principal Development Control Officer

Tel: (0118) 974 6442 (Direct Line)
Fax: (0118) 974 6484
Email: Julia.Mountford@wokingham.gov.uk
Date: 01 September 2003
My ref: JM/BP/71493/Earley
Your ref:

Mr Pring
26 Easby Way
Lower Earley
Reading
Berkshire
RG6 3XA

Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
P.O. Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR
Tel: (0118) 974 6000
Fax: (0118) 974 6486
Minicom No: (0118) 974 6991
DX: 33506 – Wokingham

Dear Mr Pring

PROPOSED ALTERATION TO APPLICATION F/2002/7228, 145 HILMANTON, LOWER EARLEY

I refer to your letter and drawing number 03/436/10 received by the Local Planning Authority on the 28 July with reference to the above. I confirm that the reduction in the massing of the roof as shown on drawing 03/436/10 would be acceptable and a new planning application will not be required.

Should you require any further information, please contact Julia Mountford on the above direct dial number.

Yours sincerely,

B POLNIK (MRS)
Principal Development Control Officer

* pre-app attached *

Application Number : F/2002/7228	**Map No :** 65
Case Officer : PT	**Site Area :** 0 05
Valid Date : 26.7.02	**Received Date: 26/07/2002**

Level : Delegated Application

Description : Proposed two storey front extension to dwelling and single storey rear extension .

Location : 145, Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading.

Parish : EA **Ward : RED** 1.8 02 B

Applicant : Mr G Cox C/O Chamberlain Syrad Architecture.

Fee Required: £110 **Fee Received: £110** (4)

Additional: ..... or Refund: .....

Enforcement Section to be notified ☐ (tick if required)

Additional information required for validation;

REASON	NOTES	DATE REQ	DATE RECD
LOCATION PLANS			
BLOCK PLANS	Development needs highlighting + red line on one. - Parking?		
FORMS UNSIGNED			
S.66 MISSING/INCORRECT/ UNSIGNED			
ELEVATION PLANS			
FLOOR PLANS			
NO SCALE OR SCALE IS IMPERIAL			
ENCROACHMENT LETTER REQUIRED			
OTHER			

Is the site in a Conservation Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No If "Yes" which one _____

Is the site a Listed Building: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Is a Statutory Advertisement required: ☐ Yes ☐ No

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Building Control

Heritage (Harold Sanders)

Landscape

Trees

● Environmental Health

Housing

Leisure & Cultural Services

Public Rights of Way Officer

Property

Policy & Plans

Joint Strategic Planning Unit

Archaeological Officer (BABTIE)

Education

Social Services

● Highways

EXTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

Adjacent DPA : _____

Adjacent Parish : _____

SEB

British Gas

Oil pipeline

Transco

Environment Agency

Railtrack

Police Arch Officer

HERITAGE BODIES

Victorian Society
The Georgian Group
Ancient Monuments Society
Council for British Arch
RCHME
NRPB (Telecommunications)
Sport England
Society for Proct' of Ancient Bldgs
English Heritage

OTHERS

* Pre-app attached *

NEIGHBOURS

I.S.I.N. + see map

Organisation_Name	Building_Name	address1	Postcode
		19HILMANTONREADING	RG6 4HN
		93HILMANTONREADING	RG6 4HN
		94HILMANTONREADING	RG6 4HN
		144HILMANTONREADING	RG6 4HJ
		145HILMANTONREADING	RG6 4HJ
		146HILMANTONREADING	RG6 4HJ
		147HILMANTONREADING	RG6 4HJ
		148HILMANTONREADING	RG6 4HJ
		149HILMANTONREADING	RG6 4HJ

WORK SHEET FOR : Phillip Taylor

Application Number : F/2002/7228

Applicant : Mr G Cox C/O Chamberlain Syrad Architecture.

Location : 145, Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading.
Proposal : Proposed two storey front extension to dwelling and single storey rear extension .

Site Notice Displayed ? :

YES	NO	DATE
✓		3/09

Date of Neighbour Notifications : .....

Date of Site Visit : 7th Sept.

