

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Caversham

App Ref: 201041/HOU

Address: 131 Henley Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 6DW

Proposals: 2-storey side extension and 2-storey rear extension to create additional living and bedroom space.

Case Officer: Mr David Brett

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Kalinke

Date received (valid from): 20/07/2020

Target Decision date: 14/09/2020

1. INTRODUCTION

The proposal site is a two-storey end terrace dwelling on Henley Road, Caversham. The south side of this part of Henley Road consists of similarly designed terrace rows, lined with mature highway trees. The north side of Henley Road at this point consists of semi-detached dwellings. The proposal site is in close proximity to a parade of shops at the corner of Henley Road and Chiltern Road. Henley Road also serves the 23 and 24 bus routes. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with a mix of terrace rows and semi-detached dwellings. The proposal site is located within Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).



1. Front Elevation of 131 Henley Road (photo taken on 09/07/2020).



2. Front/Side Elevation of 131 Henley Road (Photo taken on 09/07/2020).

A full site visit for this application was not possible due to the Coronavirus lockdown. The agent supplied a site photo of the rear elevation of 131 Henley Road on 18/06/2020 as part of application 200621 (see relevant history section below). This photo was used for the purpose of determining this application.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposed development is for a 2-storey side extension and 2-storey rear extension to create additional living and bedroom space.

Plans considered:

- Existing (includes Location Plan and Block Plan) - 277-A1-00A
- Proposals - 277-A1-07

Received on 20/07/2020

- Construction Method Statement/Site Plan - 277-A1-06

Received on 01/08/2020

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

200621 - Part single, part 2-storey side and rear extensions (amended description). Approved on 10/07/2020

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 *The following addresses were consulted by letter.*

129 Henley Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 6DW - No response received.

133 Henley Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 6DW - No response received.

17 Anglefield Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 5HP - Response received on 04/08/2020.

- We are objecting to the proposed plans of building works of property 131 Henley Road due to the fact the two storey extension will impede our privacy by being overlooked. We also have serious concerns with regards to the disturbance of Wildlife associated with the large sycamore tree in the rear of the garden and would like clarification if there is any preservation order on trees surrounding this property?

19 Anglefield Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 5HP - Response received on 04/08/2020.

- Regrettably I need to express our objection to the building plans put forward for 131 Henley Road (application number 201042), especially against the two-storey rear extension as this will cause an invasion and loss of our current privacy when in our garden and Kitchen as the second story windows will overlook all the gardens and fences to the rear, more so in the Autumn/Winter when the tree has no leaves.
- Additionally, I am of the opinion that the size of the proposed extensions are not in keeping with the current size and aesthetics of the adjoining houses (Layout and density of proposed new extensions) and will create a loss of light or overshadowing to the houses directly to the left (as you look at the front) from the late afternoon, early evening sun.
- I also have serious concerns with regard to the health of the very large Sycamore tree in the centre of the rear garden of number 131 Henley Road and the effect building works will have on this tree and the large amount of wild life currently inhabiting and making use of this tree.

Reading Borough Council, Transport - Response received on 06/08/2020

- The proposed side extensions will result in the loss of the garage and therefore loss of a parking space. Submitted plans illustrate 2 off road parking spaces will be provided in the front garden area. Some landscaping will be required to provide a level area of hard standing which should be made of a permeable material. The area is accessed via an existing dropped kerb directly from Henley Road.
- A grass verge can be found outside the property and it should be noted that this is part of the public highway and should not be used for parking.
- There is no objection to this application as parking is being provided in accordance with the Council's current Parking Standards and Design SPD.

Reading Borough Council, Trees - Response received on 22/05/2020

- I have no objections to the application as the front wall is specifically retained, preventing the possibility of vehicular passage across the verge to the parking.
- A small area of landscaping is proposed so standard landscaping condition L2 would be appropriate, unless the applicant wishes to indicate the specific landscaping now to avoid a pre-commencement condition.
- I agree with Transport in that informative I24 should be used which, along with the notes on plans relating to no parking on the highway (or storage of materials), should protect the adjacent grass verge area, hence the root system of the adjacent street tree.

Reading Borough Council, Ecology - Response received on 07/09/2020

- The application site comprises an end of terrace house with a clay tile roof located on a busy road out of Reading. The surrounding habitats are largely urban with smallish gardens with limited tree cover, and the building, its roof and soffits appear to be in good condition as seen on google street view. As such it is considered unlikely that the proposals will affect roosting bats and there would be no objections to the application on ecology grounds.

