

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Application No: 201475/HOU

Address: 97 St Saviours Road

Applicant: Mr Goel

Proposal: Single Storey Rear and Side Extensions

Target date: 29/12/20

Case officer: Connie Davis

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site is a two storey extended (see planning history) semi-detached dwelling situated on the southern side of St Saviours Road. The site is opposite the Coley United Football Club playing field. The property has a protruding ground floor window with a porch area extending over the front door. A TPO is located at the far end of the rear garden.

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

Proposal:

Planning permission is sought for a single storey wrap around side/ rear extension. It would have a total depth of 13.5m, however only 5m of this would extend past the rear elevation of the main house (on the boundary with no.99). On the boundary with no. 95, the proposal would replace an existing conservatory so would protrude 1.9m beyond the current footprint of this structure. The extension would have a width of 2m from the front elevation, but the rear extension would extend the entire width of the main house. It would have an eaves height of 2.5m and a maximum height of 3.1m. It would have a mono-pitched roof with several roof lights with pitch at the rear.

Materials are proposed to match the main property.

Plans Considered:

44172_01_00 - Existing Arrangements, Existing Site Block Plan, Location Map

Received 3rd November 2020

44172_02_04 - Proposed Arrangements, Proposed Site Block Plan, Location Map

Received 10th December 2020

Relevant Planning History:

040547 - Two storey rear extension, single storey front and side extension

040166 - Rear Conservatory - Application Permitted

Consultation Responses:

Internal Consultees

Transport - no objection subject to pre-commencement condition demonstrating that 2 parking spaces can be achieved on site.

Ecology - No objections.

Natural Environment - No objections as TPO is located far back in the rear garden and would not be disrupted by the development. Would like to see some landscaping added to the frontage of the property, but acknowledges this may be beyond the remit of this application.

External Consultation

The following addresses were formally consulted via letter on 03/11/20:

95 and 99 St Saviours Road.

In addition, a site notice was displayed between 11th November 2020 - 2nd December 2020.

Two letters of objection were received; one from each adjoining neighbour. They read as follows:

No. 95

Would be happy if the back single storey extension was going to go out to the same size as their existing conservatory, but it is intended to go out quite a bit further & will create considerable shadow & loss of natural sun light to my patio area.

Both of our properties have already had double back, single side extensions & conservatories, I thought there was a limit to the maximum expansion size, to the original size of the property?

Also are the main drains not situated under this proposed single storey extension?

Officer comment: The size of the extension in relation to this neighbouring property will be discussed in the report. Each planning application is assessed on its own merits and in relation to existing planning permissions, however there is no definitive set limit as to the amount a property can be extended; this decision is made when assessing proposals. How the proposal will relate to existing drains is not a planning consideration; the applicant will be required to get Building Regulation approval which will deal with matters such as this.

No. 99

I am afraid I must object strongly about this proposed extension. Our side extension has a flat roof so the only light we get is through the door window & adjacent window. This extension would block out all of this light due to the height.

Another issue is I am concerned about building so close to my side extension which was a garage conversion so is only a single skin wall without deep foundation.

There is also the issue of the drain for the street which runs along the back of our properties, we did enquire about extending out our house but we were told we could not because of the drain?

Officer comment: The size of the extension in relation to this neighbouring property will be discussed in the report. The impact the proposal could have on the structural integrity of the neighbouring extension is not a planning matter but seeking advice from the Council's

Building Control department may be of use. However, the applicant has acknowledged this concern and *stated 'The proposed side extension will have new foundations for sure and we will seek to have a party wall agreement in place with a surveyor conditions survey/report, whilst a structural engineer specified foundation design in place to ensure the integrity of no. 99s side extension is not compromised'*. As noted above, drains are also a Building Control matter as opposed to a planning consideration.

