

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Mapledurham

App Ref: 211633/HOU

Address: 7 Balliol Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7DT

Proposals: Part one, part two storey front, side and rear extensions

Case Officer: Tom Hughes

Applicant: SK Design consultants

Date received (valid from): 30 September 2021

Target Decision date: 25 November 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

The application site comprises a two storey detached dwelling set within a sizeable plot. A single storey extension projects from the southward side elevation. A detached garage is located to the rear, beyond the northward side elevation. Trees of amenity value are located to the front and rear. The surrounding area is residential in character. The site is adjacent to an identified Green Link.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for single and double storey extensions to the front, side and rear.

The agent supplied the following, received on 30/09/21:

Drawing No: P1259-01 - Site Location and Block Plan

Drawing No: P1259-02 - Existing Floor Plans and Elevations

Drawing No: P1259-03 - Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

The original proposal was for a larger extension, with first floor elements projecting deeper to the front and rear. The original proposal also included the provision of a balcony to the rear, and an altered vehicular access via a new dropped kerb.

The agent was advised on 22/11/21 of significant concerns held with the proposal, principally relating to the disproportionate scale and lack of subservice of the extensions, and harm that would be caused to neighbouring amenities as a result of the proposed balcony. The agent was invited to supply amended plans to address these concerns. The agent was also advised of the requirement for bat and tree surveys to be supplied, and clarification was sought on the proposed dropped kerb and vehicle crossing.

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received 01/12/21:

Preliminary Roost Assessment by Arbtech, dated 01/12/21

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received 14/12/21:

Drawing No: P1259-01 Rev. A - Site Location and Block Plan

Drawing No: P1259-03 Rev. A - Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

970454/FUL - Single storey side extension - Permitted 13/03/98

191554/HOU - First floor side extension - Permitted 20/11/19

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter:

The Spinney, Upper Warren Avenue, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7EJ

9 Balliol Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7DT

8 Balliol Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7DT

10 Balliol Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7DT
5 Balliol Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7DT
30 Upper Warren Avenue, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7EJ

4.2 Two letters of representation have been received, with regard to the following:

- Loss of privacy through overlooking to the rear of 30 Upper Warren Avenue from proposed balcony
- Loss of privacy through overlooking to the rear of 9 Balliol Road from the proposed balcony

Reading Borough Transport Development Control

Sought clarity on the proposed dropped crossing, including visibility splays. Advised that a licence would be required from the Highways Department.

Reading Borough Ecology

Advised that due to the site location and extent of the proposed works, there would be a risk of harm to roosting bats and that the findings of a bat survey would be required prior to the determination of the application. Following receipt of the Preliminary Roost Assessment, confirmed that the survey had been undertaken to an appropriate standard, concluding that the risk of bats being affected by the proposals would be minimal. Raised no further objections to the proposal.

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)
Policy EN12 - Biodiversity and the Green Network
Policy EN14 - Trees, Hedges and Woodland
H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)
Policy TR3 - Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters
Policy TR5 - Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging

Design Guide to House Extensions SPD (2021)

6. APPRAISAL

H9 states: An extension to a house will be acceptable where it:

A. Respects the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design;

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- detract from the appearance of the original building through the use of ill-matching materials and by not fitting in with the design, scale and proportions of the original building; **No, the amendments address the concerns raised. The set back of the first floor elements, and the omission of the part beyond the original side and rear elevations suitably reduces the overall scale of the extension, achieving an appropriate degree of subservience**
- reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree; **No**
- require the loss of trees in the garden or put significant trees at risk; **No, subject to conditions requiring the submitted Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement to be followed**

B. 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; Respects neighbour's amenities and does not present a large blank façade to public areas.

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- significantly reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight enjoyed by neighbouring properties; **No, the extension has been designed to avoid 45 degree lines from the adjacent properties. No significant light loss is expected to occur**
- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **No, the omission of the originally proposed balcony addresses concerns with regard to loss of privacy through overlooking. A condition is applied restricting the use of the roofs of the single storey elements**
- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **No, the surrounding area is characterised by large, detached dwellings of various styles, many of which have been extended. Though the proposals constitute a significant enlargement of the property, a sufficient degree of subservience is achieved, with no significant resulting harm to the character of the area**
- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **No, materials have been selected to match those of the existing property**

CC8: Safeguarding Amenity 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.

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties in terms of:

- Privacy and overlooking; **No, see above**

- Access to sunlight and daylight; **No, see above**
- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development; **No, the amendments reduce much of the bulk presented by the original proposal. While occupants of the neighbouring properties will notice the additional scale of the proposals, no significant harm is expected to occur**
- Noise and disturbance; **No**
- Artificial lighting; **No**
- Vibration; **No**
- Dust and fumes; **No**
- Smell; **No**
- Crime and safety. **No**

7. CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed and the proposed works are considered to be in accordance with the above relevant policies and planning permission can be granted.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

Application Permitted