

## **DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT**

**Ward:** Mapledurham

**App Ref:** 190615/HOU

**Address:** 24 Carlton Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7NT

**Proposals:** First floor side extension

**Case Officer:** Tom Hughes

**Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Godfrey

**Date received (valid from):** 14 April 2019

**Target Decision date:** 9 June 2019 - ext to 11 June 2019

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

The application site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling in a distinctive chalet style. The dwelling benefits from a box dormer window and a flat-roofed garage beyond the side elevation. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, generally comprised of dwellings of the same style and design.

### **2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

The proposal is for a first floor side extension, in the form of an enlargement of the existing box dormer. The proposal would extend at the same height and width as the existing dormer, projecting to a depth flush to the principal elevation. A window would be located to the front elevation. Materials have been selected to match those of the existing dwelling.

The agent supplied the following, received on 15/04/19:

Drawing No: BA 0141 01 - Site Location and Site Plan, Existing Floor Plans and Elevations

Drawing No: BA 0141 02 - Site Location and Block Plan, Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

### **3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

None.

### **4. CONSULTATIONS**

#### **4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter:**

26 Carlton Road, Caversham, Reading, Berkshire, RG4 7NT

27 Hilltop Road, Caversham, Reading, Berkshire, RG4 7HR

15 Carlton Road, Caversham, Reading, Berkshire, RG4 7NT

29 Hilltop Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7HR

22 Carlton Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7NT

13 Carlton Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7NT

#### **4.2 Letters of representation have been received as follows:**

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.

## 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 Framework Core Strategy (2008)

CS7 (Design and the Public Realm)

### Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012)

DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity)

DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

### SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

## 6. APPRAISAL

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 proposal is sufficient in its design and proportion that it doesn't detract from the original buildings appearance. The proposal represents an extension of the existing box dormer, a feature of the original dwelling. The proposal is proportionate in terms of its scale, fitting within the existing roof slope**
- 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; 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 proposal would be located a sufficient distance from the neighbouring dwellings, and would not significantly reduce the amount of light to those dwellings**
- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **No, the proposed window is not considered to be any more harmful than the existing fenestration**
- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **No, the dwellings in the surrounding area are generally of the same style and design, many of which have been extended with**

**the same extension as that which is currently proposed. This eases any concerns with regard to inconsistent design**

- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **No, materials have been selected to match those of the existing dwelling**

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, see above**
- Access to sunlight and daylight; **No, see above**
- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development; **No, though residents of the neighbouring dwellings will notice the additional depth of the proposal, it would be located a sufficient distance from those dwellings and is not considered to be visually dominant or overbearing**
- Noise and disturbance; **No**
- Artificial lighting; **No**
- Vibration; **No**
- Dust and fumes; **No**
- Smell; **No**
- Crime and safety. **No**

## **7. CONCLUSION**

The proposed development has been assessed and the proposed works are considered to be in accordance with the above relevant policies and planning permission can be granted.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**Application Permitted**