

DELEGATED REPORT

Application No. 210230/HOU

Site Address: 87 Balmore Drive

Proposal: Erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension (amended)

Applicant: Mrs Mihalea Radu

Agreed Target Date: 23/08/21

Case Officer: Connie Davis

Site Description

The application site sits within Balmore Drive, a private residential road. The road is characterised by pairs of semi-detached 1930s properties of uniform design. Properties have a front bay window at ground and first floor level and are primarily finished in red-brick, although some do have pebbledash/ render at first floor level. Street trees line both sides of the road.

No. 87 is situated towards the top of Balmore Drive, near the junction with Peppard Road and is no different in terms of design to other properties on the road. However, the application is considered to benefit from a wider plot than neighbouring properties in the immediate vicinity (although not as large in terms of depth). Due to this additional width, the site accommodates a detached double garage to the east.

The property is not listed, nor in a conservation area.



Surrounding properties



87 Balmore Drive

Proposal

The proposal comprises of a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension beyond the existing garage.

The two-storey side extension would have a width of 4.4m, maximum height of 8.7m, eaves height of 5.3m and a depth of 8.4m. It would be set back from the front

elevation of the main house by 0.5m and set down from the ridge of the main house by 0.5m.

The single storey rear extension would protrude beyond the existing garage by a depth of 3.4m. It would have a flat roof.

The existing garage would remain in place. Materials would be in keeping with the main house, with the exception of metal cladding to the rear single storey elevation and render round the rear ground and first floor windows.

This application was originally called for determination by the Planning Applications Committee by the Thames Ward Councillor. However, upon review of the revised scheme by the Councillor, the decision is now delegated to Planning Officers, as confirmed on 16/08/21. This was subject to a condition being included preventing no further side windows being installed on the side elevation without separate planning permission.

Documents Submitted

Drawing/ document:

Ecological Survey ref. 21-014-BAS dated 13/07/21 prepared by Eaves Ecology
Received 22nd July 2021

2019-007_0002 Rev C - Proposed Block Plan
2019-007_0030 Rev F - Proposed Elevations
Received 3rd June 2021

2019-007_0020 Rev C - Proposed Floor Plans
Received 24th May 2021

Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Ref: R2757a dated April 2021 prepared by JohnWenman Ecological Consultancy
Received 10th May 2021

Appendix 2 Precedent Study - Dormers
Received 26th April 2021

Appendix 1 - Precedent Study
Design & Access Statement dated February 2021 Rev.A April 2021
Received 7th April 2021

Application Form
CIL Form
2019-007_001 - Location & Block Plan
2019-007_0010 - Existing Floor Plans & Elevations
Received 15th February 2021

Various iterations of the Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations have been superseded during the course of the application. The floor plans and elevations being considered in the determination of this application are those mentioned above.

Relevant Planning History

200915 - Demolition of existing garage and erection of proposed new dwellinghouse and associated works - Application Withdrawn

020105 - Loft conversion with side dormer - Application Permitted

010739 - Loft conversion with side dormer - Application Refused

Consultations

Internal Consultees

Ecology - No objections

Transport - No objections subject to conditions

Natural Environment - Objection

Public Consultation

The following addresses were formally consulted via letter on 22/02/21:

85, 86, 88 Balmore Drive
49 Peppard Road

In addition, a site notice was sent to the agent for display and was displayed on 26th February 2021 until 19th March 2021.

55 representations (51 objections and 4 observations) were received relating to the following matters:

- The extension is excessive in terms of width and general overall size
- Erroneous statements within the submitted Design and Access Statement
- Concern the property would be sub-let/ turned to a HMO due to its proposed size. (suggestions of a condition preventing this should be attached to any permission)
- Concern over parking arrangements and cars spilling onto the road resulting in a potential pedestrian hazard