Date Registered : 26/07/2002

Earliest Date for Decision : 24/08/2002

Latest Consultation Date/Site Notice Expiry Date : 24/08/2002

This application will have expired on: 20/09/2002. You need to make a decision 1 day prior to this date for this application to count as determined in less than 8 weeks.

Consultation Responses :

Nghbr comments - objections on grounds of overlooking and comments in relation to noise and parking.
Ear Town Council -
Thames

Planning Issues :

1. Impact on character of the area
2. Nghbrg Properties

Policy LBE1, LBE2
WOS3, WBE1
LD3, ENI

Application Number: F/2002/7228

Appraisal :

The proposal is for a ~~first floor~~ two storey and s/s front extension and single storey rear extension. The dwelling is a large detached house sit on a corner plot within identified settlement.

The two storey element would be built adjacent to an exist two storey front projection above the garages. The roof of this part of the house would be replaced with a higher hipped and pitched roof. The extension is not considered to have any adverse impacts on neighbouring properties because there are no side windows in No 144. However in terms of sheetbeam, the extension would form a dominant and obtuse feature by nature of the higher roof above the garages. The location of the dwelling on the close excentricates the bulk of the extension. For this reason the application should be refused.

The single storey element will have no impact on the adjacent neighbour and will have no impact on sheetbeam.

4 car parking spaces would be available which is considered acceptable.

Recomendation : Approval: ☐ **Refusal:** ☑
(tick appropriate box)

Application Number F/2002/7228
Conditions/Reasons for Refusal

No	Std Con	Std Reas	Non Std Conditions / Reasons for Refusal
			The proposed two story front extension
			by reason of its design, bulk ~~[illegible]~~ size
			and location on the dwelling
			would form an obtrusive and
			dominating feature in the streetscene to
			the detriment of the character of the area.
			As such it is contrary to policy
			EN1 of the BSP, policies LBE1, LBE2 &
			LALP and policies WBE1 and WOS3 of
			the WDLP (dd).

Informative for approvals	
N16	
LODDON AREA LOCAL PLAN POLICIES:	LBE1, LBE2
SOUTH-EAST AREA LOCAL PLAN POLICIES:	
WOKINGHAM DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN POLICIES:	WOS3, WBE1
GREEN BELT LOCAL PLAN POLICIES:	
BERKSHIRE STRUCTURE PLAN POLICIES:	~~LD2~~, EW1
MINERALS LOCAL PLAN POLICIES:	

RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS/REASONS AGREED: T E Watson
(Development Control Manager)

Date: 11/9/02

RECORD OF SITE VISIT

SITE ADDRESS: 145 Hilmanton Lower Earley Reading. APPLICATION NUMBER: F/2002/7228	OFFICER: Phillip Taylor DATE OF SITE VISIT: 3/09

1 SITE/STATUTORY NOTICE DISPLAYED ? Yes

2. DESCRIPTION OF SURROUNDINGS residential
[illegible]

3. DESCRIPTION OF SITE/BUILDING [illegible] detached [illegible]
gage + 1st floor [illegible] level [illegible]
[illegible] of 144 roof hips [illegible]

4. RELATIONSHIP TO ADJOINING PROPERTIES 146 set [illegible] back
roof line of 146 lower in any case above gage bedroom with [illegible]



5. SITE CONSTRAINTS

TREES

ACCESS/PARKING

LEVELS

BOUNDARY TREATMENT

OTHERS

Sheetbrown existing projection
makes impact

S/S near no constraints.

Check 45° to bedroom ①

PLANNING APPLICATION COMMENTS SHEET
FOR F/2002/7228. (Case Officer:Phillip Taylor)

PLEASE NOTE THAT **ALL** COMMENTS SUBMITTED ARE OPEN TO PUBLIC VIEW, **THIS INCLUDES THE APPLICANT.**

[illegible]VICES	HPT
POL	TLS
	ENF
APP	
GS	

WOKINGHAM UNITARY
Aiming for Excellence

locality; 22 AUG 2002

COPIES TO ✓ 2218

THINGS WE **CAN** TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION WHEN DETERMINING A PLANNING APPLICATION;
DESIGN, APPEARANCE AND LAYOUT.
HIGHWAY SAFETY.
RESIDENTIAL AMENITY (loss of attractive features within the e.g. parks or woodland).
LOSS OF LIGHT.
OVERSHADOWING/OVERLOOKING (loss of privacy).
NOISE, DISTURBANCE, SMELL etc ONCE THE DEVELOPMENT IS IN USE (e.g. from a proposed restaurant, takeaway, public house or industrial unit).

