

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Application No: 201400/HOU

Address: 41 Silchester Road

Applicant: Mrs Joan Spence

Proposal: Single storey side extension

Target date: 08/12/20

Case officer: Connie Davis

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site is an end of terrace property located on the northern side of Silchester Road. The surrounding area comprises of clusters of small terraces with good size rear plots. Properties are fairly uniform in their design and materials and have gable roofs.

The site is not a listed building, nor in a conservation area.

Proposal:

Planning permission is sought for a single storey side/ rear extension. It would measure a total depth of 13m. 6m of this would extend along the existing side elevation, with 5m protruding from the existing rear elevation, adjoining an existing decked area. It would have a width of 2.6m at the front elevation, an eaves height of 3.6m and a maximum height of 5.6m. It would have a mono-pitched roof, and at the rear finished in a gable.

A mezzanine storage area is proposed over the rear part of the extension.

Materials are proposed to match the existing dwelling.

Plans Considered:

Location Plan

1194/1 - Existing Ground Floor

1194/4 - Proposed Block Plan

Received 6th October 2020

1194/2A - Proposed Ground Floor

1194/3B - Existing and Proposed Elevations

Received 30th November 2020

Relevant Planning History:

None.

Consultation Responses:

Internal Consultees

No internal consultees were consulted on this application.

External Consultation

The following addresses were formally consulted via letter on 13/10/20:

39, 43 Silchester Road
113, 115 Southcote Lane

In addition, a site notice was displayed between 20th October 2020 - 10th November 2020

No responses have been received.

Discussions with applicant/ agent

Amended plans were received following officer feedback which inserted a window to the proposed front elevation levelled the roof form of the extension. It was considered that these would improve the extension's appearance within the street scene.

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 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

National Planning Policy Framework;
National Planning Policy Guidance;

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

Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003)

Appraisal Checklist

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**, whilst the extension is of a good size depth and would extend past the rear elevation by more than 4m (as specified in the Design Guide SPG), it is considered that the proposal would not result in adverse harm to the host property in terms of scale due to being single storey and the rear element not projecting across the entire width of the property.

- 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 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 extension would be set off the boundary with no. 43 (to the east) by 5.2m and so is not considered to reduce the amount of light to this neighbouring property to a harmful degree.

The extension would also be set off the boundary with no. 39 (to the west) by 1.1m. This neighbouring property has an extended rear projection along the shared boundary with the application site. Whilst the extension would be an addition of a slightly larger depth than the outrigger of no. 39, and would extend closer to the boundary, it is not considered that the development would impact light levels to this property due to there being no side windows facing the application site. It would also not be considered overbearing due to being single storey.

- Invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **NO**, no side windows are proposed.
 - Detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **NO**, whilst it is acknowledged the proposed extension is larger at the rear than others in the vicinity, it is not considered that there is a distinct pattern of development so as to restrict that proposed. When viewed from the street, the extension would be somewhat of an anomaly due to properties being terraced, and so there being less scope for extensions on the road. However, the extension is considered of an acceptable design so as not to cause harm to the surrounding area to a substantial degree.
 - Detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **NO**, materials are proposed to match the host dwelling.
- 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**, the application has been submitted as an extension. However it is noted that the space could be occupied as a standalone functional space (with bathroom and living area) and accessed via a separate side door. As such, it is considered necessary to prevent the extension being used for purposes other than those ancillary to the main house which will be secured via a planning condition.

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**
- 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**.

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 (2003).

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION

Conditions

1. TL1 - 3 year time limit.
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to match
4. Ancillary use

Informatives

1. Building Control
2. Construction & Demolition
3. Terms

4. Encroachment

5. Positive and Proactive

1HA