

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 252 Peppard Road, Reading

Application No: 181514/HOU

Proposal: Single storey rear extension and first floor rear extension over utility room

Applicant: Mr & Mrs T Baxter

Date received (valid from): 24/08/18

Target Decision date: 19/10/18

Case officer: Jonathan Markwell

1. Site Description and Surrounding Area

- i. The application site comprises an extended two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the east side of Peppard Road. The property is one of a pair of semi-detached properties (the other half being No. 254), which already includes a ground floor rear extension. Properties along this section of Peppard Road are a mix of detached and semi-detached properties, all set within generously sized front and rear garden spaces. The immediate surrounding area is residential in nature. The application site is not listed, nor within a conservation area.

2. The Proposal

- i. Planning permission is sought for a single storey ground floor rear extension and a first floor rear extension.
- ii. The ground floor extension will be 4.5m in depth, 6.6m in width and 3.2m in height, with a contemporary flat roof design incorporating two rooflights and also including a brick finish and sliding doors leading out to an area of hardstanding. The extension would be marginally set off the boundary with No. 254 and align with the width of the original main house (i.e. not incorporating the area where a historic side extension has already been built). The extended space would facilitate a dining / kitchen space, based on the plans submitted. The first floor extension would effectively infill the remaining depth of the pre-existing historic side extension. There is a slight set-back on this element off from the original rear building line of the original house. This extension would include a small gable with clay roof tiles to match the existing and a white painted render finish. This additional space would serve an en-suite (based on the floor plans) and include one window on the rear elevation.
- iii. During the course of the application the depth of the ground floor rear extension was reduced and annotations were included on the proposed plans to clarify the proposed materials.

3. Consultation

- i. Neighbour Consultation
Consultation letters were sent to three neighbouring occupiers on 30/08/18.

Two objections have been received (one objection was received within two separate submissions), summarised as follows:

- a) The proposed extensions fly directly in the face of much of the guidance given Policy HSG8 and the published booklet, 'A Design Guide to House Extensions'.
- b) The somewhat industrial look of the proposed extension does not sit well within the surroundings
- c) The 5.3m depth of the ground floor rear extension would present the neighbouring occupier with characterless block like structure terminating in a perimeter parapet at 3.2

metres in height - concerns about the modernist design and potential to devalue a nearby property.

- d) First floor rear extension white render finish does not match or complement the existing building. Another objector describes this as an ugly, out of style and out of character extension.
- e) Inaccuracies on the planning application form regarding the existing roof material being facing brickwork.
- f) Concerns over party wall and the excavation of footings given the close proximity of the proposed rear extension to the boundary wall and neighbouring footings in what is a subsoil heavily laden with clay. The objector acknowledges an understanding that this is not a planning concern and specifies that would be discussed with Building Control should planning be granted.
- g) The existing two-storey side extension (which it is stated does not have planning permission) includes a ground floor side elevation window which causes overlooking to a neighbouring kitchen and bathroom.
- h) Overlooking from the ground floor rear extension side return window - particularly owing to No. 252 being 0.5m higher than a neighbouring property.
- i) Drainage - a neighbouring property is regularly affected by runoff of collected rainwater from No. 252 as the soakaway does not work. Sought for this to be rectified when the retrospective planning permission for the existing two storey extension is requested.
- j) Concern that the proposed first floor rear extension includes a flat roof rather than a pitched roof. This and the white render finish would devalue a neighbouring property.

Officer responses:

- a) & b) & d) please see the design section of the appraisal below. Policy HSG8 is not an adopted policy (it was replaced by the current policies - see these separately below).
- c) During the course of the application the depth of the extension was reduced from 5.3m to 4.5m. Matters relating to the devaluation of neighbouring properties are not a material planning consideration. Please also see the design section of the appraisal.
- e) This inaccuracy was witnessed during the officer site visit; the application form does not form part of the approved documents, so effectively is inconsequential.
- f) Party Wall matters are not material in the consideration of this planning application; an informative will be included on the decision notice to advise the applicant on this separate requirement.
- g) and an element of i) Although there does not appear to be any planning permission in place from the past quarter of a century for the two-storey side extension, Google streetview shows the existing side extension in place at the site in both 2009 and 2012. As such, it would be immune from enforcement action and there is no scope to include stipulations / restrictions in relation to elements which do not form part of this specific application.
- h) Please see the amenity section of the appraisal below.
- i) This matter is subject to Building Control regulations and not a material planning consideration as part of this proposal.
- j) It is confirmed that a pitched roof is proposed. Matters relating to the devaluation of neighbouring properties are not a material planning consideration.

ii. Internal Consultation

RBC Transport Planning

There are no Transport objections to this application as there is no change to the existing parking arrangements and no impact on other road users.

The existing garage appears to have had some previous internal alterations, however although not illustrated on submitted plans there is adequate parking on the drive to accommodate a minimum of 2 vehicles.

IF3 Highways

- 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.

4. Plans & Documents Considered

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

BA 0129 01 Existing Plans & Elevations, as received 24/08/18

BA 0129 03 A Site and Location Plan, as received 16/10/18

BA 0129 02 B Proposed Plans & Elevations, as received 16/10/18

5. Relevant Planning History

Application site

None in the past 25 years.

