

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Caversham

App Ref: 191121/HOU

Address: 37 The Mount, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7RU

Proposals: Two storey extension to front for hall/WC/en-suite shower, and single storey at the rear for dining.

Case Officer: Tom French

Date received (valid from): 9 July 2019 **Target Decision date:** 3 September 2019

PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Plans considered

- 243-01 - Existing
- 243-02 - Proposed
- 243-03 - Block Plan
- Location Plan

As received: 09/07/2019

CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

33 The Mount, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7RU

39 The Mount, Caversham, Reading, Berkshire, RG4 7RU

35 The Mount, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7RU

One letter of representation has been received objecting on the basis of the following.

- The plans are not available to view on the RBC website
- The recent building in the area took 2.5 years and was very disruptive at times
- Requesting that the worker adhere to the Considerate Constructors scheme, that work be limited to 8am - 6pm Monday to Friday and that no cars/vans are ever parked in a way as to cause nuisance to neighbours or block emergency access to Treetops
- It is also requested that contractors refrain from arriving early and being disruptive

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 policies in 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'

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

In addition, the New Reading Borough Local Plan is at an advanced stage. The Inspector's report into the Proposed Modifications has now been received and the new local plan is proposed to be adopted by the Council on 4 November 2019. Accordingly, it is taken into account as part of the determination of this application.

- Reading Borough Submission Draft Local Plan 2018
- CC7: Design and the Public Realm
- CC8: Safeguarding Amenity
- H9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation
- H10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space

Assessment

Design, impact on the host dwelling, character of the area and street scene

The proposal includes a two storey front extension and single storey rear extension. Given the nature of the proposed development, it would be visible from the street scene along The Mount. The proposed front element would be two storey with a gable roof form to match that of the main roof. It would be set back from the existing front elevation by 2m and set down from the existing ridge by 1.2m. As such, the proposed front extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling when viewed from the street scene and with materials to match the existing and projecting gabled form; is considered to integrate satisfactorily with the character of the host dwelling and surrounding area in terms of scale, design, materials and location.

The proposed rear extension would not be visible from the street scene and would be single storey with a flat roof with a maximum height of 3.1m (due to changes in ground levels across the site the roof is higher to the rear of the proposed extension). It would project a maximum of 5.8m from the rear of the host dwelling and would retain the existing 1m set off the common boundary. Whilst the proposed rear extension would have a depth greater than the 4m recommended in the Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003), it is considered that in this instance that the scale of the host dwelling and associated rear garden are such that the rear extension would not be significantly harmful to the character of the host dwelling or surrounding area in terms of scale. As the existing separation from the boundary would be retained, the proposal would not appear unduly cramped. The rear extension would also be finished with materials to match the existing and considering the above, would respect the character of the host dwelling and integrate satisfactorily with the visual amenity of the wider surrounding area.

The host dwelling would retain sufficient amenity space to the rear elevation, which is considered adequate for a dwelling of this size and relative to the character of amenity spaces to surrounding dwellings.

The proposal would accord with Policies CS7, DM9 and DM10.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

The neighbouring properties potentially affected by the proposed development are 35 The Mount and 39 The Mount, located to the north and south respectively.

With respect to no.35, the proposed front extension would be two stories, to the north of the property, and would abut the common boundary with no.35. However, due to the change in ground levels along The Mount the application property is lower than no.35 and the proposed front extension would not project beyond the existing detached garage at no.35. As such it is considered that the two storey front extension would not have significant detrimental impact in terms of loss of light or overbearing. The rear extension would be single storey, set off the northern boundary by 0.7m and would not project beyond the existing rear bay window (that it would replace). As such the proposed rear extension would not have any significant adverse effects on the living environment of the occupiers of no.35 in terms of loss of light or overbearing.

With regards to no.39, the proposed front extension would be to the north of the property and as such would not impact upon the amenity of no.39. The proposed rear extension would project approximately 5.8m beyond the rear of no.39. In addition, the change in ground levels means that the rear garden level at no.39 is lower than that at the application site, increasing the impact of the proposed development in terms of loss of light and overbearing effects. However, the proposed rear extension would be set off the common boundary by 1m and would be a relatively modest 1.2m higher than the existing boundary treatment (close board wooden fencing). As such it is considered that whilst the proposed extension would be visible from the rear of no.39, it would not have such a significantly detrimental impact in terms of loss of light or overbearing to warrant the refusal of this application.

Whilst additional side facing glazing is proposed to the rear extension, this would be at ground floor level and set off the common boundary by approximately 4m. As such it is considered that there would not be any significant detrimental impacts in terms of privacy or overlooking. As a flat roof is proposed, it is considered necessary to include a condition requiring that it is not used as a terrace. A condition restricting the addition of first floor side facing windows is also considered appropriate to protect the privacy and amenity of no.35.

Other issues

Community Infrastructure Levy

The proposal would not be liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Public consultation response

With respect to the matters raised during the public consultation, when the case officer attempted to view the plans through the RBC website they were publically available however the plans have also been available to view at the Civic Offices. In this it is considered that the LPA has discharged its statutory duties with respect to the publicity for this planning application.

It is also noted that disruption caused during the building process is not a material planning

consideration and as such cannot inform upon the determination of this application. An informative is recommended advising the applicant that construction and demolition associated with the approved development will be subject to environmental health law.

RECOMMENDATION:

Grant

The development is not harmful to the character or appearance of the site or its surroundings and does not have a detrimental impact on the original building or neighbouring properties.

As such the proposal is 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 (2012) and the Councils Supplementary Planning Guidance "A Design Guide to House Extensions" (2003).

CONDITIONS

Time Limit

Materials

Approved Plans

No Use of Roof

No Additional Windows