- Revised access to the site would be needed to accommodate 2 vehicles. This has not been shown on the plans
- Pavements, grass verges and cross overs are owned by the Balmore Drive Road Trust Fund. The applicant will need consent of the Trust make such changes
- Side extension would unbalance the pair of semis
- Proposal not sympathetic to the inter-war development. Consider the proposal should be assessed in relation to Policy EN6 (new development in a Historic Context)
- Extension would be overbearing on surroundings
- Design has a variety of roof forms, window shapes and sizes and materials which are not permitted by the by-laws of the road
- Garden and patio would be overlooked by the rear balcony style window
- Loss of grass verge as a result of extending the driveway
- Concern the development would lead to more traffic
- Cladding is not in keeping with the street and is an ongoing fire hazard
- Window leading to the snug appears a door which could result in sub-letting
- Proposed materials are not in keeping with the main property
- Three storey rear window would impact the privacy of properties at the rear of the site
- Concerns over the removal of the apple tree and relocation of the Wisteria
- RBC should consider the green environment and prevent the repurposing of green spaces and gardens for profit driven building schemes
- Examples in the submitted precedent studies are not comparable to this scheme
- Proposal would be out of character with the surrounding area
- Additional 3 bathrooms would pose an issue with drainage
- Other extensions in the road are ore in keeping and sympathetic
- Landscaping should not be relied upon to make the development acceptable or more attractive
- Overshadowing and loss of light to neighbouring properties
- Garage should not be allowed to be converted to a room
- No. 87 is located at the start of the road, rather than at the end - any development will therefore have a greater impact on traffic movements entering and existing the road
- Proposal could result in the terracing effect
- Site notice was erected late
- Rear elevation will look very different to others
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Visual dominance for neighbouring properties
- Impact on house prices
- A condition should be included to include screening to minimize the impact of development

- Loss of a large part of the garden which in turn has environmental impact
- A business should not run from the property
- The development would lead to reduced openness at the entrance to the road
- Misleading showing the extension approved at no. 86 as this was never built
- Any new trees should not reduce light onto neighbouring gardens - they should be planted away from the boundary and maintained at a suitable height
- Will result in neighbouring gardens being overlooked
- Size of the toilet on the ground floor is smaller than that of a standard toilet - non-compliance with design standards
- Dormer would stick out of the roof from the side elevation
- Glazed rendered tower does not fit in with the design of the main house
- Rear glazed tower would look into neighbouring gardens
- North facing design elements should be in keeping with the main house
- No full light study provided. Given the extended roof lines to North and East and extension going outside the existing house wall boundary to the North, it is likely that there will be an impact on gardens to the North of the Property, especially in the winter

Second consultation period (discretionary)

The same addresses were formally written to as the first consultation period.

Comments were received on the amended scheme relating to the following:

- Concern that the utility room and garage doors will open onto the boundary fence
- If the stained-glass window cannot be retained facing no. 88, an opaque window should be installed
- Condition preventing subletting should be included
- The proposal is still an overdevelopment of the plot

Following the second consultation period, the scheme was amended further. A third consultation period was not considered to be warranted due to the proposal reducing further in scale by the removal of the rear dormer.

Officer comment: All comments (from both consultation periods) will be addressed throughout the report.

Discussions with applicant/ agent

Officers raised concerns over the original scheme for the following reasons:

- Size (width of the two storey side extension)
- Concern over the rear dormer (position | the roof slope and general design)
- Proposed materials, particularly on the front and side elevations
- Fenestration configuration

Following the above, the extension was reduced in scale, rear dormer removed and materials/ fenestration amended to be more sympathetic to the main house and wider street scene.

Planning policies

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Policy Guidance

Local

Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019)

CC7: Design and the Public Realm
CC8: Safeguarding Amenity
H9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation
H10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space
TR3: Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters
TR5: Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging
EN6: New Development in a Historic Context
EN12: Biodiversity and the Green Network
EN14: Trees, Hedges and Woodland

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Design Guide to House Extensions (2021)

Appraisal

The main issues to be considered are:

- a) Principle of Development
- b) Design and impact on character of the area
- c) Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- d) Amenity Space
- e) Transport Matters
- f) Ecological Matters

a) Principle of Development

The principle of an extension to the dwellinghouse is not resisted in principle. However, this is subject to the proposal being acceptable in terms of other planning considerations such as design, neighbouring amenity and transport and landscaping.

b) Design and impact on the street scene

Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) states: All development must be of high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area of Reading in which it is located.

