

---

### Statement of Consultation

The draft Supplementary Planning Guidance on House Extensions was published for a four week consultation period from 30 April 2004 until 28 May 2004.

Over 550 consultees were contacted directly. These included some 480 local planning agents, all 62 parish and town councils, statutory and non-statutory consultees including neighbouring local authorities, the CPRE, The Environment Agency, The Countryside Agency and English Nature. In addition all consultees on the Council's Planning Policy electronic mailing list were informed of the consultation exercise.

Copies of the draft SPG were made available for inspection at the Council Offices at Market Street and at all public libraries in the district. The draft SPG was also available to view on the Council's web site.

Responses were received from 19 organisations and individuals:

1. Ashampstead Parish Council
2. Purley on Thames Parish Council
3. Cold Ash Parish Council
4. Thames Water Property Services
5. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
6. Martin F Winter
7. Tilehurst Parish Council
8. Thatcham Town Council
9. Holybrook Parish Council
10. Lambourn Parish Council
11. Theale Parish Council
12. Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council
13. Compton Parish Council
14. Bucklebury Parish Council
15. Pangbourne Parish Council
16. Dreweatt Neate
17. Colin Milsom
18. Dr J D Davies
19. Christopher Strang Associates

### Summary of Comments with Council's Response

Comment	Council's Response
<b>No Comment</b> (5, 9, 17,19 )	
<b>General Comments</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ General support and favourable comments (2, 7, 8 ,10, 12, 13, 14, 15)</li> </ul>	Support noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Draft SPG does not consider the desirability of extensions – effect on affordability (1)</li> </ul>	This issue is outside the scope of this SPG, which is primarily concerned with design rather than social issues. No

	amendment proposed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sections dealing with road safety, historic buildings and protected species should include references to the planning policies in the Local Plan (3).</li> </ul>	These sections are intended as supplementary guidance to the policies in the Local Plan and therefore reference to the policies will be made in Section 11.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Would be improved by adding detailed list of references for documents mentioned (11)</li> </ul>	This has been added at the end of the guidance
<p><b>Comments on 'Tip' Boxes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Would like references to Village Design Statements strengthened – guidelines can help preserve the character of villages and should be seen as mandatory requirements (3)</li> </ul>	Village Design Statements are referred to in the text of Section 3 and in a 'Tip box'. The reference can be strengthened but Village Design Statements, though material considerations when adopted as SPG, cannot be seen as mandatory requirements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Suggest reference to building regulations be removed as not a planning issue (3)</li> </ul>	Building regulations are referred to in a 'Tip' box. The SPG is intended to be a useful document for householders contemplating extending their home and it is felt that the tips, though not all strictly planning issues, provide helpful advice to householders. No amendment proposed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In 'tip' on seeking advice the profession of building engineer should be added (6)</li> </ul>	This has been added to the tip on page 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The useful tip on energy efficiency could be extended to refer to water conservation in accordance with paragraph of RPG 9. Wording suggested (4)</li> </ul>	This wording has been added to the tip on energy efficiency.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Extensions tend to have disproportionately high heat losses which can be mitigated by design, siting and wall construction. Conversely these factors can improve solar gain. (18)</li> </ul>	It is considered that the content of the tip box on energy efficiency is sufficient for the purposes of this SPG. It is intended that a Supplementary Planning Document on Design and Sustainability be prepared as part of the Local Development Framework

<p><b>Comments on Character of Area</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The character of the area has not been a significant factor in the past and is something which will be taken into account in the Village Design Statement (15)</li> </ul>	<p>The character of the area is always taken into account in the determination of planning applications – Village Design Statements provide very helpful guidance. No amendment necessary</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Terracing is not always inappropriate, some roads are built with a mixture of house types. (15)</li> <li>▪ Advice on established pattern of development is generally sound but there may be exceptional circumstances which would require “rule” to be broken (15)</li> </ul>	<p>The introduction to the SPG states that the guidelines are not inflexible rules and that there may be cases where alternative approaches may be acceptable. No amendment proposed</p>
<p><b>Comments on Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Request that additional paragraphs in relation to sewerage infrastructure, development over public sewers and release of sewer atmosphere be included (4)</li> </ul>	<p>Issues relating to control of building over public sewers would be considered under the Building Regulations. It is not felt necessary to include details within this SPG..</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The purpose of dormers IS to provide additional floor space, although agree that very large dormers can dominate a neighbouring property , and a flat roof would be out of keeping in many instances.(15)</li> </ul>	<p>Dormers are a means of increasing headroom and providing light and ventilation to an existing roof space. No amendment necessary.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 1st paragraph line 3 should perhaps read “...does not <b>adversely</b> impact” as all building works are likely to have some impact.(15)</li> </ul>	<p>This amendment has been made.</p>
<p><b>Comments on The Effects on Neighbours</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The design and effect on neighbours can only be properly reviewed if sufficient information is provided with a planning application(15)</li> </ul>	<p>Applicants are requested to submit site plans which show the existing dwelling, outbuildings and neighbouring properties and also elevations showing building materials to be used. No amendment necessary</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Particular support for aims concerning overlooking and overshadowing (2)</li> </ul>	<p>Support noted</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Suggestion that height of extension be considered by requiring a 45 degree angle to be taken from the cill height on ground floor windows of a neighbouring property measured against the proposed elevation, not just</li> </ul>	<p>This can be complicated to work out and in a document aimed primarily at the householder it is felt adequate to retain the guidance as in the draft. The document does refer to the Building Research Establishment report “Site Layout and</p>

<p>the plan format. Plans would need to show adjoining buildings and fenestration to make sound planning judgement.(16)</p>	<p>Planning for Daylight and Sunlight”, which gives excellent guidance on these issues.</p>
<p><b>Comments on Car Parking Provision and Road Safety</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Residents are able to convert garages into other accommodation and/or use a front garden for parking. Highways should ensure that sufficient off road parking is still available and the impact on the street scene and effect of dropped kerbs on pedestrians should be considered.(15)</li> </ul>	<p>Conversion of garages and hard surfacing of front gardens would not normally require planning permission although there may be instances where conditions may be used to restrict use of a garage as an extra room.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Current parking standards make it virtually impossible to refuse application on those grounds. Guidelines give scope, particularly in relation to alteration of access (15)</li> </ul>	<p>Parking standards set out a maximum provision as required by PPG13. Road safety aspects remain an important consideration in assessing a planning application. No amendment necessary</p>
<p><b>Comments on Private Outdoor Space</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Would be helpful if guide figures for minimum garden or communal amenity areas are included in section 2 and 7 (15)</li> </ul>	<p>The guidance at present refers to SPG 4 Private Open Space for New Residential Development, although it should be noted that this document is now quite dated and that the guidance in the Government’s PPG3 needs also to be taken into account.</p>
<p><b>Comments on Granny Annexes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Granny annexes. Condition that a large annexe capable of being made into a separate dwelling would not normally be acceptable should not dictate that annexe has to be “of modest size”. Size should be determined on merit relative to the size of the property and the overall size of the plot. (15_)</li> </ul>	<p>Ancillary accommodation needs to be modest in relation to the property. The term “comparatively modest” has been substituted.</p>