A site notice was displayed from 3rd August 2020, expiring on 24th August 2020 - no further responses have been received.

5. 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.

6. 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 (Adopted November 2019)

CC7 Design and the Public Realm
CC8 Safeguarding Amenity
EN12 Biodiversity and the Green Network
EN14 Trees, Hedges and Woodlands
EN15 Air quality
H9 House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation
H10 Private and Communal Outdoor Space
TR3 Access, Traffic and Highways-Related matters
TR5 Car and cycle parking and Electric Vehicle Parking

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG
Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD (2011)

7. APPRAISAL

7.1 Design

In accordance with Reading Borough Local Plan policy H9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation, house extension proposals are acceptable where it:

- *Respects the character and appearance of the house in terms of scale and locations.*
- *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.*
- *Does not result in a loss of biodiversity within gardens.*

The width of the existing garage element to the side elevation of the existing dwelling is 3m, this is to be removed as part of this proposal and replaced with a two-storey side extension with a width of 1.9m. The proposal features a hipped roof that is set down from the ridge of the existing dwelling. The front elevation of the side extension is slightly set back, which contributes positively to the overall considered subservience of the proposal. The works to the ground floor consists of a wraparound side and rear extension. The ground floor rear extension has a depth of 3.8m from the rear of the existing dwelling and has a width of 9.1m.

While the works to the ground floor are considerable in relation to the existing dwelling, it is considered that the depth of the garden helps with the proposal site's capacity for a development of this footprint, particularly at ground floor level. The depth of the ground floor rear extension is considered acceptable in relation to a dwelling this size and does not protrude beyond the existing ground floor rear extension.

The works to the first floor of the two-storey side extension element consists of a bathroom. The first-floor element of the side extension has a depth of 5.1m and does not extend significantly beyond the existing first floor elevation at 131 Henley Road. The first-floor rear extension aspect of the proposal has a depth of 3.7 and has a width of 6.6m. The first-floor rear extension consists of two additional bedrooms to the existing dwelling. The western side elevation of the first-floor rear extension is 0.45m from the side elevation of the first-floor side extension. The first-floor rear extension features a hipped roof, that is set down from the ridge of the existing dwelling.

While the proposal has not been amended during the course of the application, officers raised concerns regarding the extent of the first floor element. These concerns were raised during the course of application 200621. During the course of the application, it was made clear that the extent of first floor element (as approved - to clarify, the width was reduced during the course of the application following officer feedback) was at the limits of approval for that application. It was considered within application 200621 that while the side elevation of the first-floor rear extension does extend slightly beyond the existing side elevation, this is not considered unacceptable to the point of refusal for application 200621. This application proposes a first floor rear extension that goes beyond the limits for approval and what has resulted is a first floor rear extension that is considered overbearing to 129 Henley Road and an overdevelopment of the site and existing dwelling, taking into account the cumulative aspects of the overall development. As well as considering the proposals within the context of the previous approval, the proposals have been considered on their own merits and the same conclusion is reached. One may reasonably question what made the previous application acceptable, but this proposal unacceptable. In short, it is considered the overall width of the proposed extension at first floor level does not sufficiently respect the character and appearance of the house in terms of scale; instead it is considered to overwhelm it, in contrast to the previous approval which was more sympathetic with the existing property, provided better relief from the boundary and was deemed appropriate (albeit at the upper limit of acceptability for this property).

In addition, in accordance with the House Extensions SPD, extensions of more than 4m are not normally supported by officers. In this instance, it is considered that the proposal site is potentially capable of being able to accommodate a rear extension with a depth greater than 4m (as it is a considerable property set within a relatively generous plot, therefore providing potential for a larger than normally permitted extension). The size and scale of the proposed rear extension and proximity to the side boundaries of the neighbour at 129 Henley Road, however, are what leads to the consideration that the proposed rear extensions are overbearing to neighbouring residents and would not be subordinate to the existing house either; instead the proposal fails to respect the character and appearance of the existing house, fails to respect the character and patterns of neighbouring properties, and would present an overbearing impact on neighbours, by virtue of the two storey rear addition in particular (thereby contrary to key elements of Policy H9). The House Extensions SPD recommends that rear extensions are located as far from side boundaries as possible to avoid an overbearing impact to neighbouring residents and a loss of light to habitable rooms.

With regard to the impact of the proposal on trees within the garden, the proposed development is not considered to harm and protected trees and is considered acceptable in relation to policies EN12 and EN14 of the Reading Borough Local Plan. No concerns were raised by the RBC Trees and Ecology regarding the application, as such the proposals are not considered to harm nearby trees of wildlife to the point of refusal for this application.

