

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Application No: 191054/HOU

Address: 16 Whitley Wood Road

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Brian Casey

Proposal: Single storey rear extension with dual pitch roof

Target date: 26/08/19

EOT: 28/06/19

Case officer: Connie Davis

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site is a two storey detached property located on the northern side of Whitley Wood Road, on the corner with Tamarisk Avenue. The property is finished with brick at ground floor level and pebble dash at first floor level.

The property is not listed, nor in a conservation area.

Proposal:

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension. It would measure a depth of 5m, maximum height of 4m and a width of 3.25m. Materials are proposed to match the existing property.

Plans Considered:

Location Plan

Site Plan

Existing Floor Plan

Alternate Side Elevations

Side Elevations

Rear Elevations

Proposed Floor Plan

Floor plan - extract

Received 1st July 2019

Relevant Planning History:

None.

Consultation Responses:

Internal Consultees

No internal consultees were consulted on this application.

External Consultation

A site notice was displayed at the property from 02/08/19 - 23/08/19. In addition the following addresses were formally consulted via letter on 01/07/19:

14 and 18 Whitley Wood Road

1 and 27 Tamarisk Avenue

One response (objection) was received from no. 14 relating and reads as follows:

We (my wife and I) bought our property for its brightness and airy. We are concerned that an extension of such is going to block lights and air into our property. We have an utility room with doors close to boundary and a kitchen window facing the proposed extension site. We are also concerned that the proposed extension is right up to boundary foundations of which could encroach into our land.

We would recommend to move the extension about 1m away from the boundary and reconsider the height of the extension to a such that do not cause obstruction for lights and air into our property.

Officer comment: Although the proposed extension will run along the boundary with no. 14, it is not considered that the extension would reduce light or air to the neighbouring property to an unacceptable degree. This is due to the extension being single storey and the neighbouring house being set substantially off the boundary (with the exception of the garage, which from the objection appears to have been converted to a utility room). Nevertheless, a utility room is not considered a habitable space. A line of 45 degrees was taken from the centre of the nearest habitable window and it was not breached. The window facing the application site, as mentioned, is already blocked by the boundary fence. A line of 45 degrees was also not breached in this instance. As such, the proposal is not considered to cause a substantial loss of light to this property.

An informative would be attached to the planning permission reminding the applicant that encroachment should be avoided. Permission is only being granted for development that falls within the red line of the location plan submitted, which is the land belonging to no 16. A party wall agreement should be discussed between the applicant and objector.

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

Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015)

DM4 Safeguarding Amenity

DM9 House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

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 proposed extension is not out of proportion with the host property. It is noted that the depth of the extension (5m) exceeds the Council's guidance on house extensions which states that extensions should generally not project beyond a depth of 4m. However the size of the plot is considered sufficient to accommodate a slightly larger extension and the proposal is not considered to affect neighbouring amenity to a substantial degree, as already discussed.**
- 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, as discussed earlier in the report. The extension would not breach a line of 45 degrees taken from neighbouring habitable rooms.**
- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **NO, a velux window is proposed on the side elevation facing no. 14 however this is not considered to overlook this property due to its position within the roof.**
- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **NO, the proposal would not be visible from the street.**
- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **NO, materials have been selected to match the host 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 comments.**
- Access to sunlight and daylight; **NO, see above comments.**
- 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
 Site Plan
 Alternate Side Elevations
 Side Elevations
 Rear Elevations
 Proposed Floor Plan
 Floor plan - extract

Received 1st July 2019

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

3. Matching Materials

Informatives

1. Building Control
2. Construction & Demolition
3. Terms
4. Encroachment
5. Positive and Proactive

1HA