Policy H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation): Extensions must respect the character and appearance of the house in terms of scale, location, materials. The design should also respect 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

The prevailing character of Balmore Drive is pairs of 1930s semi-detached dwellings with separate access and driveways. The road has several curves, but of the whole, the road is considered to have a regular rhythm and pattern in terms of positioning and design of properties. It is noted that some properties within the Drive have been extended both at single and two storey.

In terms of design, when viewed from the front elevation, the proposed roof form (hipped) and general design is in keeping with the main house. To the rear, a joined ground and first floor level is proposed with a slightly protruding window. Whilst this is a feature more contemporary in nature compared to the rest of the road, there is not considered strong resistance given its position at the rear of the property, and the extension, as a whole, respecting the overall design of the main house.

The two storey side extension would be set down from the ridge of the main house and set back from the front elevation. Whilst the set back/ down could be greater, it is still considered a noticeable distance (particularly the set down). Given it is noticeable, there is not considered grounds to refuse the application due to a lack of subservience. It is also not considered the extension would unbalance the pair of semis as at present they are not strictly balanced at present due to the single storey side extension at no. 86. Whilst Officers acknowledge that the two storey side extension at no. 86 was not built out (although indicated on the plans), development has occurred at the side of this property which disrupts the symmetry of the pair to some degree. It is also not considered the extension would result in the terracing effect or result in a cramped, overdevelopment of the plot due to the gap that will be maintained between no. 87 and 88; the terracing effect is applicable when two properties extend with their extensions in close proximity to one another. Furthermore, due to the set back and down of the extension, the proposal is considered a noticeable subservient addition.

The width of the extension was raised in neighbor comments, although this has been noticeable reduced from over 7m to 4.5m. It is considered the width of the extension is now at the limit of acceptability. It is considered the reduction in width and scale, along with the removal of the rear dormer responds to many comments raised in the original neighbour consultation period. For those where concerns remained, the above details the conclusion reached by Officers on this matter.

Properties on Balmore Drive have been extended to the side at both single and two storey level. As such, it is not considered the presence of the extension would disrupt the overall street scene or appear an addition substantially out of keeping with surroundings to a degree that would warrant refusal of the application.

Materials and fenestration have been altered throughout the course of the application to respect that found on the main house, and other properties in the road, particularly from the front elevation. Materials are to match, other than the small portion of rear cladding on the single storey element and white render around the rear ground/ first floor window. The applicant should ensure, through building regulations approval, that the cladding would be suitable in terms of fire safety. As these differing materials this will not be viewed from the street, its impact on the street scene cannot be used to resist the application.

Within neighbour representations, the architectural quality and history of the properties was noted. However, the site, at present, is not formally designated (ie. a Conservation Area or Listed). Policy EN6 (New development in a historic context) is considered to relate to development that is formally located within a designated space. However, Policy EN6 states that *'New development will make a contribution to the historic character of the area by respecting and enhancing its architectural and visual qualities'*. Given the above assessment, and the proposal respecting the architectural and visual qualities from the view of the street, it is considered to go some way in helping to preserve the history and design of the property. However, a full assessment against Policy EN6 cannot be made as the site is not strictly designated.

As such, the proposal is considered of a satisfactory design to respect the architectural features of the main house from the front elevation. Whilst there are elements of more contemporary design and finish at the rear, views of this would be minimal and would not be considered to disrupt the appearance of the street scene. The scale of the extension is considered at the limit of acceptability. A condition will be included to prevent any dormer being constructed under Permitted Development given the extra roof space that has been created under this application, and given the dormer was removed from this proposal.

The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in relation to Policy H9 and CC7 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

c) Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

Policy CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) is concerned with preventing significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties, including in terms of privacy and overlooking, loss of daylight and visual dominance, amongst other impacts.

The neighbouring properties potentially most affected by the development are nos. 86 and 88 Balmore Drive to the west and east of the site respectively.

In addition, properties that back on to the application site; particularly 47, 49, 51 and 53 Peppard Road.

