

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 43 Albert Road, Reading

Application No: 181330/HOU

Proposal: Demolition of existing rear lean-to and conservatory. Erection of single storey rear and part side extension

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Rainbow

Date received (valid from): 09/08/18

Target Decision date: Originally 04/10/18; Extension of time subsequently agreed until 06/11/18

Case officer: Jonathan Markwell

1. Site Description and Surrounding Area

- i. The application site comprises a two storey (and roofspace accommodation) dwelling located on the west side of Albert Road, close to the junction with Highmoor Road (to the south). The property is one of a pair of semi-detached properties (the other half being No. 20 Highmoor Road, located on the junction of both roads). To the north-west is land associated with the neighbouring No. 45, with the garden space between the properties having outline consent for a separate dwelling (see relevant history section below).
- ii. The immediate surrounding area is solely residential in nature. The application site is not listed, nor within a conservation area.

2. The Proposal

- i. Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing rear single storey lean-to extension and the existing conservatory. At the time of the office site visit the conservatory had already been demolished to ground level. Permission is also sought for the erection of replacement single storey rear and part side extension at ground floor level. The depth of the extension will go 3m beyond the existing lean-to extension and wrap around the rear side of the existing building. The overall depth will be 0.3m less than the former conservatory and go beyond the side building line by 1.4m (again in comparison with the former conservatory). Four rooflights are also shown to be proposed as part of the extension.
- ii. During the course of the application an additional side elevation plan was submitted. At this time the proposal was altered from being wholly within No. 43 Albert Road, to the side wall being built on the centre line of the boundary with No. 20 Highmoor Road and this to therefore become the new party wall between the two properties (with the applicant detailing that this allows the owners of No. 20 to use the structure should they wish to in the future). From a procedural basis this resulted in the applicant submitting a revised application form (with certificate B signed instead of certificate A) and included reference to notice being served on this neighbour on 08/10/18. Furthermore, revised plans have also been submitted to demonstrate this. The revised plans also clarify that the existing conservatory has already been demolished to ground level.

3. Consultation

i. Neighbour Consultation

Consultation letters were originally sent to neighbouring occupiers on 14/08/18. The applicant has indicated that a site notice was displayed by the applicant from 21/08/18. One objection has been received, summarised as follows:

- Concerned about a crack in the party wall and effects of excavation beneath this party wall in the course of a new adjoining construction.
- Existing rear extension proposed to be demolished is contiguous to the back of the neighbouring property; the proposal would cut the roof off, expose the wall and be virtually inaccessible.
- Therefore, concerns about the effects on the neighbouring property of the proposals to dig foundations and carry out building works so extremely close to the neighbouring house.

Officer response: these matters will be covered under the Party Wall Act - an informative will be included on the decision notice.

Re-consultation

In light of the context outlined at section 2ii above, re-consultation letters were sent to nearby occupiers on 09/10/18. The 21 day period following this expired on 30/10/18. One objection has been received, summarised as follows:

- Remain concerned about the effect of excavation beneath a party wall, which has a long-standing crack.
- Concern that a neighbouring garden will be used as 'a building site'
- Concern that the neighbouring garden will not be a safe enclosed space for domestic pets during the course of construction,
- Concern about damage to neighbouring trees and shrubs.
- If the existing low party wall is to be replaced by a longer, higher wall, it is expected to be used as part of the neighbouring garden.

ii. Internal Consultation

RBC Transport Planning

There are no Transport objections to this application as there is no change to the existing parking arrangements (as space for 3 parking spaces is shown to be retained on the front drive, as per the parking plan submitted).

Recommended informative:

- i) The attention of the applicant is drawn to Section 59 of the Highways Act 1980, which enables the Highway Authority to recover expenses due to damage caused by extraordinary traffic.
- ii) Any works affecting the Highway shall be in accordance with Reading Borough's Council's document "Guidance Notes for Activities on the Public Highway within the Borough of Reading". The applicant should note that compliance with this document is mandatory and licences to work on the Highway will only be issued if the requirements contained within it are met. A copy can be obtained from the Council's website.

RBC Natural Environment

Having considered the officer site visit photographs, it is confirmed that there are no concerns with the proposals.

4. Plans & Documents Considered

- i. The Council, in reaching its recommendation, has taken into consideration the following plans & documents:

PL.1200 Rev A - Location Plan
PL.1201 Rev A - Existing Block Plan
PL.1300 Rev A - Existing Floor Plans
PL.1500 Rev A - Existing Elevations

PL.1210 Rev B - Proposed Block Plan
PL.1211 Rev B - Proposed Parking Plan
PL.1310 Rev A - Proposed Floor Plans
PL.1510 Rev A - Proposed Elevations
As received 08/10/18

Design and Access Statement by Fineline Architects dated July 2018

5. Relevant Planning History

Application site

None in the past 25 years.