THINGS WE **CAN'T** TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION WHEN DETERMINING A PLANNING APPLICATION;
PRIVATE PROPERTY ISSUES, FOR EXAMPLE BOUNDARY AND ACCESS DISPUTES.
LOSS OF VIEW OVER OTHER LAND.
EFFECT ON PROPERTY VALUES.
POTENTIAL INCONVENIENCE, NOISE AND DISTURBANCE CAUSED BY CONSTRUCTION WORKS.
MATTERS COVERED BY OTHER LAWS (e.g. alcohol, betting, restaurant, music licensing).
MATTERS SUBJECT TO MARKET COMPETITION (we can't refuse an application on the basis that its approval would harm other commercial activity of a similar nature in the area).
THE SPECULATIVE USE OF A DEVELOPMENT AFTER IT HAS BEEN BUILT.
RADIO OR TELEVISION INTERFERENCE CAUSED BY A DEVELOPMENT.
SUBSIDENCE TO NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES.

COMMENTS ON APPLICATION: F/2002/7228

YOUR NAME: Andrew Townley-Freeman

YOUR ADDRESS: (if these details are incorrect please amend)
19 HILMANTON
LOWER EARLEY
READING
RG6 4HN

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO:

Environmental Services Department,
Planning Services
P.O. Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR

I WISH TO (tick relevant box); OBJECT TO THE APPLICATION ☐
SUPPORT THE APPLICATION ☐ COMMENT ON THE APPLICATION ☑

Comments:
I have no specific objections to the plans however, I do have concerns. The house is already very large and this will make it even bigger. I can't see the need to extend the lounge at all. However these are my main concerns:-

1) Noise. Prior to the application there was regular and intrusive playing of music, and there is a drum kit used and I am concerned that the extended area may be used to provide more permanent musical facilities, thus increasing the noise

Continue over the page if more room required

PTO

2) The occupants regularly park two trade vehicles and two cars at the property, frequently using the front garden as "extra" parking space. If the garden area is reduced this would result in them having to park elsewhere, poss. bly on the busy street.

148,Hilmanton,
Lower Earley,
READING.
Berks.
RG6 4HJ.

OBS

PLANNING SERVICES	HPT
POL	TLS
DC PT	ENF
APP	
CS	

14 AUG 2002

COPIES TO	ACK 15/8
	FILE:

Dear Sir,

Re- Planning ApplicationF/2002/7228

My wife and I had thought it almost certain we would object to the above proposal at 145,Hilmanton. After all, 145 has the highest ridge around, and two of the several trees in its rear garden are even higher. The latter now take away an hour or so of quality evening sunlight from our garden and patio for about four months of the year as the sun waxes and wanes to and from the West.There remains a small triangle of unaffected sunlight between theses trees and the sloping gable end of 145's roof. Any incursion by an altered roof line into this triangle would have been the last straw for us.

No. 144 are even worse affected losing sunlight most of the day but have only recently moved in or maybe like shade.No.149 is also badly shaded from about lunchtime,but is empty as owners have just moved out.A third tree on the Southern boundary of 145 is now beginning to obstruct sunlight to us in the triangle between 146 and 145. Fortunately the row of conifers directly between 145 and us at 148 have been trimmed to a reasonable height of about 10feet.

We have,however examined the plans and no alteration to roof line seems proposed.To this extent we are mollified.The only other effect is that the plethora of dustbins kept near their animals in the rear garden will possibly move nearer to us when the rear extension is complete.

All in all,we would like our sunlight back but the trees will have to shrink to achieve this.

