

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Thames

App Ref: 200508/HOU

Address: 318 Kidmore Road, Caversham

Proposals: Removal of existing external decking to rear and replace with new. New fencing screens to boundary

Case Officer: Mr James Overall

Applicant: Mrs Helen Mynett

Date received (valid from): 1 April 2020

Target Decision date: 27 May 2020

1. SITE DESCRIPTION & PROPOSAL

The proposal relates to a semi-detached two storey property which is seeking planning permission for the replacement of a rear decking. The replacement decking would benefit from a set of new steps down to the garden, a small mid-way landing area and additional privacy screens. The overall usable area of decking being replaced will remain as existing, however it will be 0.16 metres higher than existing.

2. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Plans considered:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received
Site and Block Plan		20-318KR-P-SITE-01	12 Jun-20
Floor Plans	Existing & Proposed	20-318KR-P-01.03	12 Jun-20
Elevational Sections	Existing & Proposed	20-318KR-P-02.02	12 Jun-20
Rear Elevations	Existing & Proposed	20-318KR-P-03.02	12 Jun-20

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

900307 - Single storey rear extension to dwelling; conversion of garage to kitchen, including front bay window extension - Application Permitted 17 June 1990

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter:

316 Kidmore Road
320 Kidmore Road
27 Winterberry Way

4.2 Two letters of representation were received from both 316 and 320 Kidmore Road. One of these raised no concerns, whilst the other objected on the grounds of overlooking and stated:

"We have carefully considered the plans and have come up with a proposal which we think provides a good solution for both parties."

The downward slope of the land between this row of houses means some overlooking into neighbours' gardens is unavoidable.

However, the proposal to increase the height of decking, which is already high, would make privacy more of an issue for both parties, hence the perceived need for extra screening/fencing on our boundary.

The full increase in the height of the deck would therefore not be acceptable to us, it would make a significant difference to our privacy and overlook our garden further.

So, we suggest a compromise which would be to increase the height of the deck by half the proposed amount.

We would like the 'privacy screen'; on our boundary to be kept at 1.2m above this new deck height.

Also we do not want any extra trellis or tall planting to be added to the height of this screening.

The mature jasmine (which already provides a natural screen) on our border should not be damaged in the process. We realise it may need some trimming back to enable works to be completed.

We think these are reasonable requests given the already current scale and height of the deck, and the natural downward sloping lie of the land”.

4.3 Internal Consultations

Transport

No response was received from the Transportation department.

Equality Act

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.

5. 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 Policy

National Planning Policy Framework
National Planning Practice Guidance

Reading Borough Local Development Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

SPG/SPD

- A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

6. APPRAISAL

A. Respects the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design;

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- detract from the appearance of the original building through the use of ill-matching materials and by not fitting in with the design, scale and proportions of the original building; NO
- reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree; NO
- require the loss of trees in the garden or put significant trees at risk; NO

B. Respects the character and pattern of neighbouring properties and the street as a whole in terms of scale, location, materials and design, and any important existing building line;

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; NO, the decking is not increasing to an excessive degree and therefore is considered acceptable.
- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; NO

CC8: Safeguarding Amenity states 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. This has been assessed and it is considered the proposal would not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of any existing or new occupiers or neighbours.

C. Respects neighbour's amenities and does not present a large blank façade to public areas.

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- significantly reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight enjoyed by neighbouring properties; NO
- Infringe the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; NO. Whilst there have been objections received from a neighbouring household, an amended plan has been received, which proposes an increase to the height of the privacy screening along the boundary. This screening is proposed to be 1.7 metres above the height of the decking. 1.7 metres is considered a sufficient height to maintain privacy. It is therefore accepted that a screening height of 1.7 metres from the height of the decking is sufficient to safeguard the amenities of adjoining neighbours and will prevent the replacement decking from causing any harmful overlooking.

7. CONCLUSION

The proposed development would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the site or its surroundings and would not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the original building or neighbouring properties or amenity. As such the proposed works are considered to be in accordance with the above relevant policies and permission can be granted.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

Application Permitted subject to conditions and informatives