No. 86

In relation to no. 86, the development is unlikely to cause adverse impact to this neighbour due to its positioning on the east of the site. The development would protrude approximately 1m beyond the rear elevation of no. 86 which is primarily due to the rear bay windows. However this would also be set off the boundary with this neighbour by 6m. The single storey rear extension is to be behind the existing garage. Again, this would protrude beyond the rear building line of no. 86 by just over 1m, in line with the bay windows, however again, it would be set off the boundary considerably and so would not be considered overbearing or result in a loss of light or privacy due to the modest scale past the existing rear building line.

No. 88

No. 88 Balmore Drive is set at an angle to the application site with the rear amenity space for the property backing on to the existing garage.

As part of the proposal, the existing garage is to remain in place. The side extension would infill the gap between the main house and the garage. As such, built for would not be brought closer to this boundary than the existing situation. Whilst the increase in bulk would be noticeable from the garden of this neighbouring property, the two storey element it is considered of suitable distance away from the boundary (5.8m) so as not to appear overbearing visually or cause a loss of light dominant to an unacceptable degree. The single storey extension is considered modest in depth and would be shielded by boundary treatment.

At ground floor level, the garage and utility room door would face onto the neighbouring site, although would be screened by the boundary fence. Furthermore, these are not habitable spaces and so even if the boundary treatment not in place, it would not be considered to result in a substantial loss of privacy. This neighbour expressed concern over these doors potentially hitting the boundary fence when opened. The LPA are unable to insist on what type of door is installed, however the applicant has been made aware of this matter and any issues regarding this would be a civil matter.

At first floor level, one side window is proposed, along with one rooflight. However, the latter would not be considered to result in substantial views to the neighbouring site due to its position in the roof slope. The first floor side window would not serve a habitable space (bathroom) and so would not be considered to result in a loss of privacy for the neighbouring site. This window is proposed to be stained-glass (retrieved from the existing property). There was concern from the neighbor as to the type of window that would be installed if the stained-glass window broke in transit. Given the window would serve a bathroom, it would be likely this would be opaque, however this can also be secured by condition. A condition will also be included preventing any further window being installed on the side elevation facing no. 88 in the interests of neighbouring amenity. Furthermore, a condition will also be included preventing the flat roof of the single storey rear extension being used as a roof terrace without separate planning permission in the interests of maintaining privacy on the boundary of the site.

Nos.47, 49, 51 and 53 Peppard Road and 85 Balmore Drive

There would be considered a suitable separation distance between the proposed extension and these neighbouring sites so as not to result in an overbearing scheme, or one that would result in a loss of light or privacy. The originally proposed rear dormer has been removed from the scheme, and so windows facing onto the rear of the site are now at the same level as those on the existing property. As such, it is not considered that these properties would receive a greater loss of privacy compared to the existing situation.

As such the proposal is considered acceptable in relation to neighbouring amenity and so accords with Policy CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

d) Amenity Space

It is considered that an acceptable level of amenity space would be retained. This would be comparable to properties within the vicinity. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of Policy H10 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

e) Transport Matters

The proposal has been reviewed by the Reading Borough Council Transport Officer.

The applicant's agent has confirmed to Transport Officers that no changes shall be made to the verge, boundary fence or drive width (as per the stipulated rules along Balmore Drive). Given that the proposed driveway measures at approximately 7m wide by 9m long, there is sufficient space for two vehicles to manoeuvre using the existing site entrance as it currently stands. It should be noted that this is a similar arrangement to other properties in Balmore Drive. The existing garage is also to be retained for parking, and this will be secured via condition.

Therefore, there are no transport objections subject to condition ensuring vehicle parking is as specified on the block plan.

It is noted that a number of representations were received relating to highway matters, in particular parking provision, access, safety and alterations to the grass verges that are the responsibility of the Balmore Drive Road Trust. This is a civil matter between the applicant and the Trust. In relation to highways safety, this application has been submitted as a Householder application (rather than the creation of a new dwelling) and so the level of parking is likely to remain as existing. As such, the amount of cars on site should not pose a substantially greater hazard than the existing situation. No hazards or highway safety issues were raised by the Transport Officer. Furthermore, parking provision (as shown on the plans) will be secured by condition.

