

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Caversham Heights

App Ref: 230540/HOU

Address: 22 Morecambe Avenue, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7NL

Proposals: Single Storey Detached Garden Outbuilding

Case Officer: Mr Ryan Allen

Applicant: Michael Davies

Date received (valid from): 21 April 2023 **Target Decision date:** 12 September 2023

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

Site visit date: 18/05/23

The application site is a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse located on Morecambe Avenue, Caversham. The surrounding streetscene is primarily residential, comprises of properties that share design characteristics. The building itself is not listed, nor is it situated within a conservation area.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey, detached garden outbuilding to the rear of the property.

Plans considered:

Received 21/04/23

Drawing No: Arboricultural Impact Assessment rev. A - dated 03/23

Drawing No: GH/DS/162230:23 - BS5837:2012 Tree Survey & Arboricultural Impact Assessment

Drawing No: 22MA.SP101 - Proposed Plan and Elevations, Location and Block Plans - dated 04/23

Received 30/05/23

Drawing No: 22MA.SP101 rev A - Proposed Plan and Elevations, Location and Block Plans - dated 26/05/23

Drawing No: Tree Protection Plan rev. B - dated 05/23

Received 02/08/23

Drawing No: Tree Protection Plan rev. D - dated 08/23

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

14/06/23 - 230828/TPO - T2 Ash Fell - Permitted

4. CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

24 Morecambe Avenue, Caversham, Reading, Berkshire, RG4 7NL

8 Uplands Road, Caversham, Reading, Berkshire, RG4 7JG

159 Kidmore Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7NJ

10 Morecambe Avenue, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7NL
6 Uplands Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7JG
28 Morecambe Avenue, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7NL
20 Morecambe Avenue, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7NL

Letters of representation have been received as follows:

Internal

Natural Environment - *The tree survey doesn't indicate that the tree is imminently dangerous, which it would have to be to fall under the 'dangerous' exemption. The condition results in a recommendation to remove it, and this would need to be subject to a tree works application, especially as the removal is not required to implement the planning proposal (if approved). Incidentally, I note that the AIA plan and Block plan have the outbuilding in a different place. The arb implications are different - the planning app plans require the removal of T5 Holly, the AIA doesn't. On the assumption that the planning app plans are correct, the AIA needs to be amended. In doing so, I would suggest a Tree Protection Plan is provided, as would be expected, to avoid this being subject to a pre-commencement condition. I note Appendix A is called 'Tree Protection Plan' but the only plan on file is an AIA plan. I further note that 6.1 of the arb report states: 'T2, T3 and T5 are proposed for removal as part of the new development, as these specimens could not be effectively retained as they are located within the outline of the new structures, or located too close to make their retention feasible / sustainable'. However this doesn't appear to be the case, whichever location is correct, or for the location shown in the AIA on which I assume the comments must be based, hence this should be re-assessed and corrected as applicable. Clarity should be provided on how many (non-TPO) trees are proposed for removal in order for us to assess a requirement for L1. Clarity should also be sought on intended services to the outbuilding as the route of these could impact retained trees. (25/05/23)*

I visited the site this morning (6th July). My visit was partly to assess tree works application 230828 to fell the Ash tree, which I intend to approve in due course as a result of its poor condition - this makes no difference to the planning application. I understand from the applicant that the revised plans submitted relocate the position of the outbuilding and have reduced the size from that originally proposed. You will note (from the 1st photo) that the base has already been prepared and I am advised that this has been done under PD in preparation to build, and that if the proposed building is not approved, they will build within the PD size limitations. The revised Tree Protection Plan Rev B (revised to take account of the relocation of the building) shows tree protective fencing only for one tree, that being the purple Norway maple. It is not clear why protection would be proposed for this tree and not T7 Hazel, whose RPA covers a large area adjacent to the proposed building. I explained the reasoning behind protecting RPAs to the applicant (who hadn't seen the TPP). They are keen to retain this and other trees on site (there are a number of other small trees not shown on the TPP), hence it would seem appropriate to avoid activity within the RPA by suitably protecting this. I would suggest the arb consultant liaise with the applicant to discuss, as it may be that ground protection is appropriate. A revised TPP is required and shouldn't be too onerous. (06/07/23)

Thank you for the attached, which is acceptable. Condition L7A required:

L7A ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT (AS SPECIFIED)

Protective measures, including fencing, ground protection, supervision and working procedures shall be carried out in accordance with the BS5837:2012 TREE SURVEY AND ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: 22 Morecambe Avenue, Caversham, RG4 7NL, ref GHA/DS/162230:23, dated 6th March 2023 and Tree Protection Plan Rev D dated August 2023. Any deviation from the

works prescribed or methods agreed in the report will require prior written approval from the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order to ensure that reasonable measures are taken to safeguard trees in the interests of local amenity and the enhancement of the development itself in accordance with Policy EN14 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019. As an aside, I note the replacement (for the TPO Ash) labelled on the Plan - whilst not formally agreed with us, it is acceptable under the replacement condition attached to tree works consent 230828/TPO hence it's fine for that to be included on the TPP. (10/08/23)

External

A total of four objections were received for the application raising concerns on the scale of the proposal and impact on neighbouring amenity, surrounding area and trees in the rear garden; one of which being subject to a TPO.

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)

EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodlands)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPD

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.

Initial drawing submitted illustrated a proposal that was considered by officers to be excessive in scale and out of character for the local area. Although other outbuildings are present in the area, none are comparable with the scale of the initial proposal. Revisions were sought and ultimately accepted demonstrating a reduction in scale, in line with concerns expressed by officers. Materials are not set to match those of the existing dwelling. However, given the position of the outbuilding to the properties rear and that the host dwelling is not listed, nor is it situated within a conservation area, the proposed materials are acceptable in this instance.

Overall, the proposal is 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.

Revisions illustrate a change in location to the end of the rear garden at the site. It is considered that this, marrying with the reduction in overall scale showcased, further mitigated received concerns regarding the impact the outbuilding could pose on neighbouring amenity by furthering the separation between the proposed and adjacent properties. Also, heavy vegetation exists at the site and neighbouring properties, considered to impede the potential for detrimental harm due to the shielding said vegetation provides. As such, the proposal is compliant with policies CC8 & H9 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019).

Trees

A large Ash tree, subject to TPO, is present at the application site and the tree survey provided in support of the application specified the need for felling due to the trees poor condition. This was agreed to by NE officers under application: 230828/TPO. The further TPP provided was assessed by NE officers and they confirmed, after revisions, that the TPP was acceptable under local policy and recommended condition L7A to secure the protection of surrounding trees upon commencement of development. Overall, the proposal is compliant with policies CC7 and EN14 of the Reading Borough 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

Recommended Conditions:

TL1
AP1
M3
L7A