Overall, the proposed works are considered an overdevelopment of the existing dwelling house. This is taking into account the cumulative impact of all aspects of the proposal (ground floor and

first floor works). The proposals are not considered subservient to the existing dwelling. In accordance with policy H9 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019), the proposed development is not considered to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or surrounding area by virtue of the size and scale of the proposed works.

Considering specific detailed design matters, the arrangement of windows and doors is considered acceptable throughout. No windows have been proposed to side elevations and windows and doors have been selected to match the existing dwelling. The proposed works to the porch includes the replacement of the existing flat canopy with a tiled pitched roof, supported by timber posts on existing brick walls. The slope leading up to the front door is to be replaced with a step. The proposed works to the porch are considered acceptable. Materials used in the construction of all aspects of the proposal, including brickwork, roof tiles, windows, and doors have been specified to match the existing dwelling.

7.2 Safeguarding Amenity

This proposal has also been assessed against Reading Borough Local Plan policy CC8: Safeguarding Amenity, which states that proposals are acceptable where they will not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties with regard to factors including:

- *Privacy and overlooking*
- *Access to sunlight and daylight*
- *Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development*
- *Harm to outlook*

It is also relevant that Policy H9 also guards against extensions which present an overbearing impact on neighbours.

It has been demonstrated on the plans that the proposed works would not encroach on a 45° line taken from the mid-point of the window to the nearest neighbouring habitable rooms at 129 Henley Road and 133 Henley Road. The rear elevation of the 131 Henley Road and adjacent neighbouring properties is south facing, meaning that any potential loss of light would be minimal due to the orientation of the proposed works. It has also been demonstrated that the proposed works would not encroach a 45° angle drawn from a potential side extension at 133 Henley Road.

In comparison with 200621 (which is extant and has not been implemented as far as officers are aware at the time of writing), there has been an overall increase in size and scale from the first floor element approved. More specifically, the first floor elements is now significantly closer to the boundary of No. 129 than previous. It is considered that this change (in the context of the approved scheme) has tipped the balance from acceptability to unacceptability in outlook and visual dominance / overbearing terms. Whilst the applicant has evidenced that the 45 ° angle is maintained (largely a light consideration), it is considered that the proposed first floor element would be visually dominant and overbearing for current and future occupiers of No. 129, when combined with the existing context and the proposed context of the side extension element. Insufficient set-back has been proposed on the rear elevation element of the first floor extension (serving a proposed bedroom), given an overall oppressive feel for the neighbouring occupier from their property or immediate rear amenity space. As well as considering the proposals within the context of the previous approval, the proposals have been considered on their own merits and the same conclusion is reached.



3. Existing rear elevation of 131 Henley Road (photograph provided by agent on 18/06/2020)

With regards to 133 Henley Road, the proposed first floor rear extension is set from the side boundary by 2.2m. On the boundary with No. 133 the relationship is unchanged from that approved under 200621. Accordingly, no significant adverse amenity impacts are envisaged to No. 133 from these proposals.

It is also noted that, as a result of the proposals an area of flat roof are provided. Although access to this area is likely to be limited, it would have been considered necessary to include a condition preventing these areas being used as terrace areas, due to their proximity to neighbouring properties and obvious potential for loss of privacy and overlooking should they be used as terraces in the future. This would have been the case if the application was approved.

Side facing windows were not proposed within the first-floor extensions. To ensure these do not occur in time, a condition would have specified that separate applications will be required should any first floor side elevation (east and west) windows be sought, thereby protecting neighbouring amenity. This would have been the case if the application was approved.

Objections were raised by 17 and 19 Anglefield Road concerning loss of privacy within the gardens and habitable rooms at their properties as a result of the first floor rear extension. It is considered that the separation distance between the first floor rear extension and habitable rooms at 17 and 19 Anglefield Road is too great to result in any significant loss of privacy to these residents to the points of refusal for this application.

Overall, the proposed development is considered unneighbourly, overbearing and would harm the outlook to neighbouring properties in particular 129 Henley Road. As a result, the proposed development is not considered favourably against Reading Borough Local Plan policies CC8 or H9. Furthermore, the proposed development is considered out of character with the character and appearance of the surrounding area due to the size, scale and bulk of the proposed works.

