

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Minster
App Ref: 200501
Address: 14 Edenham Crescent, Reading, RG1 6HU
Proposal: Proposed part two part single-storey rear extension.
Case Officer: James Schofield
Applicant: Mr Shashikanth Hallibyl
Date received (valid from): 2 April 2020
Target Decision date: 26 June 2020

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposed site is a two-storey semi-attached dwelling on Edenham Crescent. The site has a relatively modest garden and a shared driveway with the neighbouring site. The site is not in a conservation area and no trees on site are covered by tree protection orders. The site is within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed development is for the removal of the exiting rear conservatory and construction of a part two, part single-storey rear extension. Plans considered;

Drawing No. P1141-01 Location block plan
Drawing No. P1141-02 Existing Plans Elevations
Drawing No. P1141-03 Proposed Plans Elevations
As received 1st of April 2020

Drawing No. P1141-01A Location block plan
Drawing No. P1141-03A Proposed Plans Elevations
As received 26th of May 2020

Drawing No. P1141-01-B Location & Block plan
Drawing No. P1141-02-B Existing Plans and Elevations
Drawing No. P1141-03-B Proposed Plans and Elevations
As received 27th of May 2020

Drawing No. P1141-01-C Location & Block plan
Drawing No. P1141-03-C Proposed Plans and Elevations
As received 28th of May 2020

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REF: 200317
Description: Rear extension measuring 6m in depth, with a maximum height of 3m, and 2.5m in height to eaves level. Notification of the construction of an extension under class A Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.
Decision: Withdrawn, the officer had resisted the scheme based on its size.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Neighbours

All adjoining neighbours were consulted by letter, and one response was received from the neighbours of the attached dwelling. The objection is relatively long and is attached as an appendix. The issues raised by the objection were summarised as;

- Lack of relevant comparable precedent
- Overdevelopment (e.g, increase of 43% in floor area of original house)
- Loss of sunlight and daylight (eg, 45 degree rule breached at 1st storey level and stretched to the maximum at 2nd storey level)
- Visual dominance and overbearing effect (eg, blocking 30 degrees of the 50 degree upper visual field of people on Number 16's rear patio)
- Character and appearance (eg this is a large 2-storey extension to a small house and garden)
- Noise and disturbance - ongoing after proposed extension completed from use of extension of kitchen into the garden
- Loss of biodiversity
- Increase in on-road parking problems (eg demolition of existing garage)
- Lack of planning approval and/or building control approval for conversion some years ago of the front garden to a parking lot for 2 cars.

The objections, where they relate to a material consideration, are addressed by the subsequent appraisal.

5. EQUALITY ACT 2010:

In determining this application, the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. There has been an indication that a member of one of the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this planning application. Therefore, in terms of the key equalities protected characteristics it is considered necessary to assess if the local development plan adequately avoids the causing any significant adverse impacts. It is determined that local policy seeks explicitly to take these needs into account wherever feasible, and in this case, Policy H9 is considered to be compliant with the Equality Act 2010 by virtue of offering special consideration and additional latitude in terms of a wider array of amenity provision in the case of annexes in order to empower protected groups to live more independently and or meet other identified needs where possible.

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'.

Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special interest which it possesses.

Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority in the exercise of its functions to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

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

EN15: Air Quality

TR1: Achieving the Transport Strategy

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

7. APPRAISAL

7.1 Principle of development

The application seeks permission for a part two, part single-storey rear 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 development are not harmful. Other considerations will be considered in more detail in the following sections.

7.2 Scale, appearance and design

The proposed development includes a side and front extension to the ground floor. 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"*

The rear extensions make use of a combination of a hipped and flat roof in order to integrate with the existing roof form of the original dwelling. The materials appear to match those of the existing dwelling. The two-storey extension would create an enlarged first floor rear bedroom. The depth would not conflict with the guidance contained within the Council's SPD. This element would not represent a disproportionate addition to the dwelling. Overall the proposal is considered to be adequately sympathetic to the design of the existing dwelling and its immediate context.

As such, the proposal is considered to be in accordance 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).

7.3 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, the following has been considered - would the proposal cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties in terms of:

- Privacy and overlooking; **NO, the proposal does not result in any new views being created - simply existing openings moved 4 metres backward. One new window in the east elevation at the first floor is proposed to be obscure glazed. A condition requiring this to remain the case is considered prudent to ensure neighbouring privacy is not compromised.**
- Access to sunlight and daylight; **NO, the two-storey element is located away from neighbouring boundaries. Furthermore, the aspect of the rear gardens ensures that any loss of light that does result will be limited to the morning. As such, the proposal is considered to be relatively typical of development of this type and to accord with the local SPD and policy objectives.**
- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development; **NO, the single-storey element closest to neighbouring boundaries are of a limited height while the two-storey element is located sufficient distance from the shared boundary.**
- Noise and disturbance; **NO**
- Artificial lighting; **NO**
- Vibration; **NO**
- Dust and fumes; **NO**
- Smell; **NO**
- Crime and safety. **NO**

Subsequent to the above analysis, 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 provided the discussed conditions are put in place.

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.

Given the existing biodiversity value of the area in which the extensions will occupy (conservatory and patio), 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 and is therefore recommended for approval subject conditions.

9. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT

10. CONDITIONS

1. Standard time limit (TL1)
2. Standard approved plans (AP1)
3. M1 Materials to match