

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Caversham
App Ref: 200472
Address: 12 Mill Green, Caversham, Reading, RG4 8EX
Proposal: Two storey side and single storey front extensions
Case Officer: James Schofield
Applicant: Mr Richards
Date received (valid from): 24 March 2020
Target Decision date: 16 October 2020

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling on *Mill Green* (road name). The site is not in a conservation area. It is within a habitat of optimal suitability for foraging by protected species of bats. The site falls within Flood Zone 3. The site is adjacent to an identified Green Link.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed development is for an extension to the existing porch and the erection of a two-storey side extension on the site of an existing attached garage on the ground floor. Plans considered;

Drawing No. 34719-01 Existing Ground Floor Plan
Drawing No. 34719-02 Existing First Floor Plan
Drawing No. 34719-03 Existing Elevations
Drawing No. 34719-04 Proposed Ground Floor Plan
Drawing No. 34719-05 Proposed First Floor Plan
Drawing No. 34719-06 Proposed Elevations
Drawing No. 34719-07 Block and Location Plans
As received 26th of March 2020

Drawing No. 34719-04A Proposed Ground Floor Plan
Drawing No. 34719-05A Proposed First Floor Plan
Drawing No. 34719-06A Proposed Elevations
Drawing No. 34719-07A Block and Location Plans
As received 12th of June 2020

Drawing No. 34719-07B Block and Location Plans
As received 16th of October 2020

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Neighbours

A site notice was displayed and no responses were received.

Ecology

Officers indicated the site is part of a habitat of optimal suitability for use by commuting or foraging bats. And as such a bat survey was required prior to any permission being granted. This

was subsequently completed to the satisfaction of the Ecology Officer who indicated there were no concerns about harm to protected species resulting from the development.

Transport

Transport indicated that the original plans did not illustrate the location of the dropped kerb while proposing new parking spaces. A request for updated plans indicating this was requested and subsequently received which proposed a new wider dropped kerb. As such an informative indicating the applicant will need to seek a permit for this new kerb should be included as part of any recommendation for approval.

5. LEGAL AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

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.

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 Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and The Conservation of habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (The Habitat Regulations) prohibit either deliberate or reckless damage, harm or disturbance of protected species without first obtaining the relevant license for derogation from the regulations from the Statutory Nature Conservation Organisation.

The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

National Planning Policy

- National Planning Policy Framework (2019)
- National Planning Practice Guidance
- Paragraph 99 of government Circular 06/05: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and Their Impact Within The Planning System
- Guidance: Flood risk and coastal change, [What is meant by “minor development” in relation to flood risk](#) (Par. 046, Ref ID: 7-046-20140306)
- Guidance: Flood risk and coastal change, [The flood risk issues raised by minor developments](#) (Par. 047, Ref ID: 7-047-20150415)
- [Flood map for planning; 12 Mill Green](#)

Reading Borough Local Plan (adopted 2019)

- CC7: Design and the Public Realm
- CC8: Safeguarding Amenity
- H9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation
- EN12: Biodiversity and the Green Network
- EN18: Flooding and Sustainable Drainage Systems

SPG/SPD

- A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

6. APPRAISAL

6.1 Principle of development

The application seeks permission to build a two-storey side and single-storey porch extension. Such domestic works are supported in principle by Policy H9 of Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) subject to a number of criteria ensuring the effects of such works are not harmful. Other considerations will be considered in more detail in the following sections.

6.2 Scale, appearance and design

Policy H9 'House extension and ancillary accommodation' states that: *"an extension to a house or other householder development will be acceptable where it:*

- Respects the character and appearance of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design;*
- 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 present an overbearing impact on neighbours or a large blank façade to public areas; and*
- Does not result in a loss of biodiversity within gardens"*

Further to discussions with the agent, amended plans were submitted for the proposal to ensure the two-storey side extension is set-back and down from the main dwelling, to ensure it remains subservient to the main house, and employs design features which draw on the most positive aspects of the existing design.

The side extension is now considered subservient to the main dwelling and typical of development like this in terms of its scale. As such, the proposal would not result in a scale which would be inappropriate for the dwelling itself or its wider context.

Therefore, the amended proposal for the side extension and porch are now considered to integrate sympathetically into the existing dwelling and are acceptable in terms of their impact on the character of the dwelling and that of the wider context.

The proposal is considered to accord with CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) and H8 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance "A Design Guide to House Extensions" (2003).

6.3 Safeguarding Amenity

Policy CC8: Safeguarding Amenity states that 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 it is necessary to consider if the proposal would cause a *significant* detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties in terms of:

Privacy and overlooking;	The design of the proposal would ensure there would be no worsening of existing privacy or overlooking concerns. The proposed rear-facing first floor window is in a similar position to the existing window serving
---------------------------------	--

