

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Caversham
App Ref: 200387
Address: 68 Queens Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 8DL
Proposal: Single storey side extension.
Case Officer: Mr James Schofield
Applicant: Mrs A Basketfield
Date received (valid from): 9 March 2020
Target Decision date: 4 May 2020

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

68 Queens Road is an early-twentieth century mid-terrace dwelling. It is typical of dwellings within the immediate context, which are characterised by a uniform shared roof ridgeline and front elevations with repeating/mirrored door, fenestration and chimney placement plans. Ground-floor bays and chimneys alternate in a mirrored pattern from one dwelling to the next; giving the sense that the dwellings are wider and grander. To the rear, alternating two-storey rear projections offer additional accommodation; sharing a party wall and one half of a gable-ended roof set down from the main ridgeline and first floor windows exclusively sited below the rear gable. The site is not listed, within a conservation area and does not benefit from any trees with Tree Protection Orders.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks permission for a 4.8-metre single-storey rear extension running the length of the original rear projection and replacing the existing single storey mono-pitch roofed rear extension. Plans considered:

Drawing No. 03820-01 Existing Ground Floor Plan
Drawing No. 03820-02 Proposed Ground Floor Plan
Drawing No. 03820-03 Elevations
Drawing No. 03820-04 Rev. A Block and Location Plans
As received 24 March 2020

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Neighbours

A site notice was displayed and all adjoining neighbours were consulted by letter receiving one comment from 70 Queens Road; an adjacent neighbour within the terrace. The comment requested conditions and informatives be placed on an approval regarding the Party Wall Act and the use of considerate construction practices due to the potential for a detrimental impact upon the structural integrity of shared walls and the potential for detrimental impact upon their residential amenity t result due to the proximity of the sites. These points are well taken, and as such, any positive recommendation should carry with it conditions regarding construction times and practices as well as informatives regarding the Party Wall Act and encroachment.

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 extensions 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 proposal, if built, would not extend beyond the established rear projection building line. While the proposed rear extension is modestly deeper than the 4-metre guideline provided by the Householder SPD, this ensures the rear projection does not terminate prematurely before reaching the end of the established rear projection building line. If the site were to rely on Permitted Development rights a 3-metre rear extension would appear ad hoc and fail to respect the character

of the existing dwelling and the wider area. While filling in this section of outdoor space between the rear projections is considered to alter the character of this part of the dwelling, it is considered that in this instance, improving the quality of accommodation offered by this relatively narrow dwelling in a manner which respects the rear building line at an appropriate scale is preferable and not detrimental. 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 is 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. M1 Materials to match