

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 35 South View Avenue, Reading

Application No: 181551/HOU

Proposal: Single storey rear extension

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Harper

Date received (valid from): 03/09/18

Target Decision date: 29/10/18

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 north side of South View Avenue, between the junctions with Washington Road (to the south-west) and Ardler Road (to the south-east). The property is one of a pair of semi-detached properties (the other half being No. 33 South View Avenue). The neighbouring building to the east is unusual by being a chalet bungalow amongst predominantly semi-detached (on the north side of South View Avenue) and a combination of terraced / semi-detached and detached properties (on the south side of South View Avenue). Properties on the north side of South View Avenue include long rear amenity spaces.
- ii. At the time of the site visit on 21/09/18 a large rear dormer roof extension was seen on the rear roofslope and three rooflights on the front roofslope. The rear dormer is not shown on the existing/proposed plans submitted and no planning permission or lawful development certificate appears to have been submitted or approved for this, although there are Building Control records for a loft conversion in 2016-2017.
- iii. Part of the front amenity space is located within flood zone 2. The footprint of the existing house and the area amenity space is outside flood zone 2. The site is also within an air quality management area and a smoke control zone.
- iv. The immediate surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature, along with St Anne's Primary School on the junction of South View Avenue and Washington Road. The application site is not listed, nor within a conservation area.

2. The Proposal

- i. Planning permission is sought for a replacement single storey rear extension. This will involve the demolition of the existing historic rear single storey extension and the more recent rear extension with lean-to roof conservatory. The replacement extension includes a pitched roof and three rooflights on each roofslope. The replacement extension would extend 3.6m beyond the existing historic rear extension on the boundary with No. 33 and 4.6m beyond the more recent rear extension at the site. Not including the existing rear additions the extensions would extend 6.995m beyond the original primary rear building line. The extension would extend the full width of the property (6.416m) and therefore be adjacent to the boundary with No. 33 and set off the boundary with No. 37 by 1m (to allow the existing side boundary gate access to remain). The height of the extension would be 2.6m at eaves level on the side of No. 37, a built up eaves level to 3.2m on the boundary with No. 33 and 4m at ridge level.

3. Consultation

i. Neighbour Consultation

Consultation letters were sent to neighbouring occupiers on 03/09/18. One observation has been received from a nearby occupier seeking reassurance that the extension will not affect the natural light received in the kitchen of No. 33.

4. Plans & Documents Considered

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

01 B Plans & Elevations for rear extension, as received 31/08/18

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
CS36 Flooding
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
- Flooding
- CIL

ii. Design

It is acknowledged that the context of the rear of the building will change as a result of the proposed works. The loss of the existing structures is not objectionable to and the proposed design, with a simple pitched roof, remains sufficiently subservient to the existing house. Although significant in depth in itself (as detailed in the proposal section), when considered within the context of the existing rear additions the additional depth and height is considered satisfactory. A significantly sized rear amenity space would remain and the extension would not be out of place within the wide variety of rear additions elsewhere on the north side of South View Avenue properties. Furthermore, the proposed materials would match those of the existing building. With all factors duly taken into account 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 33 and 37 would be the only nearby occupiers potentially impacted. Considering No. 33 first, it is noted that there is an existing rear addition on the boundary, together with a 2m brick wall with vegetation growing above it (at the time of the site visit). The neighbouring property includes a rear addition which extends a similar depth to the existing rear addition at the host property. The proposed extension will be set higher (at 3.2m) than the existing and extend an additional 3.6m in depth. However, in the context of the existing situation, it is not considered that the proposed rear extension would result in any significant loss of amenity to this neighbouring occupier in terms of day/sunlight, overlooking (no windows are proposed), outlook, sense of enclosure or any other policy DM4 consideration. The pitched nature of the proposed rear extension assists in these regards.

Turning to consider the impact on No. 37, it is noted that the boundary treatment comprises a 2m high fence and the proposal would be set 1m off the boundary, with the eaves height

minimised at 2.6m. Although the neighbouring chalet bungalow includes a number of side elevation windows close to the boundary at ground floor level (visible over the boundary) all except the furthest to the rear window are obscure glazed. The side elevation window closest to the rear elevation was seen during the officer site visit to be one of a number of windows serving the dual aspect internal space (and rooflights). The extension would extend almost as far as the rear building line of No. 37, but owing to the aforementioned context/factors, the proposal is not considered to result in any significant loss of amenity to these neighbouring occupiers, with regards to the policy DM4 considerations.

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 space would be created by the proposed works. Therefore, in overall terms it is considered that the proposals comply with policy DM4.

iv. Transport

No transport based issues arise from this development.

v. Flooding

Although part of the front amenity space is located within flood zone 2, the existing building and proposed extension are located outside of flood zone 2. As such, in the context of this and the nature of the proposed works, it is not considered necessary to seek/receive flooding based information in this specific instance.

vi. CIL

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

vii. Other matters

As per section 1ii above, at the time of the site visit on 21/09/18 a large rear dormer roof extension was seen on the rear roofslope and three rooflights on the front roofslope. The rear dormer is not shown on the existing/proposed plans submitted and no planning permission or lawful development certificate appears to have been submitted or approved for this, although there are Building Control records for a loft conversion in 2016-2017. As such, reference to this is detailed in an informative, for the avoidance of future doubt.

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 + informative regarding rear dormer)

At the time of the officer site visit a large rear dormer roof extension was witnessed on the rear roofslope and three rooflights on the front roofslope. The rear dormer is not shown on the existing/proposed elevation plans submitted and no planning permission or lawful development certificate appears to have been submitted or approved for this. Accordingly, this is noted and you are advised to explore regularising this.