It is also recognised that the proposed works would improve the quality of accommodation for current and future occupiers, creating an enlarged kitchen at ground floor level and a fifth bedroom at first floor level. The conversion of the garage for ancillary accommodation (which would have been secured as such via condition had the proposal been supported) also improves the accommodation. In the planning balance however, the harmful design and amenity impacts identified above are considered to outweigh any planning benefits of the scheme.

7.3 Private and Communal Outdoor Space

This proposal has also been assessed against Reading Borough Local Plan policy H10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space, which states that:

- *Usable outdoor space for houses should be no less than the gross floor area of the dwelling. To which it relates.*

It is considered that this proposal will not represent an unacceptable loss in private outdoor space. As the size of the private outdoor space will still be larger than the usable floor space of the dwelling on the ground floor.

7.4 Vehicle Parking and Construction

The proposed plans are considered acceptable by Reading Borough Council Transport and Natural Environment as the existing access would accommodate the proposed vehicle parking spaces, without the need for development of the grass verge. However, it was requested by RBC Transport that a Construction Method Statement (CMS) be produced for the proposals. The CMS would need to demonstrate that during construction the grass verge would not be used for the storage of construction materials or be damaged by construction vehicles. The CMS stated that the contractor and site supervisor were to ensure that the site operatives were to only park on site and store materials on site. Plant and materials would be store on site and not on the public highway. The Construction Method Statement provided is considered acceptable in supporting this application, with a compliance condition ensuring this takes place had the proposals been able to be supported.

7.5 Air Quality

This proposal has been considered against Reading Borough Local Plan policy EN15, as the proposal site is within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). As demonstrated in the policy, this proposal does not meet the requirements for an Air Quality Assessment (AQA) and is considered not enough of a detrimental impact air quality to warrant such an assessment due to the size and scale of the proposal.

7.6 Progress of Application

A series of communications were undertaken with the agent during the course of the application, summarised below. Communications regarding withdrawn application 200621 have also been added for context:

Communication	Date	From	To	Details
Application 200621 (for context)				
Email	18/06/2020	Case Officer	Agent	Raised concerns regarding the application having discussed the proposal with other officers. Highlights that the proposed second storey rear extension is considered an overdevelopment of the site, with the second storey rear extension not considered characteristic of the surrounding area.
Email	18/06/2020	Agent	Case Officer	Addresses the points raised by the case officer. Highlights that a two storey rear extension of 3m in depth can be achieved under permitted development. States that overall proposal is within 50% of the original site. States that the proposal allows for 45° light angles to habitable windows at neighbouring properties. Points out the changes in elevation between 129 and 131 Henley Road. Highlights an example of a two storey rear extension at 159 Henley Road. Closes by stating that the agent and

Communication	Date	From	To	Details
				applicant will consider reducing the size of the second storey rear extension.
Email	19/06/2020	Case Officer	Agent	Highlights that the proposals have been submitted as a householder application and will be considered as such. Explains that the second storey rear extension is considered visually dominant, overbearing and would harm the outlook to neighbouring. States that the example at 159 Henley Road is not a fair comparison as the first floor element does not extend beyond the existing side elevation. Asks to submit revised plans by 23/06/2020 and agree an extension of time on decision.
Email	19/06/2020	Agent	Case Officer	Revised plans submitted reducing the width of the second floor rear extension.
Email	22/06/2020	Case Officer	Agent	States that the revised plans are considered acceptable. Asks to address an error on the plans concerning the front elevation. Asks to agree a revised application description. Asks to reconsult neighbours for 21 days on revised plans.
Email	22/06/2020	Agent	Case Officer	Agrees to fix error on plans. Agrees to change of application description. Agrees to extension of time on decision.
Email	23/06/2020	Case Officer	Agent	Asks for updated plans addressing the error in order to commence the re-consultation of the plans.
Email	23/06/2020	Agent	Case Officer	Sends over amended plans. States that the applicant is not happy with the current design and will contact agent later to discuss.
Email	24/06/2020	Case Officer	Agent	Confirms that re-consultation will commence once approval has been given by the agent and applicant.
Email	24/06/2020	Agent	Case Officer	Revised plans submitted bringing the side elevation of the second storey rear extension closer to the side boundary at 129 Henley Road.
Email	24/06/2020	Case Officer	Agent	Appreciates that the design does not infringe the 45° light angle to neighbouring residents. States that officers felt that the plans submitted on 23/06/2020 were at the limit of what would be considered acceptable.
Email	24/06/2020	Agent	Case Officer	Acknowledges response from case officer. States that agent would respond shortly.
Email	24/06/2020	Agent	Case Officer	Asks for re-consultation to commence based on plans submitted on 23/06/2020.
Email	24/06/2020	Case Officer	Agent	States that plan 277-A1-05J (Issue Date: 22/06/2020) will be reconsulted on. Asks to confirm agreement to this.
Email	24/06/2020	Agent	Case Officer	Agrees for re-consultation to commence.
Email	10/07/2020	Principal Officer	Agent	Approval decision notice for application 200621 issued to agent.