	'Bedroom 2' (as labelled on the plans). The new windows introduced into the front elevation do not face or overlook any areas sensitive to privacy or overlooking concerns.
Access to sunlight and daylight;	Due to the facts that, there is a gap between 12 and 14 Mill Green, and 14 Mill Green is directly east of 12 Mill Green it is not considered likely that access to sunlight should suffer a materially detrimental impact on sunlight amenity. This is because the gap reduces the impact on the sunlight amenity of windows for neighbouring sites and outdoor private amenity space as; • Due to siting, shadows resulting from the proposal would be unlikely to reach and overshadow the front facing windows of 14 Mill Green (whose windows appear to be primarily sited in the front and rear elevations). And; • as number 12 is directly west of number 14 Mill Green, both have north facing aspects for their rear windows and protected outdoor amenity space. As such, existing levels of overshadowing will already be extensive stemming from the siting and massing of existing development. As such, it is considered that access to sunlight for the site or its neighbours would not detrimentally worsen as a result of the development to any material degree.
Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development;	Due to adequate spacing and relative distance in siting/massing between the extension and neighbouring dwellings, no worsened sense of visual dominance or overbearingness would likely result from the proposal.
Noise and disturbance;	It is considered that due to distance between the proposal and neighbouring buildings that no increase in noise and disturbance would likely result from the development once built. However, the site is adjacent to existing residential dwellings and the potential for an unacceptable impact on the levels of noise and disturbance during construction is considered to be possible. As such, provided a condition is included limiting the possible hours of construction, the proposal is unlikely to be harmful to noise levels to a significant degree.
Artificial lighting;	Similarly, no long-term impacts in terms of <u>artificial lighting</u> are considered likely to result from the proposal once built. However, during construction this may not be the case. The condition limiting hours of construction is considered to address this.
Vibration;	Similarly, no long-term impacts in terms of <u>vibration</u> are considered likely to result from the proposal once built. However, during construction this may not be the case. The condition limiting hours of construction is considered to address this.
Dust and fumes;	Similarly, no long-term impacts in terms of <u>dust and fumes</u> are considered likely to result from the proposal once built. However, during construction this may not be the case. The condition limiting hours of construction is considered to address this.
Smell;	Similarly, no long-term impacts in terms of <u>smell</u> are considered likely to result from the proposal once built. However, during construction this

	may not be the case. The condition limiting hours of construction is considered to address this.
Crime and safety;	No impact on the relative crime and safety of the site or its neighbours is deemed to result from the proposal.

Subsequent to the above analysis, in this instance based on the site's individual circumstances further to the discussed condition, the proposed development is deemed to accord with Policy CC8 and the overbearingness considerations of Policy H9.

6.4 Biodiversity and sustainability

Part 'b' of Policy EN12 indicates that all development sites should not result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. These aims are supported by Policy H9 which states that an extension will only be acceptable where it does not result in the loss of biodiversity within gardens. Paragraph 99 of the government Circular 06/05: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and Their Impact Within The Planning System requires the establishment of the presence or otherwise of protected species through surveys prior to the granting of planning permission in most instances.

The Ecology Officer indicated the site is part of a habitat of optimal suitability for use by commuting or foraging bats. As such, a statutory requirement for a bat survey was established. This was subsequently provided by the agent and was verified by the Ecology Officer to have been conducted correctly and to demonstrate there was no meaningful risk of harm to any protected species of Bats.

While the front of the site runs parallel to a Green Link, the part of the front garden proposed to be used for parking and the porch is covered with grass and includes no notable vegetation or trees.

As such, the proposal is not considered likely to result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity and thus the proposal is considered to accord with the biodiversity and sustainability considerations of Policies H9 and EN12 of the local plan and to accord with the requirements of Paragraph 99 of the government Circular 06/05.

6.5 Flood-Risk

The Environment Agency's standing advice defines minor developments as;

- minor non-residential extensions: industrial/commercial/leisure etc. extensions with a footprint less than 250 square metres.
- alterations: development that does not increase the size of buildings e.g. alterations to external appearance.
- householder development: For example; sheds, garages, games rooms etc within the curtilage of the existing dwelling, in addition to physical extensions to the existing dwelling itself. This definition excludes any proposed development that would create a separate dwelling within the curtilage of the existing dwelling e.g. subdivision of houses into flats.

As this application is for a householder development extending an existing dwelling within its curtilage, it is considered to be a minor development. As such, according to the Environment Agency's Standing advice, it is unlikely to raise significant flood risk issues;

- unless they would have an adverse effect on a watercourse, floodplain or its flood defences;
- they would impede access to flood defence and management facilities, or;
- where the cumulative impact of such developments would have a significant effect on local flood storage capacity or flood flows.

The proposal is considered unlikely to in anyway affect access to flood defence and management facilities, have an adverse effect on the watercourse or flood defences, and is unlikely to harm flood storage capacity or flood flows provided the amount of hard standing on the site is limited and permeable surfaces are employed for the proposed parking area. This is aided in part by the fact that majority of the footprint of the proposed extension is replacing an existing attached garage.

Provided two conditions are included, one requiring the scheme uses the materials proposed on the amended plans and the other removing the sites' PD rights relating to new hard standing without planning permission, the proposal is considered unlikely to significantly raise the level of harm posed on the flood storage capacity of the site. As such, with these conditions, the proposal accords with both the Environment Agency's standing advice on minor development within flood risk zone 3 and Policy EN18 of the local plan.

7. CONCLUSION

In light of the above assessment the proposal is considered to accord with the requirements of the development plan and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

8. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT

9. CONDITIONS

1. Standard time limit (TL1)
2. Standard approved plans (AP1)
3. Materials as specified (M3)
4. No new hard surfacing without obtaining planning permission
5. Limited construction hours (C1)