

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Application No: 191248/HOU

Address: 1 Crawshay Drive

Applicant: Mr K Haroon

Proposal: Single storey front and rear extension

Target date: 24/09/19

EOT: 24/10/19

Case officer: Connie Davis

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site is a two storey semi-detached property located on the western side of Crawshay Drive. The property has a link detached garage; the main house and garage are connected through the kitchen area which is set back substantially from the front elevation

The application site is not listed, nor in a conservation area. However a TPO is in place on a tree in the neighbouring garden.

Proposal:

The proposal comprises of a single storey rear and front extension. To the rear, the extension would measure a width of 10m, depth of 3m and maximum height of 2.6m. It would have a flat roof which would connect with the flat roof of the existing kitchen. This flat roof would then be extended to infill the gap between the main house and the garage. From the front elevation, the extension (infill) would be 3m wide and would be set back from the main elevation by approx 1m.

In addition, a new first floor side window is proposed on the southern elevation.

Plans Considered:

Location Plan

01 - Existing Floor Plans

02 - Existing Floor Plans

03 - Existing Elevations

04 - Existing Block Plan

Received 31st July 2019

01 Rev B - Proposed Floorplans

02 Rev A - Proposed Floor Plans

03 Rev A - Proposed Elevations

04 Rev B - Proposed Block Plan

Received 20th October 2019

Planning History

None.

Consultation Responses:

Internal Consultees

Transport

No objection as one off road parking space is still retained despite the loss of the garage.

Natural Environment

The RBC Natural Environment Officer reviewed the application and questioned as to whether a new patio would be proposed as part of (or following the completion of the works). The agent provided revised plans showing a new patio area of a depth of 0.8m, so as not to conflict with the RPA of the protected tree in the neighbouring garden. It was noted by the case officer that a patio of this size would not be considered very useable. However no changes were made to the proposed plans.

As such a condition preventing the construction of any further patio space without permission from the LPA would be attached to planning permission. This is to ensure that any further patio would not conflict with the protected tree, and thus Policy CS38.

The consultation response from the Natural Environment Officer did not state that a patio of a depth of 0.8m would conflict with the RPA.

External Consultation

The following addresses were formally consulted via letter on :

3 and 11 Crawshay Drive
30, 32 and 34 Courtenay Drive

In addition a site notice was sent to the agent on.

Two responses (observations) have been received and relate to the following matters:

Trees/ Window

If the application section referring to falling distance of a tree means is there an adjacent tree that could fall on the proposed development, then the application should have said yes not no. The adjacent garden has a substantial - possibly two hundred year old protected (TPO) oak tree - within a few meters of the development.

The proposed development should not be permitted to encroach on the protected oak tree roots area. The next door development already built into the protected zone and subsequent poor tree health was observed. Additional encroachment would further damage the protected tree.

I note the concern raised by the planning officer on the likelihood of a patio area further damaging the protected oak tree root area. This could increase the risk of the protected tree falling on adjacent properties.

I assume the regulations require the side window to be opaque.

Officer comment: See appraisal

Design

'Proposed side extension is not in keeping with other houses in the road. New side extensions on houses have either had to come forward with an added pitched covered porch or be recessed with a pitched roof on the extension. The flat roof and flat frontage looks unsightly'.

Officer comment: See appraisal below

Discussions with applicant/ agent

None.

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.

Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

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

National Planning Policy Framework;
National Planning Policy Guidance;

RBC Local Development Framework

Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015)

CS7 Design and the Public Realm
CS38 Trees, Hedges and Woodland

Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015)

DM4 Safeguarding Amenity
DM9 House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation
DM10 Private and Communal Outdoor Space
DM12 Access, Traffic and Highway Related Matters

Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003)

Appraisal Checklist

DM9 states: An extension to a house will be acceptable where it:

- 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**, the rear extension is considered acceptable in terms of its overall scale and design. The extension also proposes to infill the space between the garage and the main house. The alterations to the front would be in line with the existing garage and set back from the front elevation of the main house by approximately 1m. It is acknowledged that the entire extension would have a flat roof continuing from the rear to the front. Although from the front elevation, the flat roof differs from that of the main house, the property already has a flat roof element visible from the front (although set further back). It is considered this arrangement differs from other houses in the street and therefore in this instance, the continuation of what already exists is, on balance, considered acceptable.
- 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**, as discussed earlier. The provision of any further patio space will be subject to a planning application to prevent harm to the protected tree. This will be secured by condition. The consultation response from the Natural Environment Officer did not state that a patio of a depth of 0.8m would conflict with the RPA. No further patio space was wished to be included as part of this application.

- 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; 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**, the proposed rear extension is not considered to reduce light levels to adjacent neighbour, no. 3 Cawshay Drive due to the modest depth of the extension (3m) and thus is compliant with the Council's 'A Design Guide to House Extensions'. The extension, by way of its depth, would therefore qualify as permitted development.

The proposal is not considered to conflict with other neighbouring property, 30 Courtenay Drive due to the orientation of this plot with the application site being at a right angle, and thus does not conflict with neighbouring windows.

- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **NO**, no side windows are proposed on the extension. One side window is proposed on the southern elevation at first floor level of the existing house. However the separation distance between the application site and 30 Courtenay Drive is around 24m and therefore it is not considered that this window would result in a substantial loss of privacy for this neighbour. In addition, the window will serve a bathroom which is not considered a habitable room.
- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **NO**, as discussed above, the application site differs from other properties in its partially set back front elevation. Therefore extending this forward and in filling the gap is considered acceptable. The flat roof, has on balance, been considered acceptable due to a flat roof already being in place.
- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **NO**, materials are proposed to match the existing.

DM4: 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.

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**
- Access to sunlight and daylight; **NO**
- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development; **NO**
- Noise and disturbance; **NO**
- Artificial lighting; **NO**
- Vibration; **NO**
- Dust and fumes; **NO**
- Smell; **NO**
- Crime and safety; **NO**

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 original building or neighbouring properties. As such the proposed works are considered to be in accordance with CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008), DM4: Safeguarding Amenity and DM9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document (Oct 2012) and the Councils Supplementary Planning Guidance A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003).

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION

Conditions

1. TL1 - 3 year time limit.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location Plan

Received 31st July 2019

01 Rev B - Proposed Floorplans
02 Rev A - Proposed Floor Plans
03 Rev A - Proposed Elevations
04 Rev B - Proposed Block Plan

Received 20th October 2019

Reason: because permission is granted in respect of the development as detailed in the approved plans only.

3. Matching Materials

4. No additional rear patio shall be constructed without permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to ensure that appropriate protection is given to trees of amenity value within and adjacent to the site in accordance with Policy CS38.

Informatives

1. Building Control
2. Construction & Demolition
3. Terms
4. Encroachment
5. Positive and Proactive
6. Highways
7. Do not damage the verge

1HA