Yours Faithfully,

D Watson

09/09/2002

Cc 145,
Earley T C.

PLANNING APPLICATION COMMENTS SHEET
FOR F/2002/7228. (Case Officer:Phillip Taylor)

PLEASE NOTE THAT **ALL** COMMENTS SUBMITTED ARE OPEN TO PUBLIC VIEW, **THIS INCLUDES THE APPLICANT.**

WOKINGHAM UNITARY
Aiming for Excellence

THINGS WE **CAN** TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION WHEN DETERMINING A PLANNING APPLICATION;
DESIGN, APPEARANCE AND LAYOUT.
HIGHWAY SAFETY.
RESIDENTIAL AMENITY (loss of attractive features within the locality, e.g. parks or woodland).
LOSS OF LIGHT.
OVERSHADOWING/OVERLOOKING (loss of privacy).
NOISE, DISTURBANCE, SMELL etc ONCE THE DEVELOPMENT IS IN USE (e.g. from a proposed restaurant, takeaway, public house or industrial unit).

PLANNING SERVICES	HPT
POL	TLS
DC PT	ENF
APP	

13 AUG 2002

15/8

THINGS WE **CAN'T** TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION WHEN DETERMINING A PLANNING APPLICATION;
~~PRIVATE PROPERTY ISSUES, FOR EXAMPLE BOUNDARY AND~~ ACCESS DISPUTES.
LOSS OF VIEW OVER OTHER LAND.
EFFECT ON PROPERTY VALUES.
POTENTIAL INCONVENIENCE, NOISE AND DISTURBANCE CAUSED BY CONSTRUCTION WORKS.
MATTERS COVERED BY OTHER LAWS (e.g. alcohol, betting, restaurant, music licensing).
MATTERS SUBJECT TO MARKET COMPETITION (we can't refuse an application on the basis that its approval would harm other commercial activity of a similar nature in the area).
THE SPECULATIVE USE OF A DEVELOPMENT AFTER IT HAS BEEN BUILT.
RADIO OR TELEVISION INTERFERENCE CAUSED BY A DEVELOPMENT.
SUBSIDENCE TO NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES.

COMMENTS ON APPLICATION: F/2002/7228

YOUR NAME: Mr J.P. PAWA.

YOUR ADDRESS: (if these details are incorrect please amend)
144 HILMANTON
LOWER EARLEY
READING
RG6 4HJ

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO:

Environmental Services Department,
Planning Services
P.O. Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR

I WISH TO (tick relevant box); OBJECT TO THE APPLICATION ☑
SUPPORT THE APPLICATION ☐ COMMENT ON THE APPLICATION ☐

Comments: From the front of both properties it looks fine but, from the rear of 144 Hilmanton this design will have a significant impact on sunlight especially during autumn/winter/spring. From the side of 144 Hilmanton this design will greatly "overshadow" and reduce natural light in both the side walkway and also the extension at the rear of 144.
Overall little consideration has been given to the design - if viewed from the rear of 144 and is made worse by the angle of the boundaries.

Continue over the page if more room required

SBB

PLANNING SERVICES	HPT
POL	TLS
DC PT	ENF
APP	
CS	
12 AUG 2002	
COPIES TO	ACK 15/8

143 Hilmanton
Lower Earley
Reading
RG6 4HJ

8th August 2002

Phillip Taylor
PO BOX 157
Wokingham District Council
Shute End
Wokingham
RG40 1WR

Dear Sir

REF: Planning Application No. F2002 / 7228

It is with some concern that I write to you with regard to the two story front extension proposed at No. 145 Hilmanton, Lower Earley.

At the present time the front garden and driveway is being used to garage a number of vehicles, private aswell as commercial vans. (The latter bears the logo of Berkshire Carpets.)

If this large extension proceeds I feel the vehicles will ultimately be parked in the carriageway causing inconvenience to other house holders, restrict access to vehicles and in particular any emergency service that maybe required and also cause danger to children who play in the area.

I have no objection to the single storey rear extension proposed on the same order.

