

## DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

**Ward:** Church

**App Ref:** 231110/HOU

**Address:** 25 Cressingham Road, Reading, RG2 7RT

**Proposals:** Part two storey, part single storey rear extension and separate single storey garage/workshop in rear garden.

**Case Officer:** Sian Hickey

**Applicant:** Mr Andrew Piper

**Date received (valid from):** 7 August 2023

**Agreed decision date (ext):** 7th November 2023

### 1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two storey detached residential property located on the southern side of Cressingham Road. The property has a detached single garage located at the front. The property is not a Listed Building, nor does it fall within a Conservation Area. The surrounding area is predominantly residential consisting of a variety of house styles and sizes.

**Site visit date:** 23/08/2023

**Site visit photos:**



### 2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Planning permission is sought for a part two storey and part single storey rear extension and a separate single storey outbuilding in the rear garden to facilitate a garage/store. The ground floor element of the rear extension would have a width of 8.2m and a depth of 6.3m. The first floor element would have a width of 4.4m and a depth of 5.1m. The proposed outbuilding would measure 8m by 5.10m. The outbuilding would have a pitched roof continuing over a veranda at the rear.



### Plans considered

Location Plan received 7<sup>th</sup> August 2023

Drawing No.135-01 - Existing Floor Plans received 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023

Drawing No.135-02 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan received 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023

Drawing No.135-03 - Proposed First Floor Plan received 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023

Drawing No.135-04 - Existing Eastern and Northern Elevations received 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023

Drawing No.135-05 - Existing Western and Southern Elevations received 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023

Drawing No.135-06 - Proposed Eastern Elevation received 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023

Drawing No.135-07 - Proposed Northern Elevation received 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023

Drawing No.135-08 - Proposed Western Elevation received 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023

Drawing No.135-09 - Proposed Southern Elevation received 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023

Drawing No.135-10 - Existing Roof Plan received 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023

Drawing No.135-11 - Proposed Roof Plan received 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023

Proposed Block Plan received 18<sup>th</sup> September 2023

### 3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

### 4. CONSULTATIONS

#### Ecology

*The application site comprises a large, detached house that may have features potentially suitable for roosting bats. It is proposed to erect a two-storey extension at the side and rear of the house. The site is on a designated green link as per policy EN12 with an area of woodland to the adjacent to the rear of the site. Given the location of the house, and the extent of the works, there is a risk that the proposals may affect roosting bats and a bat survey report will need to be provided before this application can be determined.*

Further to the comments above, a bat survey was received and additional comments below were received from Ecology.

*The bat survey (Species Ecological Consultancy, September 2023, Final Report) provides the result of two emergence / re entry surveys carried out in August-September 2023. No bats were seen to emerge or return to the building and the report concludes that the risk of bats being affected by the proposals is minimal. Therefore, there are no objections to this application on ecology grounds.*

### **Transport**

*There is no impact on the highway or changes in parking provision as the garage is to be retained and aerial images confirm there is additional parking on the front drive. No changes are proposed to the existing vehicle access.*

### **Berkshire Archaeology**

*Thank you for consulting Berkshire Archaeology regarding the above application. Berkshire Archaeology is part of Reading Borough Council's Museum and Town Hall Services and provides historic environment advice to the five unitary authorities of Bracknell Forest Council, Reading Borough Council, Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, Slough Borough Council and Wokingham Borough Council. This response relates solely to buried archaeological heritage, the Council's Conservation Officer should be consulted for any matters relating to the historic built environment.*

*There are potential archaeological implications with this proposed development as demonstrated by Berkshire Archaeology's Historic Environment Record. The site is located close to a known Late Iron Age and Roman site at no.29 that revealed ditches and evidence of occupation. It is also c.220m south of another site of similar date beneath what is now Stansfield Close and adjacent buildings. There is strong evidence for widespread settlement on the gravel ridge overlooking the Kennet and Thames during the Iron Age and Roman period including stray finds from gardens and artefacts located in previous works.*

*Although this is not a largescale development, the garden of the plot seems never previously to have been developed and is therefore undisturbed. As the construction is quite a substantial addition to the building and includes an additional freestanding building within the garden space there is potential to impact undisturbed archaeology.*

*As shown, the application site falls within an area of archaeological significance and archaeological remains may be damaged by ground disturbance for the proposed development. It is therefore recommended that a condition is applied, should permission be granted, in order to mitigate the impacts of development. This is in accordance with Paragraph 205 of the NPPF(2021) which states that local planning authorities should 'require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible'.*

**Planning Officer Note:** Further to the above comments, a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) was provided by the applicant 12<sup>th</sup> September 2023 and the Archaeology officer confirmed this was satisfactory. A condition is attached to this permission to ensure the proposed development shall take place in accordance with the approved WSI, and the development must not be occupied until the post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

### **RBC Natural Environment**

*The Tree Survey & Arboricultural Impact Assessment Ref. Q-10212 by ProHort Ltd dated 20<sup>th</sup> September 2023 shows the proposals are outside of the Root Protection Areas of all existing trees. All trees will be retained and no tree works are proposed except for severing Ivy on one Ash tree, all of which is positive.*

