

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Kentwood
App Ref: 200226
Address: 6 Western Oaks, Tilehurst, Reading, RG32 6JE
Proposal: Proposed basement, Landscaping works and rear extension.
Case Officer: Mr James Schofield
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Berry
Date received (valid from): 12 February 2020
Target Decision date: 28 April 2020

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

Western Oaks an suburban close characterised by detached houses. Dwellings are typically detached with generous gardens. 1 meter of the very end of the garden falls within a designated Green Link.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks permission for the building of a basement in the back garden of the site and a corridor/staircase leading from the main dwelling to it from the ground floor. A landscape plan incorporates the planting of hedge within the designated Green Link. The garden would retain a similar appearance with the exception of astroturf, windows, and a staircase/entrance from near the end of the garden.

Plans considered:

Drawing No. BA0027 01A Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Drawing No. BA0027 04A Proposed Elevations

Drawing No. BA0027 50B Proposed Plans

Drawing No. BA0027 51A Proposed Elevations

Drawing No. BA0027 52 and Block Plan

As received 13 February 2020

Drawing No. BA0027 53 Landscape Plan

As received 16 April 2020

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

APP Ref: 11-00432-FUL | 110292

Proposal: Erection of detached 4 bedroom house with integral garage (re-submission of 11/00028/FUL).

Decision: Permitted. Appeal allowed. Decision varied; deletion of conditions 4 and 5 and replacement with a substitute condition. Condition 4 removed PD rights as they pertained to the building of all additions, extensions and outbuildings. Condition 5 removed PD rights for the creation of new windows or doors in the side elevations. The varied replacement condition simply removed PD rights for new windows, dormers or doors at or above the ground floor; meaning any new ones would require planning permission.

Decision date: 16/5/2011. Appeal decided 11 January 2012.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Neighbours

A site notice was displayed and 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

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 extension and alterations 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 proposed basement has the benefit of extending the house without being conspicuous for adjacent sites. Those elements of the extension which could be viewed from the rear garden, the stairwells connecting the basement to the garden and the main dwelling, are either below the ground level or of a single storey construction, small and in a non-sensitive elevation and location.

For the reasons discussed above, the development is considered to avoid causing any harm to the character or appearance of the wider area while improving the character of the dwelling. 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 complements these aims by indicating that acceptable development will not present an overbearing impact on neighbours or public areas.

As demonstrated on plans, the ground floor and basement levels of the proposal are deemed to avoid any concerns about detrimental impact on neighbour's privacy, sunlight or overbearingness by virtue of siting and levels. No views into adjacent neighbour's private outdoor amenity space is introduced which differ from those already established elsewhere in the existing rear elevation.

The site enjoys a large rear garden and the proposed development would leave a very similar amount of the garden as open space; but develop almost the entirety of it depending on one's perspective. Regardless, the form of development complies with the spirit of this guideline as the space remains open and a garden; albeit one on a "*green*" roof of sorts.

Subsequent to the above analysis, whilst constituting a relatively large addition to the dwelling, in this instance and based on the site and the proposals individual circumstances and characteristics, 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. 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.

While a small part of the site lies within an identified Green Link, the landscape plan improves the overall biodiversity of this section of the garden. Furthermore, the astroturf replaces conventional grass outside of this area.

As such the proposal is considered to accord with the biodiversity and sustainability considerations of Policies H9 and EN12 of the local plan and is best supported with a condition requiring the implementation and maintenance of the landscape plan.

7.5 Basement Extension Considerations

Basement works are usually large and complex undertakings. In carrying out excavation works there is a risk that nearby buildings will be undermined. The potential for various negative consequences to result include the potential for a worsening of drainage on the site, negative impact on the urban drainage systems, detrimental impact on traffic during construction, destruction of archaeological assets, damage to surrounding properties due to the potential for collapse and negative impact on residential amenity of neighbours due to construction related noise and or dust. The following chart lists various considerations, assessments related to them, whether these are necessary in this instance and the recommended course of action.

Engineering Design and Construction Statement (EDCS)	Considered, but not necessary to pursue separately in this instance.	Addressed in condition 4.
Demolition and Construction Management Plan	Necessary.	Addressed in condition 4.
Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)	Necessary.	Addressed in condition 4.
BREAAM Assessment	Policy CC2 <i>does not</i> require minor residential schemes to meet BREEAM standards.	
Flood Risk Assessment	<i>The site is within Flood Zone 1, as such, the potential for localised flooding is considered to be adequately addressed by the SuDs assessment.</i>	
Site Waste Management Plan	Necessary.	Addressed in condition 4.
SuDs (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems)	Policy EN18 encourages smaller developments to incorporate SuDs into the scheme wherever possible.	Addressed in condition 5.
Arboricultural Report	Not necessary as there are no protected trees on site.	
Heritage Impact Assessment	Not necessary as the site is not listed nor is it within a conservation area.	
Archaeological Impact Assessment	Not within an identified area of Archaeological Importance.	
Underground infrastructure impact assessment	The applicant will be required to take full account of where this infrastructure lies and take appropriate measures to ensure; compliance with building regulations; the avoidance of damage; and the law more generally.	Informative sufficient.

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. M3 Materials as specified
4. Construction Management Plan
5. Sustainable Drainage scheme
6. L4A Landscape Plan Implementation

APPENDIX

Site Photos

Photographs provided by the applicant.