Yours faithfully,

Mr D R F Newell

c.c. ***Earley Town Council***

**********FILE COPY**********

Tel: (0118) 974 6442

Date: 01 August 2002

My ref: F/2002/7228

WOKINGHAM UNITARY
Aiming for Excellence

Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
P.O. Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR
Tel: (0118) 974 6000
Fax: (0118) 974 6484
Minicom No: (0118) 974 6991
DX: 33506 – Wokingham

Councillor A Spratling
18 Moor Copse Close
Earley
RG6 7NA

Dear Councillor

Application Number: F/2002/7228
145, Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading.
Proposed two storey front extension to dwelling and single storey rear extension .

I write to let you know that the above mentioned application has been received.

At this stage a recommendation has not yet been made. This form should only be returned if it is likely that you might wish for the application to be listed for consideration by the Development Control Committee. This form must be received no later than 28 days from the date of this letter.

If you have concerns about the proposals it may be possible for these to be addressed during the consideration of the application. In these circumstances it would be helpful if you could discuss these with the case officer **Phillip Taylor** on **(0118) 974 6442** in the first instance.

Yours sincerely
Trevor Watson
Development Control Manager

LISTING FORM
Case officer: **Phillip Taylor** Application Number: **F/2002/7228**
145, Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading.
Proposed two storey front extension to dwelling and single storey rear extension .
I wish this application to be listed should the officers recommendation be for: GRANT/REFUSAL and my reasons are:

_____

_____

Should the officers recommendation be in accordance with my views I am happy for the application to be determined under delegated powers. YES/NO

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Councillor A Spratling

**********FILE COPY**********

**********FILE COPY**********

Tel: (0118) 974 6442

Date: 01 August 2002

My ref: F/2002/7228

WOKINGHAM UNITARY
Aiming for Excellence

Councillor F Rolls
14 Tiptree Close
Earley
RG6 4HS

Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
P.O. Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR
Tel: (0118) 974 6000
Fax: (0118) 974 6484
Minicom No: (0118) 974 6991
DX: 33506 – Wokingham

Dear Councillor

Application Number: F/2002/7228
145, Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading.
Proposed two storey front extension to dwelling and single storey rear extension .

I write to let you know that the above mentioned application has been received.

At this stage a recommendation has not yet been made. This form should only be returned if it is likely that you might wish for the application to be listed for consideration by the Development Control Committee. This form must be received no later than 28 days from the date of this letter.

If you have concerns about the proposals it may be possible for these to be addressed during the consideration of the application. In these circumstances it would be helpful if you could discuss these with the case officer **Phillip Taylor** on **(0118) 974 6442** in the first instance.

Yours sincerely
Trevor Watson
Development Control Manager

LISTING FORM
Case officer: **Phillip Taylor** Application Number: **F/2002/7228**
145, Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading.
Proposed two storey front extension to dwelling and single storey rear extension .
I wish this application to be listed should the officers recommendation be for: GRANT/REFUSAL and my reasons are:

_____

_____

Should the officers recommendation be in accordance with my views I am happy for the application to be determined under delegated powers. YES/NO

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Councillor F Rolls

**********FILE COPY**********

**********FILE COPY**********

Tel: (0118) 974 6442

Date: 01 August 2002

My ref: F/2002/7228

WOKINGHAM UNITARY
Aiming for Excellence

Environmental Services Department
Planning Services
P.O. Box 157
Shute End, Wokingham
Berkshire RG40 1WR
Tel: (0118) 974 6000
Fax: (0118) 974 6484
Minicom No: (0118) 974 6991
DX: 33506 – Wokingham

Councillor D Hare
9 Easby Way
Lower Earley
RG6 3XA

Dear Councillor

Application Number: F/2002/7228
145, Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading.
Proposed two storey front extension to dwelling and single storey rear extension .

I write to let you know that the above mentioned application has been received.

At this stage a recommendation has not yet been made. This form should only be returned if it is likely that you might wish for the application to be listed for consideration by the Development Control Committee. This form must be received no later than 28 days from the date of this letter.

If you have concerns about the proposals it may be possible for these to be addressed during the consideration of the application. In these circumstances it would be helpful if you could discuss these with the case officer **Phillip Taylor** on **(0118) 974 6442** in the first instance.