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

Considering the ground floor rear extension first, it is acknowledged that there are a variety of existing extensions in the locality, all with contrasting depths, heights and design approaches/finishes. Set within this context, although of a more contemporary style, the flat-roofed rear extension would not be specifically out of character with its surroundings. Moreover, in itself, whilst of a more contemporary nature than a number of works elsewhere in the area, it has been confirmed during the course of the application to include matching brickwork to the existing house, which is considered satisfactory.

Furthermore, during the course of the application the depth of the extension was reduced from 5.3m to 4.5m, which is 0.5m greater than that of the neighbouring (No. 254) property. Although the adopted SPD on house extensions specifies that rear extensions longer than 4m will normally not be granted, there is a caveat that houses/gardens capable of taking an extension of a longer depth may be exceptions to this. Bearing this in mind, together with the permitted development possibilities and the neighbouring context, it is considered that the depth is suitable in this specific instance.

In terms of the width of the extension, this aligns with the width of the original main house, which is considered satisfactory. Although the eaves height, at 3.2m, is slightly higher than the neighbouring extension, which includes a pitch, this is a consequence of the chosen flat roof

approach. The extension is nevertheless considered to satisfactorily align with policies CS7 and DM9.

The first floor rear extension is a relatively modest addition in itself and remains subordinate with a slight set-in off the original rear building line of the property. As a consequence of this (and the inherent difficulties of successfully integrating brickwork to the sloping roof at this point), a render finish is proposed with this element rather than brickwork to match existing. Although this does not align with the prevailing character, in this instance it is considered a suitable response to the practicalities of the build. This element will not be readily visible from the public realm and therefore is considered to align with the broad principles of policies CS7 and DM9.

iii. Amenity

In terms of the neighbouring/nearby occupiers, it is considered that No's 250 & 254 Peppard Road (the immediate neighbours) are the only nearby occupiers potentially impacted by the works. In the case of both neighbours, given a flat roof is proposed, it is considered to include a condition specifying that a separate permission would be required should the applicant wish to utilise this as a roof terrace in the future. This is to protect neighbouring amenity from privacy and overlooking. In terms of the impact on No. 250, the ground floor extension side return elevation would be set off the boundary by 4m. Although land levels are slightly higher at the host property, the window is not considered to result in any significant adverse loss of amenity (through overlooking / loss of privacy) to the neighbouring property.

With regards to the first floor extension, the window on the rear elevation would be close to the boundary and potentially result in harmful overlooking to the rear amenity area. As such, this window, denoted as serving an en-suite, will be secured via condition as obscure glazed and fixed shut up to 1.7m (floor to ceiling height internally). Furthermore, although no windows are shown on the side elevation of this extension, it is considered that any future windows installed under permitted development could result in harmful overlooking to No. 250. Consequently a further condition will specify that no windows on the side elevation of the first floor extension would be allowed in the future without separate permission being granted by the local planning authority. In all other amenity based considerations (as per DM4) the proposals are considered to be satisfactory.

In terms of No. 254, the proposed ground floor extension would extend beyond the rear building line of the existing extension at this property by 0.5m. Although 3.2m in height, given the limited depth beyond the neighbouring extension, the proposal is not considered to result in a significantly harmful loss of amenity to these neighbouring occupiers (in respect of all policy DM4 considerations).

For current and future occupiers of the host property, the extension will improve the quality of accommodation at the building.

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. 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

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this planning permission.

Reason: to prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions, and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building unless where otherwise stated on the approved plans.

Reason: in the interests of ensuring that the new development appears in keeping with the existing building in accordance with Policies CS7 and DM9.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

BA 0129 03 A Site and Location Plan, as received 16/10/18

BA 0129 02 B Proposed Plans & Elevations, as received 16/10/18

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

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order) no windows shall at any time be placed in the first floor south (side) elevation of the first floor extension hereby permitted without the grant of a separate planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises from overlooking and loss of privacy in accordance with Policy DM4

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order) the proposed rear (south) elevation window at first floor level (serving an en-suite) shall be fixed non-opening and glazed with obscure glass on parts below 1.7m as a minimum when measured from the floor level of the respective room(s), before occupation of that room, and shall be permanently maintained thereafter as non-opening and obscure glazed.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises from overlooking and loss of privacy in accordance with Policy DM4.

6. The roof area of the ground floor extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises from overlooking and loss of privacy in accordance with Policy DM4.

Informatives

1. Your attention is drawn to the terms and conditions of this permission. Any development which is carried out but which differs materially from the approved plans and details, or does not comply with any condition(s) or planning obligation(s) attached to the permission may result in the Council taking action to remedy the breach of planning control. If you are in any doubt please contact the Council.

2. Your attention is drawn to the requirement for submission of a Building Regulations application for the proposed development. Please contact Building Control on 0118 937 2449 for advice.

3. Complaints are commonly received about noise and dust caused by construction and demolition works, particularly working outside reasonable hours and smoke from bonfires associated with the burning of waste on site. The developer is reminded that construction and demolition associated with the approved development will be subject to environmental health law.

4. During the course of construction, the developer should take care to ensure that no part of this development (foundations, eaves, guttering, etc.) would encroach on, under or across the boundary line with the adjoining property, as the requisite Notice has not been served on the owner of that property. This permission does not confer any right of access onto land that is not under the developer's control. The developer should also be mindful of the obligations and requirements of the Party Wall Act (1996) details of which can be found at: www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/partywall

5. The decision to grant planning permission follows the positive and proactive consideration of the issues raised by this planning application and issuing the decision within the eight week time period.