As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of Highway safety, so far as the Local Planning Authority can control, in accordance with Policy TR3 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

f) Natural Environment and Ecology

Natural Environment - Trees

The Reading Borough Council Natural Environment Officer reviewed the proposal and raised concerns over the proposed scheme for the following reasons:

- Plans do not show the relocation of the Wisteria plant
- An existing apple tree is to be removed from the rear garden without surveys being carried out
- Replacement trees are to be provided in the rear garden but would encourage one in the rear garden
- Concrete hardstanding driveway replacement with a permeable SUDs driveway are within falling distance to a number of trees growing at no. 88 on the boundary. It is likely that re-surfacing works will affect their Root

Protection Areas. An arboricultural impact assessment and method statement might be necessary to demonstrate lack of harm to said trees

- Overall, tree information is not clearly provided; it is unclear what trees are to be removed, what trees will be planted. Lack of harm to existing trees - on or off site - has not been demonstrated

Whilst mindful of the Natural Environment Officer's comments, Planning Officers have to take into consideration what, of the above, could be carried out outside of the planning process and any requests be proportionate to the size of the scheme. The application has been submitted as a householder development and relates to a single residential dwelling. Vegetation can be planted and removed at any time outside of the planning process as it is not protected by way of a preservation order. As such, it is not considered reasonable to require the applicant to submit tree surveys and assessments for the trees that could be removed at any time. It is positive that the plans show an indicative location for replacement planting. This will be shown on the approved plans and so planting will be expected and secured via condition. Given the size of the scheme, however, it is not considered a requirement to know which species would be planted, as again, these could be planted at any time outside of the planning process. There were concerns in representations that the Wisteria plant may not survive being relocated. It is proposed to re-locate the plant to the front garden. The LPA cannot control this Wisteria plant, nor would it be reasonable to insist on it remaining in its current location given it is not protected. The applicant will be reminded via an informative to take care when relocating the plant, and when constructing the permeable driveway in relation to nearby vegetation.

Within the representations, a neighbor enquired as to whether the LPA could include a condition preventing trees being put along the boundary so garden space would not experience a reduction in light. Furthermore, the trees should be maintained to a suitable height. The LPA cannot control where trees are planted given no permission is required to plant a tree. In addition, it is not considered a reasonable condition or directly relevant to the scheme proposed. Maintaining of trees would also be the responsibility of the applicant. These concerns are a civil matter.

As such, given the size and nature of the proposal, and the status of the existing trees on site, the proposal is considered acceptable in relation to Policy EN14 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

Ecology

The Reading Borough Council Ecologist confirmed that the property may be suitable for roosting bats. As such, a bat survey would be required to confirm the likelihood of the presence of bats.

A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (John Wenman Ecological Consultancy, April 2021) and a full Bat Survey Report (Eaves Ecology, July 2021) have both been carried out to the appropriate standard. The Bat Survey Report concluded that although the house possesses features that could be utilised by roosting bats, no bats were seen emerging from or entering the building. There are therefore no objections to this application on ecology grounds. It is however recommended that the following informative is included on the decision notice:

“Should bats or evidence of bats be found prior to or during construction, works must stop immediately, and Natural England or a licensed bat ecologist be contacted for advice”

With regard to wider environmental considerations (raised in the neighbour comments), the loss of open space between the dwelling and garage, whilst open in nature, would not be considered to result in a substantial level of impact for the environment or habitats. A good-sized rear and front garden will remain, and furthermore the Ecologist had not suggested this piece of land of vital ecological/ environmental importance to prevent development. Landscaping and replacement will be provided to enhance the site and potentially biodiversity which is positive.

As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in relation to Policy EN12 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

Other Matters

Other matters raised in representations that have not been discussed as part of the assessment:

- Erroneous statements within the submitted Design and Access Statement
Officer comment - Officers are mindful that Design and Access statements are subjective documents. The Design and Access statement does not form part of the approved documents and is not relied upon when making a decision. Furthermore, as a Householder application, a Design and Access statement was not formally required to be submitted.
- Concern the property would be sub-let/ turned to a HMO due to its proposed size. (suggestions of a condition preventing this should be attached to any permission)

Officer comment: There is no indication that the property would be sub-let or used as a HMO based on the plans before the LPA today. Deviation from the plans would be a breach, and planning permission is always

required to divide a property into two. Therefore a condition is not required preventing sub-letting as it is already prevented by default.

