

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Southcote

App Ref: 191326/HOU

Address: 69 Silchester Road, Reading, RG30 3EJ

Proposals: Proposed single storey rear extension to replace outhouses and enhance kitchen and living space.

Case Officer: Mr James Schofield

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Ling

Date received (valid from): 9 August 2019

Target Decision date: 4 October 2019

1. INTRODUCTION

The development site is a mid-terrace residential dwelling located on the northern side of Silchester Road. The rear garden has a north-facing aspect.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is to demolish the existing outhouses and erect a single storey rear extension with pitched roof at a depth of approximately 8 meters and with an eaves height of approximately 3.2 meters along the eastern boundary line.

Plans considered

Dwg No. 098 - Site Block Plan

Dwg No. 099 - Site Location Plan

Dwg No. 100 - Existing Floor Plans

Dwg No. 101 - Existing Elevations

Dwg No. 102 - Proposed Floor Plans

Dwg No. 103 - Proposed Elevations

As received 9 August 2019

Dwg No. 103 Rev. A - Proposed Elevations

As received 23 September 2019

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

4. CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

67 Silchester Road, Reading, RG30 3EJ

71 Silchester Road, Reading, RG30 3EJ

93 Southcote Lane, Reading, RG30 3AH

95 Southcote Lane, Reading, RG30 3AH

No responses have been received.

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 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

7. APPRAISAL

7.1 CS7: All development must be of high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area of Reading in which it is located.

To assess this, the following has been considered - does the proposal fail to make a positive contribution to:

- Character: **NO.**
- Legibility: **NO.**
- Adaptability: **NO.**
- Diversity: **NO.**

7.2 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.

While it is acknowledged that the depth and height of the extension along the boundary line will reduce access to sunlight and daylight of the adjacent part of the garden of 71

Silchester Road; it is considered that the impact is not significantly detrimental in this respect. It is noted that two principal factors contribute to this view;

- At present there is a substantial fence which ranges in height from 2 to 2.7 meters from the end of the outbuilding to the end of the proposed extension.*
- The increasing elevation of the garden helps to reduce the impact of the extension.*

The original proposal was proposed for a height of 3.7 meters at the end of the outbuilding and 3 meters at the end of the extension. Whereas the amended plans recommended for approval are approximately 3.2 meters at the end of the outbuilding and 2.5 meters at the end of the extension. This reduces the increase over and above the fence from 1.2 meters in the most affected section to 0.7 meters, and at the least affected, from 1 meter to 0.5 meter. It is considered that a 0.5 to 0.7 meter increase in height over and above the existing fence is not a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of 71 Silchester Road.

- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development;

NO.

For the same reasons as those noted above, it is considered that a 0.5 to 0.7 meter increase in height over and above the existing fence is not a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of 71 Silchester Road in terms of visual dominance or overbearing effects of the development.

- Noise and disturbance;

NO.

- Artificial lighting;

NO.

- Vibration;

NO.

- Dust and fumes;

NO.

- Smell;

NO.

- Crime and safety.

NO.

7.3 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:

- Does the proposal employ scale, location, materials or design which detract from the appearance or special qualities of the building;

NO.

- 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.

See 7.2 above for detail.

- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies;

NO.

- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design;

NO.

See 7.2 above for detail.

- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing;

NO.

7.4 DM10 states: An extension to a house will be acceptable where it:

- A. *Dwellings will be provided with functional private or communal open space that allows for suitable sitting-out areas, children's play areas, home food production, green waste composting, refuse storage, general outdoor storage and drying space. Houses will be provided with private outdoor space whereas flats may be provided with communal outdoor space, balconies and/or roof gardens.*

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- reduce the amount of private or communal open space to a level which would not be functional for the uses described above in A;

NO.

- B. *The design of outdoor areas will respect the size and character of other similar spaces in the vicinity, clearly identify whether they are private or communal spaces, ensure that they are appropriately related to main entrances, enhance safety and the perception of safety for future residents and the general public, and not be compromised by the relationship of other buildings which may be detrimental in terms of overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing.*

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- reduce or change the size, character or design of the outdoor open space to degree which would make it dissimilar to others within the vicinity;

NO.

- create an inappropriate relationship between the private or communal open space and main entrances;

NO.

- fail to enhance safety and the perception of safety within the private or communal open space within the realm of reason;

NO.

- create a detrimental relationship with other buildings in terms of overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing;

NO.

8. 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.

9. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT