

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Minster
App Ref: 200236
Address: 62 Brook Street West, Reading, RG1 6BB
Proposal: Proposed single storey rear extension, loft extension and outbuilding to be used as a gym.
Case Officer: Mr James Schofield
Applicant: Mr Farhad Malek
Date received (valid from): 13 February 2020
Target Decision date: 20 April 2020

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The 62 Brook Street West is a mid-terrace dwelling with a recent Certificate of Lawfulness approved for a rear dormer, extension and granny annexe at the end of the garden. Number 4 Garnet Street has an annexe located at the end of their garden which abuts the end of 62 Brook Street West's garden. The site is not within a conservation area and does not benefit from any trees with Tree Protection Orders.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks permission for a 4.2 metre single-storey rear extension (an additional 1.2 metres in depth over that already approved) and to increase the height of the granny annexe to 3 metres in order to accommodate its use as a gym. Plans considered:

62 Brook 010 P21 Existing and Proposed Plans
As received 13 February 2020

62 Brook 010 P21 Existing and Proposed Plans
As received 06 April 2020

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

APP Ref: 190883/CLP
Proposal: Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed single storey rear extension, loft extension and a gym.
Decision: Permitted
Decision date: 21/08/2019

4. CONSULTATIONS

Neighbours

A site notice was displayed and all adjoining neighbours were consulted by letter and one objection was received which opposed the application due to the perception that the house would be ideal for conversion into an HMO. However, this is not a material consideration as the application is not for an HMO. Furthermore, the granny annexe could not easily develop access separate from the main dwelling. The public is reminded that they can notify the Council should they suspect an HMO is operating without a licence.

Transport

Officer raised no objections provided a condition limiting use to that of Ancillary to the enjoyment of the main dwelling is included.

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 Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

National Planning Practice Guidance

Reading Borough Local Plan (adopted 2019)

CC7: Design and the Public Realm

CC8: Safeguarding Amenity

EN12: Biodiversity and the Green Network

H9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

7. APPRAISAL

7.1 Principle of development

Residential alterations including the construction of outbuildings are supported in principle by Policy H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the Local Plan (2019) subject to criteria ensuring the effects of such extensions and alterations respect its context and are not harmful. These considerations will be examined in more detail in the following sections.

7.2 Character and scale

Policy CC7 of the Local Plan states that, development must be of a high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area in Reading in which it is located. Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it: respects the character of the house, the pattern of neighbouring properties and building lines.

The proposed outbuilding is in keeping with the established aesthetic of end of garden annexes in the context of the site; notably there is a very similar existing annexe at number 4 Garnet Street which is adjacent to the proposed site of the annexe.

The proposed rear extension is modestly deeper than the 4 metre guideline provided by the Householder SPD and would match the depth of 60 Brook Street West, the dwelling with which the proposal site shares a wall for their two-storey rear projection (original, part of a typical alternating/mirrored pattern).

Because the proposed rear extension would restore a modest degree of symmetry at an appropriate scale, and the 3-meter-high annexe is deemed to be in keeping with its surroundings; there are no concerns resulting from this application about any subsequent detrimental impact upon the character of the main dwelling or the wider context. As such, the proposal accords with the aims of Policy CC7 and the design considerations of Policy H9.

7.3 *Amenity*

Policy CC8 requires development to refrain from causing a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties or unacceptable living conditions for residents. And Policy H9 compliments these aims by indicating that acceptable development will not present an overbearing impact on neighbours or public areas.

The ground floor rear extension and annexe are deemed to avoid any concerns about detrimental impact on neighbour's privacy, sunlight or overbearingness by virtue of siting and design; with no views into adjacent neighbour's private outdoor amenity space being introduced. The site would leave over half the plot undeveloped.

Subsequent to the above analysis, in this instance and based on the site's individual circumstances, the proposed development is deemed to accord with Policy CC8 and the overbearingness considerations of Policy H9 if the discussed conditions are included with any permission granted.

7.4 *Biodiversity and sustainability*

Part 'b' of Policy EN12 indicates that all development sites should not result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity, and should provide a net gain for biodiversity wherever possible through new tree planting, wildlife friendly landscaping and other ecological enhancements. 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.

The site does not benefit from any protected trees or identified Green Links. The proposal is not considered likely to result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. As such the proposal is considered to accord with the biodiversity and sustainability considerations of Policies H9 and EN12 of the local plan.

8. CONCLUSION

In light of the above assessment the proposal is considered to accord with the requirements of the development plan. As such, the proposed development is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

9. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT

10. CONDITIONS

1. TL1 Time Limit
2. AP1 Approved Plans
3. M3 Materials as specified