

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Kentwood

App Ref: 212059/HOU

Address: 2 Polsted Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HR

Proposals: First floor side extension

Case Officer: Tom Hughes

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Hamilton

Date received (valid from): 21 December 2021

Target Decision date: 15 February 2022

1. INTRODUCTION

The application site comprises a two storey detached dwelling, to the southern side of Polsted Road. An attached garage extends from the side of the dwelling to the site boundary, projecting slightly forward. Polsted Road is a private road with a residential character. Terraced properties on the northern side of the road are subject to an Article 4 direction, protecting patterned brickwork. Victoria Recreation Ground is located immediately to the rear of the site. Buildings associated with Berkshire Metals, a metal supply and steel fabrication business, abut the southern side boundary which tapers away slightly to the rear.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for a first floor side extension, to be located above the existing garage. The extension would be set back slightly from the principal elevation, and would have a hipped roof form to match the existing dwelling.

The agent supplied the following, received on 21/12/21:

Drawing No: 02-00 - Site Location

Drawing No: 02-01 - Block Plan

Drawing No: 02-03 - Proposed Site Plan

Drawing No: 03-00 - Existing Floor Plans

Drawing No: 03-01 - Proposed Floor Plans

Drawing No: 05-01 - Existing Front and Rear Elevations

Drawing No: 05-00 - Existing Side Elevations

Drawing No: 05-03 - Proposed Front and Rear Elevations

Drawing No: 05-02 - Proposed Side Elevations

On 19/01/22 the agent was advised of concerns regarding potential encroachment of the proposed development across the southern site boundary. The agent was also advised of the requirement for a bat survey.

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received on 19/01/22:

Drawing No: 05-03 Rev. A - Proposed Front and Rear Elevations

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received on 14/03/22:

Preliminary Roost Assessment by Arbtech Consulting Ltd

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

930594/FUL - Attached double garage with granny annexe at rear - Permitted 11/03/93

950443/FUL - Attached double garage - Permitted 29/03/95

212058/HOU - First floor front and side extension - Withdrawn 26/01/22

4. CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter:
2b Armour Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HT
2a Armour Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HT
4 Armour Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HT
6 Armour Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HS
1 Polsted Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HP
10-12 Armour Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HS
4 Polsted Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HR
8 Armour Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HS
- 4.2 Letters of representation have been received as follows:
None.

Reading Borough Transport Development Control

Raised no objections to proposal.

Reading Borough Ecology

Advised that due to the site location and extent of the proposed works, there is a risk that that proposals would affect roosting bats. The findings of a bat survey would be required prior to the determination of the application.

Following receipt of the Preliminary Roost Assessment, it was confirmed that the survey had been undertaken to an appropriate standard and that the proposed works would be unlikely to affect roosting bats. Raised no objections to the proposal on this basis.

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)
EN12 - Biodiversity and the Green Network
H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

A 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 proposal is sufficient in its design and proportion that it does not detract from the original buildings appearance**
- 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**

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 proposal is sufficiently distant from neighbouring residential properties**
- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **No, the proposal is not significantly more harmful than the existing property**
- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **No, the proposal achieves a sufficient degree of subservience to the original building**
- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **No, materials would match the existing building**

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 proposal is sufficiently distant from neighbouring residential properties**
- 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