

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Caversham

App Ref: 221318/HOU

Address: 100 Blenheim Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7RR

Proposals: Proposed Single storey part ground floor and part first floor extension with internal refurbishments.

Case Officer: Ryan Allen

Applicant: Parthiban Devadass

Date received (valid from): 7 September 2022 Target Decision date: 2 November 2022

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

Site visit date: 06/10/2022

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The application site is a two-storey dwelling house located on Blenheim Road, Caversham. Blenheim Road is a wholly residential street, consisting of properties that vary in style and design, meaning no established streetscene pattern is present. The site is not a listed building, nor is it in a conservation area.

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey extension to the rear of the property. The proposal seeks stand at approximately 4.5m in depth, 5.3m in maximum width and 4.9m in height from ground to eaves.

Plans considered:

Block and Location Plan - P1355-01

Proposed Plans & Elevations - P1355-02

Received 07/09/22

Proposed Plans & Elevations - P1355-02 rev. A

Received 07/10/22

Proposed Plans & Elevations - P1355-02 rev. B

Received 11/10/22

Proposed Plans & Elevations - P1355-02 rev. C

Proposed Plans & Elevations - P1355-02 rev. D

Received 14/10/22

Proposed Plans & Elevations - P1355-02 rev. G

Received 31/01/22

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

98 Blenheim Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7RR
102 Blenheim Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7RR
98 Blenheim Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7RR

Letters of representation have been received as follows:

Objections:

10/10/22 - 102 Blenheim Road - *Having reviewed the current plans, it would appear that the proposed extension would block light and significantly change the outlook from the Kitchen window of No 102. We have discussed this with the neighbours.*

Observations:

10/10/22 - 98 Blenheim Road - *Generally the plans seem reasonable, with the following caveats. If the east (garden) end of the proposed extension extends no further than the east end of No 98, it would look neater, and avoid imposing (the two houses are less than a metre apart). The proposed plan is close to this alignment, but may be a few tens of centimetres too long (it is hard to judge the plans to this accuracy). The proposed new side window seems currently well offset to avoid looking into the existing side window of No. 98. However, an appropriate planning condition should prevent future overlooking, either into neighbouring houses, or gardens, by restricting the addition of new windows in the side elevations at other locations. Lastly, the works will necessarily cause disturbance, but a planning condition to restrict the hours of construction to 8am to 6pm Mon to Fri and 9am to 12 Saturdays would be appreciated by the neighbourhood.*

Internal Consultations:

Transport - Concerns were raised regarding the initial proposal's scale and its intrusion onto the shared driveway with neighbouring property 102 Blenheim Road. The initial proposal would obstruct the already narrow access to the shared driveway, which leads to each properties respective garage which serves as the designated parking for both properties. Transport objected on these grounds stating: *'...the extension is also to be erected on the shared access to the garages as you have mentioned and will restrict access to the garages which is the only dedicated parking for the properties and therefore this could not be supported for that reason...'*

Summary of correspondence with agent/applicant:

Officer concerns with the initial proposal were with the decking that was a potential issue in terms of privacy with regards to the proposed decking. An e-mail was sent to the agent on 07/10/22 requesting amended plans were submitted illustrating the reduction of said decking to avoid any potential privacy issues. Ultimately, it was considered that the depth of the proposal, alongside the inclusion of decking would be considered to have detrimental impact on neighbouring properties in terms of privacy. Revised plans illustrating the removal of the proposed decking to the rear of the property were received and accepted on 14/10/22.

Whilst the shared driveway to the north of the property is not considered to be used to its full, desired potential due to accessibility issues, the initial proposal sought the development to be

erected over a section of the shared driveway, further impacting access to the shared garages that are considered to be the only designated parking at 100 & 102 Blenheim Road. In order to mitigate any further accessibility issues regarding the shared driveway, an e-mail was sent to the agent on 20/10/22 requesting that revised plans were submitted illustrating a reduction in scale in order for the proposal to not further obstruct access to the shared driveway. These revised plans were submitted and accepted 20/10/22.

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)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

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 far more sympathetic to the existing property in terms of design than the current two-storey rear extension present at the site. The proposal seeks to match the existing property in terms of materials and design, whereas the existing two-storey extension is complete with materials that differ and a design that strays from the character of the existing property. Extensions of similar scales have been erected at

neighbouring properties, meaning the proposed would not be considered an outlier in terms of the existing streetscene.

Observations received in regards to the proposal mention the depth of the proposal and the desired effect of a 'neat' appearance in terms of matching the depth of neighbouring property 98 Blenheim Road. Whilst the proposal seeks to extend further beyond the rear than the aforementioned neighbouring property, it seeks to do so by an amount that is less than 1m and extends approximately 1.1m further than the existing extension. These increases in depth are seen to be negligible and are considered to respect the existing and neighbouring properties in terms of scale. All things considered, the proposal is seen to be compliant with policies H9 & CC7 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 initial proposal included substantial decking and an increased width which would protrude onto the driveway to the north of the property that is shared with 102 Blenheim Road, providing access to garages for both properties designated parking spaces. Each of these inclusions presented concerns and were considered to conflict with local policy. Revisions received took these concerns into consideration by removing the decking from the proposal and reducing the width of the extension. The initial proposal ran across the width of the existing dwelling and protruded onto the shared driveway. Whilst it is considered that the designated parking for the properties in the garages towards the end of the shared driveway are not considered fully accessible, the decrease in width to not protrude over the drive way is seen as desirable to not further obstruct access to the aforementioned garages. The revisions show a decrease in width of 1.5m away from the northern elevation of the property, resulting in no further loss of amenity space via the accessibility to the garages via the shared driveway.

Comments received objected to the proposal on the grounds at the potential loss of sun-light to neighbouring property, 98 Blenheim Road. Revisions have illustrated the reduction in width for the proposal meaning that the extension would be further set back from the property where concerns lie. Also, the distance between 98 & 100 Blenheim Road is considered to be significant enough that overbearing and sunlight issues are not foreseen to be present, meaning detrimental impact on neighbouring properties are unlikely. Furthermore, as the proposal would be erected at the rear of the property, the potential of any visual harm is mitigated as the development is not visible from the public domain.

The application site benefits from a lengthy, sizeable garden space that will be retained with the proposed. All considered, the proposal is considered to be compliant with policies H9, CC8 & H10 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019) due to the revisions received addressing the potential issues regarding the initial proposal.

Trees

No trees are present in the vicinity of the proposed development, thus complying with policies CC7 & EN14 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019).

Parking Provisions

Designated car parking spaces for properties are via garages accessible from a shared driveway between 98 & 100 Blenheim Road. Comments received from transport raised concerns regarding the parking available at the property and the further obstruction to the accessibility of said garages when referencing the initial proposal. Revisions took into consideration these concerns and revised plans illustrated the reduction in width, meaning the proposal would no longer protrude onto the shared driveway. Given the already narrow access to the garages via the shared driveway, it is not considered that the garages provide reasonable parking at the property. Given this, the proposal would not impact parking at the property due to restrictions in regards of accessibility are currently present. The reduction in width was recommended to not further obstruct access to the garages, whilst considering parking at the property would not be affected with reference to the recommended proposal, therefore establishing compliance with policies TR3 & TR5 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

Recommended Conditions:

TL1

AP1

M1