Discussions with applicant/ agent

The agent was contacted to discuss the concerns raised by neighbours. It was agreed that, on balance, the scheme would not result in a proposal that would cause substantial harm to either adjacent neighbour to a degree that is refusable. However, in the interests of retaining a harmonious relationship with neighbours, the depth of the extension was reduced by 0.2m (although acknowledged this is minimal, as will be discussed, the extension does not protrude past the neighbouring properties by an unacceptable degree even without this modification). The extension was also set back from the front elevation by 0.5m so the extension would appear a more subservient addition 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
TR3 Traffic, Access and Highway-Related Matters
EN12 Biodiversity and the Green Network
EN14 Trees, Hedges and Woodland

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, the proposed extension is considered of an acceptable scale. Although substantial in depth, the majority of this is alongside the existing side elevation. The roof form is also considered to suitably integrate. It is not considered that this extension, combined with the previous extensions at the site (the previous single storey side extension and conservatory are being replaced) would result in overdevelopment due to their appropriate scales.**
 - 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, as per the Natural Environment consultation response.**
- 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 neighbours most potentially impacted by the proposals are no. 95 to the east and no. 99 to the west. Both of these neighbours have objected on the grounds that the proposal would result in the loss of light to various aspects of their property.**

Impact on No. 95

No. 95 has concerns primarily to the potential loss of light onto their patio area. The proposed extension would surpass the rear elevation of the conservatory by approximately 1.9m. This modest depth is not considered to affect the habitable space of the neighbouring property or result in a loss of light to an unacceptable degree to the patio area. This concern is further alleviated as the height of the proposed rear extension is lower in eaves height to the no 95's existing conservatory and a maximum height of 3.1m in aim to limit as much light as possible to number 95. In addition, there is a close boarded fence of a considerable height separating the two properties and with the proposed rear extension being of similar height to the fence, it is considered that the obstruction or loss of light to the patio area of no. 95 would be similar to the existing situation. It is noted that the longevity of the fence cannot be guaranteed and variable boundary treatments (fences/ vegetation) cannot guarantee to

disguise unacceptable development. However, even without the fence, it is not considered that the extension would result in a loss of light to the patio area due to the modest depth past the neighbouring conservatory.

Impact on No. 99

The proposed extension to no. 99 will protrude approximately 3m beyond the rear elevation of this neighbour. The neighbour notes that they have a side extension in place which is served by just a rear door and window which are considered to be potentially compromised by the development. The applicant considers that this space is not used as habitable space, however this is not known conclusively. As such, it will be treated as a habitable space (and development should not result in a loss of light to habitable space to an unacceptable degree, as per Policy CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)). The neighbouring side extension has a window set away from the shared boundary. A line of 45 degrees has been taken from the approximate location of the window and it was not breached. These light angles are not measured from doors. As such, it is considered that light to this space would not be harmfully compromised which is due to the modest depth of the extension past the rear elevation.

- Invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **NO**, only roof lights are proposed which are not considered to result in a loss of privacy. Due to the proposed development building up to neighbouring development, it is not considered that side windows could be inserted. As such, a condition removing the right to insert side windows is not considered necessary in this instance.
- Detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **NO**, there are numerous properties in the vicinity that have embarked on a similar wrap around style rear/ side development or side extension. Notably no. 95 (the adjoining neighbour) has been extended at the front and side, along with nos. 87 and 89. As such, this proposal would not be considered out of keeping within the street for this reason.
- Detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **NO**, materials are proposed to match the existing 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**

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**.

Other Matters

Transport

As per the Transport consultation response, it is noted that the existing and proposed parking layout has not been shown on the plans and a pre-commencement condition is required to obtain these details (so it can be demonstrated 2 spaces can be achieved on site). However planning officers do not consider the development would change the existing parking arrangement to an unacceptable degree, if at all, due to not projecting forward of the front elevation. The width of the space in which the side extension would be placed (ie. between the main house and the site boundary with no. 99) measures just under 2.5m and parking spaces should have a minimum width of this figure. Therefore, it is considered that this space is currently not wide enough to be used for parking and so any parking (existing and proposed) would be forward of the main front building line. From images of the site it appears as though sufficient parking is achieved on site, and this will not change as a result of the development. As such, it is not considered that a pre-commencement condition is required to obtain a parking layout plan due to the development not impacting the current number of vehicles that could be parked on site, no matter what that number is. As such, the proposal it is considered that for this reason the proposal is acceptable in relation to Policy TR3 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

Ecology and Natural Environment

As per the consultation responses, it is not considered likely that the proposal would affect protected species. The proposal would also not affect protected trees. The Natural Environment Officer asked as to whether there would be scope to add soft landscaping to the front garden which is currently hardstanding. However, this was not considered a reasonable request given the extent of the proposal. As such, the proposal as submitted is considered acceptable in relation to Policies EN12 and EN14 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 (2003).

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION

Conditions

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

Informatives

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

1HA