

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

App Ref: 210166/HOU

Address: 17 Windermere Road

Proposal: Demolition of existing side garage and erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and alteration to the front door (amended)

Case Officer: Connie Davis

Agreed Target Decision Date: 12/10/21

SITE DESCRIPTION AND SURROUNDING AREA

The application site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the eastern side of Windermere Road. The property has an attached side garage set back from the front elevation of the main house. The property is finished in brick and the surrounding area is residential.

The site is not Listed, nor in a Conservation Area.



The application site - to the right

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing garage. Materials are to match the existing property, other than a flat roof to the single storey rear extension.

PLANS/ DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED

RE/17WR/P/06 Rev A - Existing Block Plans

RE/17WR/P/07 Rev A - Proposed Block Plans

RE/17WR/P/08 Rev A - Location Plans

Received 5th October 2021

RE/17WR/P/02 Rev A - Proposed Ground Floor Plans

RE/17WR/P/03 - Proposed First floor and Roof Plans

RE/17WR/P/04 - Existing Elevations

RE/17WR/P/05 - Proposed Elevations

Received 20th September 2021

RE/17WR/P/01 - Existing Floor Plans

Application Form

Received 2nd February 2021

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

030984 - Erection of two storey side extension to semi-detached house - Application Refused for the following reasons:

- Excessive size in relation to the main house
- Impact on the street scene

041200 - Two storey side and rear extension and garage (re-submission of planning application 03/01260/FUL) - Application Permitted

CONSULTATIONS

Internal consultation

Transport - No objections

Ecology - No objections

External consultation

The following addresses were formally consulted via letter on 10/02/21:

15, 17a Windermere Road

One letter of objection has been received:

- Boundary issues on the plans

Officer comment: Revised plans were received in response to this point. The Local Planning Authority is not able to check property boundaries

- Plans may exaggerated there is more space than in reality

Officer comment: The Local Planning Authority relies on plans being accurate; if not, the proposals may not be able to be built in accordance with the proposed plans and so may not be able to comply with relevant conditions

- Loss of sunlight to 15 Windermere Road. The extension would breach 45/60 degree light angle

Officer comment: This will be discussed in the report

- Property appears to be configured like a HMO and should this be included as part of the application?

Officer comment: The application has been submitted as a householder application. As the property is not within an Article 4 area, the use can change to a maximum 6 person HMO without planning permission., However no change of use is being considered or applied for under this application

- Relocation of garage may result in works to the highway

Officer comment; See Transport section of the report

- Parking provision if intended use is a HMO

Officer comment: See Transport section of the report

- The application has not been publicly displayed

Officer comment: Planning applications are required to be advertised by site notice or by writing to adjoining neighbours. Letters were sent to adjoining neighbours and therefore the Local Planning Authority has fulfilled its statutory duty in terms of consultations

- Foundation works would likely impact domestic sewage plumbing shared by 15 and 17 Windermere road (situated approx. 2m from the rear of both properties, and very close to the surface)

Officer comment: This is not a planning consideration. Please contact the Building Control department if you wish to discuss further

- Party wall issues

Officer comment: This is not a planning consideration. Legal advice should be sought for Party Wall matters

- Extension not in keeping with other examples of extensions

Officer comment: All extensions are assessed on a case by case basis according to local and national level policy

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.

Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with policies in 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 current development plan is:

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 - Design and the Public Realm
 CC8 - Safeguarding Amenity
 H9 - House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation
 H10 - Private and Communal Outdoor Space
 EN12 - Biodiversity and the Green Network
 TR3 - Traffic, Access and Highway-Related Matters

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG (2021)

Appraisal Checklist

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

- 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 extension is considered at the limit of acceptability in terms of scale given the proportion of the main house. The extension is considered suitably subservient in terms of being set back and set down in relation to the main dwelling which helps alleviate the dominance of the proposal. The side extension also has a suitable roof form in keeping with that of the main property.
 - Reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree; **NO**, adequate amenity space would still be retained.
 - 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 appearance of the street as a whole in terms of scale, location, materials and design, the arrangement of doors, windows and other principal architectural features and any important existing building line;
- & C. Does not present an overbearing impact on neighbours or 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 single storey rear extension would extend along the boundary with no. 15 Windermere Road by 3.9m and would have a height of 3m. It would be set off the shared boundary by 0.2m. This neighbour expressed concern over a loss of light to two ground floor kitchen windows due to the extension breaching 45/60 degree light angles. Whilst kitchens are habitable spaces, given there are two kitchen windows, one serves as the primary window and the other secondary. From images of the site, the kitchen window closest to the site boundary is smaller and therefore is considered the secondary window for the purposes of this assessment. The extension would not breach a 60 degree light angle taken from the centre of this window primary window, as confirmed on the revised plans. As such, the primary windows for the kitchen would receive adequate levels of sunlight. The secondary window would breach a line of 60 degrees, however given it is secondary, and light angles are rules of thumb (rather than being fixed rules), it is considered that on balance, the scheme is not harmful enough to refuse on that basis. Furthermore, the extension is of a modest and policy compliant depth.