Yours sincerely
Trevor Watson
Development Control Manager

LISTING FORM
Case officer: **Phillip Taylor** Application Number: **F/2002/7228**
145, Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading.
Proposed two storey front extension to dwelling and single storey rear extension .
I wish this application to be listed should the officers recommendation be for: GRANT/REFUSAL and my reasons are:

_____

_____

Should the officers recommendation be in accordance with my views I am happy for the application to be determined under delegated powers. YES/NO

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Councillor D Hare

**********FILE COPY**********

Received by Wokingham District Council

Application No: F/2002/7228

PROPOSAL:
Proposed two storey front extension to dwelling and single storey rear extension .

LOCATION:
145, Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading.

The application is available for inspection at the locations & during the times detailed below:

WOKINGHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL, PLANNING RECEPTION, SHUTE END, WOKINGHAM between 8.30 - 5.00 Monday - Thursday & 8.30 - 4.00 Friday. (TEL: (0118) 974 6428)
OR
WOODLEY LIBRARY, HEADLEY ROAD, WOODLEY between 9.30am - 7.00pm Mon, Thurs & Fri. 9.30am - 5.00pm Tues, 9.30am - 1.00pm Saturday and 1.00pm - 4.00pm Sunday. (closed all day Wednesday). If you intend to view this application at Woodley Library please allow 4 days from the date of this letter for delivery of plans and remember to quote application number F/2002/7228 to enable the library staff to locate the correct information.
OR
EARLEY TOWN COUNCIL, RADSTOCK HOUSE, RADSTOCK LANE, EARLEY between 9.00am – 1.00pm & 2.00pm – 4.30pm Monday to Friday. (TEL: (0118) 986 8995)

Comments should be sent in writing QUOTING THE APPLICATION NUMBER to the Case Officer Phillip Taylor P.O. Box 157 Council Offices, Shute End, Wokingham Berkshire, RG40 1WR to arrive on or before 24/08/2002. Written comments submitted will become available for public inspection.

In view of the very large number of planning applications and letters of comment received, it will not be possible for an individual reply to be issued to observations made. However any comments will be taken into account when the application is determined and you will be notified of the decision.

Trevor Watson
Development Control Manager
01 August 2002

26 JUL 2002

7228

CHAMBERLAIN SYRAD ARCHITECTURE

SNOOK HOUSE, 66 TILEHURST ROAD, READING. RG30 2JH
TEL: 0118 939 4554

26.JUL.2002 7228

Planning Services
Wokingham District Council
PO Box 157
Shute End
Wokingham
RG40 1WR

2377.04

25 July 2002

Dear Sirs

RE; 145 HILMANTON, LOWER EARLEY, READING RG6 4HJ

I enclose a planning application for a two storey front extension and single storey rear extension to 145 Hilmanton.

The property has five existing bedrooms, the main bedrooms are to the rear and two very small bedrooms are at the front. The purpose of the front extension is to convert the existing two small rooms into one and replace the lost bedroom to accommodate Mr Cox's four teenage children.

The design of the extension is intended to match the style of the original and should not have any impact on the neighbouring houses.

If you need any further information, please contact me and thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely

David Syrad

STEPHEN CHAMBERLAIN
Development Designer

DAVID SYRAD D.Arch (Kingston) RIBA
Chartered Architect

Environmental Services

For office use only. Application number: 26.JUL.2002 7228

26 JUL 2002

Householder planning application form

WOKINGHAM UNITARY
Aiming for Excellence

Please answer all questions in CAPITAL letters.
If any question does not apply to you, put N/A in the space.
Please send six copies of the filled in form and your plans to the address on the front of the folder.
We provide guidance notes to help you fill in the form. If you have any questions, please call Planning Support on 0118 974 6428 or 0118 974 6429.