Neighbouring No. 45

171753 - Outline planning application for a single detached dwelling, with all matters reserved apart from access. Granted following completion of s106 legal agreement 3/7/2018.

6. 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.

7. Relevant Planning Guidance

- i. 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. The Development Plan for Reading relevant to the application site comprises the Reading Local Development Framework 'Core Strategy' 2008 (Altered 2015) and 'Sites and Detailed Policies Document' 2012 (Altered 2015).

The 'National Planning Policy framework' ('NPPF') 2018 states clearly that its content is to be a material consideration in the determination of applications. The 'NPPF' states that due weight should be given to the adopted policies of the Local Development Framework (LDF) (Core Strategy and Sites and Detailed Policies Document) according to their degree of consistency with

the ‘NPPF’ (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the ‘NPPF’, the greater the weight that may be given). Accordingly, the ‘NPPF’ and the following development plan policies and supplementary planning guidance are relevant:

8. Relevant Policies

- i. The application has been assessed against the following policies:

National

National Planning Policy Framework 2018;
National Planning Policy Guidance;

RBC Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015)

CS7 Design and the Public Realm
CS24 Car / Cycle Parking
CS34 Pollution and water resources
CS38 Trees, Hedges and Woodlands

Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015)

SD1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
DM4 Safeguarding amenity
DM9 House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation
DM12 Access, Traffic and Highways-Related Matters

RBC Supplementary Planning Documents

A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003)
Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD (2011)

9. Appraisal

- i. The main issues are considered to be:

- Design
- Amenity
- Transport
- CIL

- ii. Design

It is acknowledged that the existing lean-to (which continues at No. 20) brings a degree of uniformity to the rear elevation of this pair of semi-detached properties. However, this isn’t in itself a sufficient rationale to resist the principle of an altered form of rear extension at the host property. The proposed extension has been considered with the neighbour in mind, by being fairly restrained in terms of its additional depth and height (as detailed in the proposals section above). Furthermore, the proposed materials would match those of the existing building, barring the contemporary aluminium bi-fold doors on the rear elevation. Although the roof form is a little unusual in that includes a small pitch followed by an area of flat roof, this is considered on balance to be suitable. In terms of the footprint of the extension, although it extends beyond the full width of the existing building and therefore wraps around the building, it is considered to remain subordinate to the property, in the context of the extent of the existing host building. With all proposed materials stated to match the existing (except where stated on the plans), it is considered that the proposed extension complies with policies CS7 and DM9.

- iii. Amenity

In terms of the neighbouring/nearby occupiers, it is considered that No's 20 Highmoor Road & 45 Albert Road (existing and future) could potentially be impacted. Considering No. 20 first, the ground floor extension on the boundary will create a new relationship between the buildings, losing the current uniformity at this point (with the removal of the lean to, with continues on No. 20 too). However, in the context of the existing neighbouring extension, the proposed extension is relatively modest being 3m additional in depth (in-fact the depth is less than the former conservatory - albeit this was away from the neighbouring boundary and not full width, as proposed) and 2.25m at eaves height (compared with 2m as existing) and 3.25 at ridge height (compared with 3m at present). Within this context, despite two windows being in the rear elevation of the neighbouring close to the boundary, there is not anticipated to be a harmful loss of day/sunlight, outlook or sense of enclosure caused by the proposed works. No windows are proposed on the flank elevation facing no. 20 and a condition will prevent future use of the flat roof created as terrace (unless permission is granted). As such, no significantly adverse amenity impacts are envisaged.

With regard to the existing No. 45, the significant distance between the proposed works and the neighbouring windows, together with the ground floor level nature of the proposals, means no significant adverse amenity impacts are envisaged. In terms of the possible new dwelling to be built between the application site and the existing No. 45 (as per an outline permission - see relevant history above), the indicative layout shown indicates the building would be built away from the boundary with the host property. Similarly, the proposed extensions are set off the boundary with No. 45, meaning that the single storey nature of the proposal with a 1.5m brick wall boundary between the two is sufficient to result in any loss of future amenity not being considered to be significantly harmful.

For current and future occupiers of the host property, the extension will improve the quality of accommodation at the building. The proposed plans indicate that an enlarged dining / kitchen, utility room and downstairs toilet would be created by the proposed works.

Therefore, in overall terms it is considered that the proposals comply with policy DM4.

iv. **Transport**

As per the transport observations above, there are no transport based concerns with the proposals.

v. **Natural Environment**

As per the natural environment observations above, there are no natural environment based concerns with the proposals.

vi. **CIL**

Although the proposals involve an increase in floorspace, this is below 100sqm and hence the proposals are not CIL liable.

10. Conclusion

- i. Having regard to the material considerations and all matters raised, the Local Planning Authority considers that the balance of considerations therefore weigh in favour of granting planning permission subject to conditions.

Recommendation

Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions - (1HA + restrict use of flat roof as a terrace)