

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Mapledurham

App Ref: 210804/HOU

Address: 37 Silverthorne Drive, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7NR

Proposals: First floor rear extension

Case Officer: Tom Hughes

Applicant: Ms Alison Wood

Date received (valid from): 19 May 2021

Target Decision date: 14 July 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

The application site comprises a two storey detached dwelling in a chalet style, with front and rear dormers. The dwelling benefits from a single storey rear extension. The surrounding area is residential in character, broadly comprised of detached dwellings of various styles and design.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for a first floor rear extension. The proposal would be sited above the existing rear extension. The rearward face of the extension would be tapered, to avoid a 45 degree line from the adjacent property.

The agent supplied the following, received on 19/05/21:

Drawing No: WSD/21/1 - Site Location, Block Plan, Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

The agent was advised on 17/06/21 of a discrepancy with the supplied drawing.

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received on 15/10/21:

Drawing No: WSD/21/1A - Site Location, Block Plan, Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter:

39 Silverthorne Drive, Caversham, Reading, Berkshire, RG4 7NR

35 Silverthorne Drive, Caversham, Reading, Berkshire, RG4 7NR

25 Shepherds Lane, Caversham Reading

27 Shepherds Lane, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7JJ

23 Shepherds Lane, Caversham, Reading, Berkshire, RG4 7JJ

4.2 Letters of representation have been received as follows:

None.

Reading Borough Ecology

Advised that the property may have features suitable for use by roosting bats. Due to the extent of the development proposed, and the surrounding habitat of high suitability for use by foraging and commuting bats, there is a risk that the proposals may affect roosting bats. The findings of a bat survey report would be required prior to the determination of the application.

The agent was advised of this requirement on 11/06/21.

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received on 12/10/21:
Bat Survey ref: B1201.001, dated 10/10/21, by Crossman Associates

Reading Borough Ecology confirmed that the bat survey had been undertaken to an appropriate standard, and concludes that the risk of bats being affected by the proposals is minimal. On this basis, there are no objections to the proposal on ecological grounds.

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

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG (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 no significant harm would be caused to the appearance of the original dwelling. While the tapered rear elevation is of slightly contrived design, it would not be visible from the public realm and the overall appearance is in proportion with the original dwelling**
- reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree; **No, the proposal would not alter the existing footprint of the dwelling**

- require the loss of trees in the garden or put significant trees at risk; **No, the proposal would not alter the existing footprint of the dwelling, and the proposal would be outside of the canopy range of adjacent trees**

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, as above the tapered rear elevation has a slightly contrived appearance, but serves the function of avoiding a 45 degree line from the adjacent property. This, combined with the separation distance to the adjacent properties, ensures that no significant light loss would be caused to neighbours**
- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **No, the proposed arrangement of fenestration is no more harmful than the existing**
- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **No, while the proposal represents a substantial addition to the original dwelling, it achieves a sufficient degree of subservice and is proportionate in terms of scale. The extension would not be clearly visible from the public realm and is not considered to cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area**
- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **No, the agent has confirmed during the course of the application that the extension would be of brick construction to match the existing dwelling. Dwellings in the vicinity of the site are of various styles, which eases any concerns held with regard to inconsistent design**

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 a sufficient distance from adjacent properties and is not considered to cause any significant visual dominance or overbearing effects**
- 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