1	Your name Address and postcode Phone number	MR G COX 145 HILMANTON LOWER EARLEY READING RG6 4HJ
2	Agent's Name Address and postcode Phone number	CHAMBERLAIN SYRAD ARCHITECTURE 66 TILEHURST ROAD READING RG30 2JH 0118 939 4554
3	Site We need you to send in six copies of the 1:2500 scale location plan and six copies of the 1:500 scale block plan, with the site outlined in red. You can buy these maps from the Environmental Services reception or order them by phoning 0118 974 6485.	145 HILMANTON LOWER EARLEY READING.
4	Give brief details of the proposal for example, two storey side extension.	About the application TWO STOREY FRONT EXTENSION SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION
5	Are there any trees on the site? If Yes, please show their positions, spread and species of the trees on the plans. Say which trees you plan to cut down.	Yes ☐ No ☑
6	Please list the external materials you will use for example, red brick to match any existing bricks and dark stained timber.	BRICK & STAINED TIMBER + ROOF TILES, ALL TO MATCH EXISTING
7	Will the proposal change the pedestrian or vehicle access to the site? Please show details of the existing access and any proposed changes on the plans.	Yes ☐ No ☑
8	Will the car parking provision at the site be changed? If Yes, please show details of any changes on the plans.	Yes ☐ No ☑

Crystal Mark
Clarity approved by Plain English Campaign

Please turn over

9	How many bedrooms does the property have?	Existing: 5	Proposed: 5
10	Does a public right of way touch the site? If yes, please show the route and any proposed alternative on the plans.	Yes ☐	No ☑
11	Checklist. Please make sure that you enclose the following.		
	a Six copies of this form signed and dated.		
	b The fee (We have attached a current scale of fees). If you do not have to pay a fee, please say why below.		
	c Six copies of each set of plans and drawings listed below.		
	• 1:2500 scale location plan with the site outlined in red.		
	• 1:500 scale site layout plan.		
	• 1:100 or 1:200 scale floor plans and elevations.		

12 Certificate of ownership (Section 66 Town & Country Planning Act 1990)
Please delete either certificate A or certificate B. If neither apply, you must fill in a full certificate which you can get from Environmental Services.

(Owner means a person with a freehold interest, or someone who is a leasehold tenant with at least seven years left on their agreement)

Certificate A

I certify that

- At the beginning of the period of 21 days ending with the date of the application nobody, except the applicant, owned any part of the land which the application relates to.
- None of the land forms part of an agricultural holding.

Certificate B

I certify that

- I or the applicant has given the necessary notice to everyone else who (at the beginning of the period of 21 days ending with the date of the application) owned any part of the land which the application relates to as listed below.

Owner's name	Address at which the notice was served	Date on which the notice was served

~~None of the land forms part of an agricultural holding.~~

Your signature: [signature] on behalf of Mr & Mrs Cox

Date 25.7.02

Please tick this box if you or your husband, wife or partner are employed by Wokingham District Council ☐

1764

MASTER CARD FOR HILMANTON

E.

ADDRESS

PARISH EARLEY

PLOT No. AREA II LOWER EARLEY

ORD. SHEET No. SU 7369 65

BUILDER

Plan No.	Applicant	Description of Development	Date of Decision	Decision
1764/73				
01945 -				
04557 -		o/l		R
07235/91				
25064	BOVIS HOMES 28457	SHOWHOUSE / OFFICE	24.2.86	GA
	130460	DISPLAY UNIT		
	324	COMPOUND		
42564				

DATE OF COMPLETION

MINISTRY DECISION

SPECIAL ORDERS TPO 253/84

DRAINAGE

1764

ADDRESS 145 HILMANTON

PARISH EARLEY

PLOT No. 15 AREA II LOWER EARLEY

ORD. SHEET No. SU7369(65

BUILDER

Plan No.	Applicant	Description of Development	Date of Decision	Decision
23554	BOVIS	DET. HOUSE & GARAGE	18/7/85	
BR 25234	"	" " "	19/3/86	APP
F/2002/7228	Mr. G. Cox	2St/F+S/St/R Ext.		

DATE OF COMPLETION

MINISTRY DECISION

SPECIAL ORDERS Pre app - 2/st front ext - Miss Bouton 20.2.02

DRAINAGE

9