*However, construction site activities and some landscaping works (page 22 in the AIA and Ms Piper's e-mail of 22 September 2023 refer to landscaping works) may affect the soil within the RPA of the retained trees. To mitigate the risk of damaging the roots or compacting the soil within the RPA, a specific Arb Method Statement, accompanied by a Tree Protection Plan, should be submitted to*

*address this. Tree protection fencing and ground protection (where the RPA cannot be entirely enclosed with fencing) should be detailed by the AMS and TPP.*

*In addition, following the references to landscaping works mentioned above, the AMS should also address methods of carrying out the landscaping works within the RPAs of the trees. Last but not least, the TPP should accurately show the location of T4 Oak - currently shown within the site boundary by the Tree Constraints Plan but outside the boundary in the Tree Survey Photographs. If you do not expect any future submissions before the decision, we can secure these via condition L7.*

*Given the references to landscaping works (page 22 in the AIA and Ms Piper's e-mail of 22 September 2023 refer to landscaping works), and if you consider it appropriate for the scale of the proposals, a landscaping condition should be attached to secure details for the proposed landscaping. Condition L1 should suffice.*

*In conclusion, as the AIA demonstrates in principle that proposals cause no harm to existing trees, the application is supported in terms of trees subject to condition L7 to secure a site specific AMS and TPP.*

**Planning Officer Note:** Further to the above comments, the applicant provided a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) and Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2023 and the Natural Environment Officer confirmed this was satisfactory and it negates the need for a pre-commencement condition. A condition is attached to this permission to ensure the protective measures, including fencing and working procedures shall be carried out in accordance with the TPP and AMS.

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

6 Monksbarn, Reading, Berkshire, RG2 7RP  
7 Maple Gardens, Reading, Berkshire, RG2 7NB  
8 Maple Gardens, Reading, Berkshire, RG2 7NB  
2 Monksbarn, Reading, Berkshire, RG2 7RP  
23 Cressingham Road, Reading, RG2 7RT  
1 Monksbarn, Reading, RG2 7RP  
4 Monksbarn, Reading, RG2 7RP  
6 Maple Gardens, Reading, RG2 7NB  
7 Monksbarn, Reading, RG2 7RP  
8 Monksbarn, Reading, RG2 7RP

Letters of representation have been received as follows: One

Concerns were raised from the neighbouring children's home with regards to noise from the proposed outbuilding and potential overlooking.

The amended plans addressed this concern and is referred to below.

#### **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

National Planning Practice Guidance

### **Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)**

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

TR3 (Access Traffic and Highway-related Matters)

TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking)

EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network)

EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodlands)

### **SPD**

Design Guide to House Extensions SPD 2021

Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD 2011

## **6. APPRAISAL**

### **Character and Appearance**

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

The proposed extension is considered to be respectful to the host dwelling in terms of design and materials; materials are set to match those of the existing. The proposed extension is considered proportionate to the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposed two storey element of the rear extension would have a pitched roof which would be set down from the ridgeline of the main roof. Although the proposed extension exceeds the 4m guidance provided within the Reading Borough Council Design Guide to House Extensions, it is considered the plot is capable of taking an extension of this size. The proposals are at the rear of the property, therefore causing minimal risk to streetscape. There are a variety of extensions and outbuildings within the surrounding area, therefore the proposals are not considered out of character. As such, the proposed rear extension and outbuilding are compliant with policies CC7 & H9 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019).

### **Residential Amenity**

Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not result in an overbearing impact on neighbours. Policy H10 seeks to ensure that the amenity of gardens and other outdoor areas are not compromised. Policy CC8 states an extension to a house will be acceptable where it will not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties.

The proposal's design situates the outbuilding and the two-storey aspect of the rear extension away from adjacent neighbouring property of 23 Cressingham Road. Furthermore, there is a

sufficient distance between the application dwelling and this neighbouring property. Therefore, there are no identified risks of the proposed development causing any additional harm to this neighbouring property in terms of visual dominance and overbearing effects, or access to sunlight and daylight. With regards to privacy and overlooking, the proposed first floor side facing window in the eastern elevation is to be obscure glazed. This will be secured by a condition attached to this permission.

With regards to the adjacent property to the east, 1 Monks Barn, this site is occupied by a Children's Home. The proposed rear extension is set away from the side boundary with 1 Monks Barn by approximately 3.4m and therefore there are no identified risks of the extension appearing overbearing. With regards to overlooking, there are no first floor side facing windows in the proposed elevation facing the children's home and the views from the rear facing window would not be significantly different to that of the existing. Concerns were raised with regards to the proposed outbuilding and the noise it would generate as the outbuilding was originally labelled as a 'workshop' on the plans. However, the applicant confirmed the outbuilding would be used for storage and it was re-labelled on the plan as 'garage/store' to avoid confusion. Although the outbuilding is large in scale, it has a fairly modest eaves height of 2.3m with a pitched roof. The pitch of the roof angles away from the boundary to reduce the impact to this neighbour. The application site has a large rear garden and the amount of remaining amenity space is considered acceptable.

Overall, the proposal is compliant with policies CC8 & H9 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019).

## **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 - GRANT**

Recommended Conditions:

Time limit

Materials

Approved plans

Obscure glazing

Archaeology part 2

Arboriculture Method Statement