The extension would not go beyond the rear of no 17a and so would not result in a loss of light to rear facing windows of this neighbour. The property does not have side facing windows that would be impacted as a result of the development

- Invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **NO**, the extension would not have any side facing windows looking onto the neighbouring plot, and a condition would be attached preventing any windows being placed on the side elevation without separate planning permission from the Local Planning Authority. A condition will also be included to prevent

the flat roof of the extension being used as a roof terrace/ balcony in the interest of neighbouring amenity.

- **Detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; NO, the design of the extension is considered suitable in relation to the main property. Properties in the vicinity are also of various styles and sizes. For these reasons, the proposal is considered acceptable in relation to the appearance of the street scene.**
- **Detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; NO, the materials of the proposed extension will match those of the existing dwelling, which is considered to be acceptable, and will not have a detrimental impact upon the surrounding area, the original dwelling or the street scene.**

D. Does not result in a loss of biodiversity within garden - NO

E. Ancillary accommodation, such as granny annexes, will be acceptable where it would not be capable of operating as a separate dwelling which could be let or sold separately - NO

CC8: states: Development will not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties or unacceptable living conditions for new residential properties, in terms of:

- Privacy and overlooking; **No**
- Access to sunlight and daylight; **No**
- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development; **No** - whilst the side extension would be located on the site boundary with no. 5 Hawthorne Road, it is considered that this neighbour has sufficient rear amenity space so the development would not result in an overbearing scheme that encompasses this neighbour's rear garden. Due to the positioning of the plots and depth of the proposed extension, the extension would not face directly onto first floor windows and so would not be considered overbearing from inside the neighbouring property.
- Harm to outlook; **No**
- Noise and disturbance; **No**
- Artificial lighting; **No**
- Vibration; **No**
- Dust and fumes; **No**
- Smell; **No**
- Crime and safety; **No** or
- Wind, where the proposals involve new development of more than 8 storeys - **N/A.**

Other Matters

Transport

The proposal has been reviewed by the Reading Borough Council Transport Officer who confirmed that the dimensions for the replacement garage do not conform to the recommended internal dimensions, however it is an improvement from the existing provision and is therefore deemed acceptable. Sufficient space on the drive is retained providing an

additional parking space, therefore the proposed parking provision complies with the Councils current standards and is therefore deemed acceptable. It was not advised that there would need to be works to the highway. Comments were raised in the representations regarding the proposed parking provision should the dwelling be converted to a HMO. This is speculative and not part of this application. The Transport/ parking provision can only be assessed as a householder application/ extension to a single dwelling.

As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in relation to Policy TR3 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

Ecology

The site is surrounded by habitat that is suitable for use by foraging and commuting bats (large connected gardens with trees and Whitley Park Farm/St Patricks Hall Pond a Local Wildlife Site less than 200m north of the application site).

Given the location and condition of the house, and the extent of the works, there is a risk that the proposals may affect roosting bats. A bat survey was carried out, submitted and reviewed and concluded that the bat survey has been undertaken to an appropriate standard and concludes that bats are unlikely to be roosting in the building. As such there are no objections to the application on Ecology grounds and the proposal is deemed acceptable in relation to Policy En12 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

Conclusion

The proposed development would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the site or its surroundings and would not have a detrimental impact on the original building or neighbouring properties. As such the proposed works are considered to be in accordance with CC7 (Design and the Public Realm), CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) and H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) along with the Councils Supplementary Planning Guidance A Design Guide to House Extensions (2021).

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION

Conditions

1. TL1 - 3 year time limit.
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to match
4. No additional side windows

Informatives

1. Building Control
2. Construction & Demolition
3. Terms
4. Encroachment
5. Positive and Proactive