

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Application No: 201855/HOU

Address: 35 Balmore Drive

Applicant: Mr James Werts

Proposal: Single storey side extension with double and single-storey rear extension

Target date: 15/02/21

Case officer: Connie Davis

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

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 (including the application site) 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. Properties in the street were originally constructed with hipped roofs, however a number have converted these to gable. The application site retains the original hipped roof. Street trees line both sides of the road.

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

Proposal:

Planning permission is sought for a side extension that would be part single storey, part two storey. It would extend to a maximum depth of 10m; 3.6m of this would be single storey and the remainder, towards the rear, would be two-storey. The single storey element would have a flat roof with a maximum height of 3m. The two-storey element would have a maximum height of 7m and have a pitched roof.

The two-storey side extension would project 4m beyond the rear elevation of the main house and would extend to a width of 4.7m. A single storey rear element is also proposed to infill the space between the two-storey element and the boundary with the adjoining neighbour (no. 36). The single storey rear extension would have a flat roof with a maximum height of 3.1m and depth of 4.6m.

Proposed brickwork and tiles are to match the main house. The single storey rear element of the extension would have dark coloured timber cladding.

Plans Considered:

Sheet No. A000 - Location Plan & Block Plan

Sheet No. A002 - Existing Ground and First Floor Plans

Sheet No. A003 - Existing Elevations

Sheet No. A004 - Existing Sections

Sheet No. A001 - Existing and Proposed Site and Roof Plans

Sheet No. A005 - Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans

Sheet No. A006 - Proposed Elevations

Sheet No. A007 - Proposed Elevations

Sheet No. A008 - Proposed Sections D-D, E-E, F-F & G-G

Design Statement

Received 21st December 2020

Bat Survey Report - Preliminary Roost Assessment produced by AE Ecology dated December 2020

Received 18th January 2021

Relevant Planning History:

070499 - Single storey rear and side extension - Application Permitted

Consultation Responses:**Internal Consultation**

Ecology - No objections

Transport - No objections subject to condition ensuring that parking is implemented as specified on the plans

Natural Environment - No objections as the proposal would not be considered to impact a nearby group of TPOs due to sufficient separation distance being maintained

External Consultation

The following addresses were formally consulted via letter on 05/01/21:

34 and 36 Balmore Drive

In addition, a site notice was displayed between 5th January 2021 - 26th January 2021.

No responses have been received.

Discussions with applicant/ agent

The agent was contacted to discuss the proposed design; more specifically the proposed roof forms of the extension (from the front elevation). The case officer had initial concerns that the various roof forms presented resulted in a somewhat disjointed proposal when viewed in the street. The agent asked whether the two-storey element could be finished with a hipped roof, and a raised roof on the presently proposed single storey front element of the extension to integrate with the main house to a closer degree.

Upon discussion with the agent, they advised that the rationale for the proposed roof design with a pitched roof, which seeks to minimise the pitch above the existing first floor facing window. The single storey element, if built with a higher roof, would potentially compromise an existing side floor window. They also highlighted that when looking at developments elsewhere in the road, there are various types of side extensions with various roof forms. Taking all this into account, the application progressed based on the original design and an assessment of whether substantial harm would occur as a result of the proposed roof form.

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
EN12 Biodiversity and The Green Network
EN14 Trees, Hedges and Woodland
TR3 Traffic, Access and Highway-Related Matters

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 proposal has incorporated several measures to help ensure the extension would be seen as a subservient addition to the main dwelling. Namely, the extension would be set back from the front elevation of the property by approximately 0.8m and would be set down from the ridge of the main house by 3m.

Although the proposed single storey rear extension would protrude by a depth greater than that advised in the Council's 'Design Guide to House Extensions' SPG (4m), the additional 0.6m is not considered to cause detrimental harm or result in a development out of scale with the main house. The two-storey rear element would be in line with the SPG and have a maximum depth of 4m.

As noted earlier in the report, discussions took place surrounding the proposed roof form of the extension and its integration with the main house. When assessing the proposal, the case officer noted that various extensions are found within the street with varying roof forms. At single storey level, there are examples of properties with flat roof extensions/ garages so on balance this is considered acceptable. The proposed pitch roof of the extension, whilst being somewhat jarring in relation to the main house, does demonstrate an element of symmetry with the roof plane being of similar angle to the main house. Pitches are also found above first floor windows of properties on the road, and so the proposed roof form goes some way to interlink with this feature. On balance, the proposed roof form is not considered to cause a substantial level of harm to warrant refusal of the application in this instance.

- 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, as confirmed by the Natural Environment Officer.**
- 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 neighbouring property to the west (no. 34) has two first floor side facing windows. From the layout of the application site, which is considered to be common along the road due to properties being of the same design, it is assumed that these neighbouring windows serve a landing and bathroom which are not considered to be habitable spaces so loss of light to these windows is not a material consideration. The extension would not protrude beyond the rear elevation of this neighbouring property (due to this property also having been extended) and so would not result in harm to rear facing windows. No neighbour representations have been received relating to this matter.**

The proposed rear extension would also not breach a 45 degree light angle taken from the centre of the first floor rear window of the neighbouring property to the north (no.36). The single storey rear extension would only protrude past the rear elevation of this neighbour by just over 2m, and so it is not considered to cause a substantial loss of light to ground floor windows.

The proposal also has to be acceptable in relation to the existing windows on the application property itself, so these are not compromised for potential future occupiers. Whilst the rear bedroom window would be somewhat impacted by the proposal, due to the neighbouring property (no. 36) not being extended, sufficient light would still be provided to this window.

- Invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **NO, 4 side windows are proposed; two at ground floor level and two at first floor level. Three of these are to facilitate bathrooms and the other being the kitchen. Bathrooms are not considered habitable spaces and a condition is recommended requiring the windows to be opaque and be retained so, therefore, they would not provide substantial views onto the neighbouring property (no. 34). Approximately half of the ground floor kitchen window would face onto the neighbouring side elevation, with the other extending beyond the elevation. It is not considered that this would result in substantial overlooking, and boundary treatment (up to 2m) can be erected without planning permission between the sites in the interests of privacy.**

- Detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **NO**, whilst the proposed roof form is at slight odds with that of the main house, it is noted that numerous properties within the road have been extended in various ways. The single storey side extension sets the two-storey element back from the road by over 3m and so the bulk of the development would be towards the rear of the property. As such, the proposal is considered of an acceptable scale in terms of the wider street scene.
- 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, with the exception of cladding on the rear single storey extension, however this would not be visible within 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**
- 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 as proposed

4. Retain side facing windows as opaque

Informatives

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