With regards to the use of the property as a HMO, again there is no indication this would be the case however neighbours have been concerned over future use of the site. Balmore Drive is not placed within an Article 4 direction preventing the change of use of family dwellings to HMOs being carried out under Permitted Development (ie not requiring planning permission). In theory, any property on Balmore Drive could change to a small HMO (max 6 occupiers) without planning permission. When attaching planning conditions, the LPA has to be mindful of the tests that are required to be met as outlined in the NPPG. Conditions must be:

- 1. necessary;*
- 2. relevant to planning;*
- 3. relevant to the development to be permitted; - Officers have concern concern that a condition restricting the property's Permitted Development rights to convert to a small HMO would fail this test. The LPA have no evidence the property would be used as a HMO; it would only be speculative. As such, it is not relevant based on the set of plans before the LPA today. If there had been a feature on the plans that would have suggested the intention could be for a HMO, it may have been relevant and more reasonable to attach a condition.*
- 4.enforceable;*
- 5. precise; and*
- 6. reasonable in all other respects*

As such, the LPA do not consider a condition preventing the property converting to a HMO would meet all of the 6 tests. It is not the default position or practice to assume large house extensions will result in a HMO use without evidence.

- Window leading to the snug appears a door which could result in sub-letting - *Officer Comment: The door has been removed.*
- Examples in the submitted precedent studies are not comparable to this scheme
Officer Comment: Officers are mindful that such documents are subjective. These do not form part of the approved documents.
- Additional 3 bathrooms would pose an issue with drainage
Officer comment: This matter should be dealt with via the Building Control application which the applicant will need to submit.

- Landscaping should not be relied upon to make the development acceptable or more attractive

Officer Comment: It is agreeable that landscaping should not shield otherwise unacceptable development as the longevity of landscaping cannot be guaranteed. The application has therefore been assessed on its merits in relation to design policy.

- No. 87 is located at the start of the road, rather than at the end - any development will therefore have a greater impact on traffic movements entering and existing the road

Officer comment: The location of the site is understood. See Transport section of the report.

- Site notice was erected late

Officer comment: Adjoining neighbours were written to via letter. This alone is an acceptable level of consultation in line with legislation, irrespective of whether the site notice was erected. It is understood the notice was erected as the LPA have confirmation from the applicant his was done on 26th February 2021.

- Impact on house prices

Officer comment: This is not a material consideration in the planning process.

- A condition should be included to include screening to minimize the impact of development

Officer comment: See above officer comment in relation to development being shielded.

- A business should not run from the property

Officer comment: There is no indication the property would be used for business purposes.

- The development would lead to reduced openness at the entrance to the road

Officer comment: The space between the property and garage is not considered fundamental to the overall appearance of the road, or serve as an important or defining feature or function.

- Misleading showing the extension approved at no. 86 as this was never built

Officer comment: Officers note this extension was not built out, but was included on the plans to contextualize the planning history at the neighbouring site.

- Size of the toilet on the ground floor is smaller than that of a standard toilet - non-compliance with design standards

Officer comment: Given the proposal is for an extension to a single dwelling, the LPA are unable to resist an application on the size of bathrooms. However, this may be discussed as part of the Building Regulations application.

- No full light study provided. Given the extended roof lines to North and East and extension going outside the existing house wall boundary to the North, it is likely that there will be an impact on gardens to the North of the Property, especially in the winter

Officer comment: See amenity section of this report. It is noted this comment was received before the submission of the revised, smaller scheme.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

The proposal would not be liable for CIL as the amount of floor space created just falls short of 100 sqm.

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.

RECCOMENDATION: GRANT

Conditions:

1. Time Limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Materials as specified
4. Any replacement first floor side window shall be obscure glazed
5. No additional side windows
6. No use of flat roof
7. No dormers to be constructed under PD
8. Vehicle parking as specified

9. Landscaping to be planted
10. No conversion of garage

Informatives:

1. Terms
2. Building Control
3. Complaints about construction
4. Encroachment
5. Positive and Proactive
6. Take care with the removal and replanting of trees
7. Should bats or evidence of bats be found prior to or during construction, works must stop immediately, and Natural England or a licensed bat ecologist be contacted for advice