Communication	Date	From	To	Details
Current application communications				
Email	07/09/2020	Case Officer	Agent	Raised concerns regarding application 201042 regarding the size, scale and bulk of first floor rear/side extension. Emphasises that the plans approved under 200621 were at the limit of acceptability. Application 201042 goes beyond what was acceptable under 200621. Informs the agent that a refusal will be issued on the application unless it is withdrawn by 4pm on 09/09/2020.
Email	07/09/2020	Agent	Case Officer	Informs case officer that feedback has been passed on to applicant.
Email	10/09/2020	Case Officer	Agent	Case officer informs agent that a decision for the application will be issued as it was not requested that the application be withdrawn.
Email	10/09/2020	Agent	Case Officer	Agent informs case officer that the client has not advised how they wish to proceed with the application.
Email	11/09/2020	Case Officer	Agent	Case officer asks agent if the agent has heard from the client.
Phone Call	11/09/2020	Case Officer	Agent	Case officer asks the agent if the client has indicated how they wish to proceed with the application. Case officer advises agent to contact officers once a decision has been reached.
Email	11/09/2020	Case Officer	Agent	Case officer asks agent to inform officers by 12pm on 14/09/2020 for how the client wishes to proceed with the application. As agreed over the phone on 11/09/2020; if a response is not received, or if the application is not withdrawn the decision will be issued.
Email	14/09/2020	Agent	Case Officer	Confirmation for a decision to be issued.

8. CONCLUSION

Overall, the proposed development is not considered subservient to the existing dwelling, or contribute positively to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. This is due to the size and scale of the first floor rear extension proposed, when considered within the context of the other works also proposed. The cumulative impact leads to the view that the proposals represent an overdevelopment of the existing dwelling.

The works go above and beyond an approval negotiated at the site in the recent past. It is considered that the harmful impacts of the first floor rear extension, as proposed, sufficiently changes the proposals (in the context of the previous approval) to one which is unacceptable. Naturally, the proposals have been considered on their own merits too.

It is also recognised that in themselves some elements of the proposals are not of concern, and the proposals would include planning benefits such as providing more floorspace/better quality of accommodation for current/future occupiers. However, the shortfalls of the proposals are considered to outweigh the merits on this occasion, when applying a critical planning balance of all material considerations.

Officers did advise the agent of these shortcomings and this conclusion. The agent was provided with an opportunity to withdraw the application prior to a decision being made, but this was not forthcoming (also acknowledging the right to appeal). Hence the above conclusion reached on the application, on the basis of the information submitted and consideration of all material matters.

Permission refused due to the following reasons:

1. The proposed first floor extension to the rear/side of the existing property, owing to its scale, bulk and massing, would fail to respect, maintain and enhance the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area, contrary to Policies CC7 and H9 of the [Reading Borough Local Plan \(Adopted November 2019\)](#).
2. The proposed first floor extension to the rear/side of the existing property, would cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of neighbouring property No. 129 Henley Road by being visually dominant, overbearing and harm outlook, contrary to Policies CC8 and H9 of the [Reading Borough Local Plan \(Adopted November 2019\)](#).

9. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

10. INFORMATIVES

IF0: Positive and Proactive Working - refusal

The Local Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant to see if relevant concerns could be resolved to allow permission to be granted. However, that has not been possible within the statutory timescale and therefore the decision to refuse planning permission has been taken.

Plans Considered

The refusal relates only to the following plans and information as received by the local planning authority:

Plans considered:

- Existing (includes Location Plan and Block Plan) - 277-A1-00A
- Proposals - 277-A1-07

Received on 20/07/2020

- Construction Method Statement/Site Plan - 277-A1-06

Received on 01/08/2020

I14: Pre-app Advice

This planning application was submitted without the benefit of first seeking pre-application advice from the Local Planning Authority, which can often result in the avoidance of refusal of planning permission. Please see the following link to the Council's pre-application service here: http://www.reading.gov.uk/media/1190/Pre-Application-Enquiry-Form/pdf/Pre-app_Nov_2016.pdf