

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Church

App Ref: 211096/HOU

Address: 68a Cressingham Road, Reading, RG2 7JR

Proposals: Two storey rear extension and single storey front extension

Case Officer: Tom Hughes

Applicant: Mr Iqtidar Khan

Date received (valid from): 1 July 2021

Target Decision date: 26 August 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

The application site comprises a two storey detached dwelling. A conservatory projects to the rear. The surrounding area is residential in character. A Green Link crosses the site. The site topography rises in an easterly direction. The site is not located within a Conservation Area, nor is it in the setting of a Listed Building.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for a two storey rear extension and a single storey front extension. The conservatory would be demolished to facilitate the proposals.

The agent supplied the following, received on 02/07/21:

Drawing No: 100 - Site Location

Drawing No: 110 - Block Plan

Drawing No: 110 - Existing Floor Plans and Elevations

Drawing No: 120 - Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

The original proposal was for a larger rear extension. The agent was advised on 12/08/21 of several concerns held with the proposals, relating to its lack of subservience and harm that would be caused to neighbouring residential amenities. The agent was invited to supply amended plans to address these concerns.

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received on 18/10/21:

Drawing No: 120 Rev. A - Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

The amendments reduced the overall scale of the rear extension, but had not sufficiently overcome the concerns originally raised. The agent was invited to supply a further set of amended plans to rectify.

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received on 22/10/21:

Drawing No: 120 Rev. B - Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

160618/CLP - Conversion of garage and insertion of window - Permitted 31/05/16

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter:

8 The Lawns, Reading, Berkshire, RG2 7JA

9 The Lawns, Reading, RG2 7JA

12 The Lawns, Reading, RG2 7JA

66b Cressingham Road, Reading, RG2 7JR

68 Cressingham Road, Reading, RG2 7JR

7 The Lawns, Reading, RG2 7JA

10 The Lawns, Reading, RG2 7JA

11 The Lawns, Reading, RG2 7JA

4.2 Letters of representation have been received as follows:

One, with regard to the following:

- The extension would block views and the right to light of 66b Cressingham Road
- The extension would overshadow 66b Cressingham Road
- The proposals would negatively impact the value of 66b Cressingham Road *Officer note: not a material planning consideration*
- The proposals would negatively impact on the wellbeing and quality of life of the occupants of 66b Cressingham Road

Reading Borough Transport Development Control

Raised no objections to the proposal.

Reading Borough Ecology

Advised that the site is located within a designated Green Link, and that due to the extent of the proposed works there is a risk that they may affect a bat roost if present. Advised that the findings of a bat survey would be required prior to the determination of the application.

The agent was advised of this requirement on 12/07/21. The agent subsequently supplied the following, received on 18/10/21:

Preliminary Roost Assessment by Arbtech, dated 15/10/21

The PRA concludes that there are missing and dislodged tiles, as well as holes in the soffit boards on the north and east elevations. Accordingly, a further survey would be required to determine whether the building hosts a bat roost. The agent was advised on 22/10/21 that the findings of a further bat survey would be required prior to the determination of the application.

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)

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 have satisfactorily addressed the concerns raised**
- 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 amendments have satisfactorily addressed the concerns raised**
- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **No, the amendments have satisfactorily addressed the concerns raised**
- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **No, the amendments have satisfactorily addressed the concerns raised**
- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **No, the amendments have satisfactorily addressed the concerns raised**

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, the amendments have satisfactorily addressed the concerns raised**
- Access to sunlight and daylight; **No, the amendments have satisfactorily addressed the concerns raised**
- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development; **No, the amendments have satisfactorily addressed the concerns raised**
- Noise and disturbance; **No**
- Artificial lighting; **No**
- Vibration; **No**

- Dust and fumes; **No**
- Smell; **No**
- Crime and safety. **No**

Insufficient evidence has been provided to determine the likely impacts of the proposals on bats, which are a protected species and a material consideration in the planning process. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy EN12 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019), para. 99 of the Government Circular 06/05: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and Their Impact Within The Planning System and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (The Habitat Regulations).

RECOMMENDATION

Application Refused