

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Mapledurham
App Ref: 191822
Address: 33 Hilltop Road, Reading, RG4 7HR
Proposal: Proposed part two part single storey side and rear extension.
Case Officer: Mr James Schofield
Applicant: Mr G Waterhouse
Date received (valid from): 14 November 2019
Target Decision date: 8 January 2020

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

Hilltop Road is characterised by suburban residences on long plots; the dwellings are a mix of semi-detached and terraces. The development site is one half of a semi-detached dwelling.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed development is for a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and a second storey dormer.

Plans considered:

Drawing No. 01 Existing floor Plans
Drawing No. 02 Existing Elevations
Drawing No. 03 Existing Block Plan
Drawing No. 04 Proposed Floor Plans
Drawing No. 05 Proposed Elevations
Drawing No. 06 Proposed Block Plan
Site Location Plan, Licence No: 100047474
As received 13 November 2019

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Neighbours

All adjoining neighbours were consulted by letter and no responses were 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 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

H9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

EN12: Biodiversity and the Green Network

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

7. APPRAISAL

7.1 Principle of development

The application seeks permission for side and rear extensions to an existing residential dwelling. Such domestic works are supported in principle by Policy H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the Local Plan (2019) subject to a number of 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 two-storey side extension is set back and down of the original dwelling as viewed from the streetscene which ensures it remains visually subordinate.

The proposed materials throughout appear to reflect the dwelling and its wider context.

The proposed depth of the single-storey rear extension at 4.7 metres does exceed the recommended 4 metres for rear extensions in the design guide. However, the proposal is not deemed to demonstrate inappropriate scale or siting because, as discussed below, the proposal is not considered likely to cause harm.

The development is not considered to cause any harm to the character or appearance of either the dwelling or the wider area, and therefore, 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 element of the side and rear extensions are deemed to avoid any concerns about detrimental impact on neighbours privacy, sunlight or overbearingness by virtue of its single-storey height.

The first-floor rear elements maintain 45-degree angles of unobstructed view from the closest first floor window of Nos. 31 and 35 Hilltop Road. The first floor elements of the proposal do not include any side-flank fenestration.

The proposed development would not introduce any new views into neighbouring gardens, obstruct sunlight or introduce development which would be overbearing for neighbours. The site enjoys a large rear garden and the proposed development would leave over half the plot undeveloped. Subsequent to the above analysis, whilst constituting a large extension, in this instance and based on the sites individual circumstances, the proposed development is deemed to accord with Policy CC8 and the overbearingness considerations of Policy H9.

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 development is not considered to comply with the aspirations of Policy EN12 part 'b' as it does not seek to provide a net gain for biodiversity despite capacity to do so.

The timing of the application (being submitted prior to the adoption of these policies) and the absence of any biodiversity loss were considerations in arriving at the view that these modest biodiversity shortcomings are not alone enough to warrant withholding planning permission for this application.

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 Standard time-limit
2. AP1 Standard approved plans
3. M1 Materials to match

APPENDIX
Site Photos

Photographs taken in the course of a site visit conducted on the 8th of January 2020.





