

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 8 Burnham Rise

Application No: 181669 / HOU

Proposal: Retrospective planning permission for single storey rear extension and single storey rear and side extension

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Farmer

Date received (valid from): 21/09/2018

Target Decision date: 16/11/2018

Case officer: Tom French

1. Site description and Surrounding Area

The application site contains a two storey semi-detached dwelling on the east side of Burnham Rise. The application site provides off road parking to the front and has a rear amenity area approximately 40m deep and 9m wide.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential and characterised by semi-detached dwellings of a similar scale and design ideology to the application property.

The application building is not listed, nor is it within a conservation area.

2. The Proposal

Retrospective householder planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension and a single storey rear and side extension. The rear extension projects 3m from the rear of the elevation of the living room and the rear and side extension infills the area alongside the living room and to the rear of the store. The extensions have a parapet wall 3.2m high and are finished with white render. As the materials used in the exterior work (white render) are not of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse (brick) the extensions do not fall within the scope of permitted development.

Whilst the total height of the extension is 3.2m (marginally greater than the 3m eaves height allowed for in the General Permitted Development Order (2015) Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, (i)) this includes the parapet wall. The Permitted development rights for householders Technical Guidance (2017) states: 'eaves height is measured from the ground level at the base of the outside wall to the point where that wall would meet the upper surface of the flat roof - the overhang and the parapet wall should be ignored for the purposes of measurement'. As such the height of the extensions would not prevent them from being considered permitted development.

3. Consultation

Neighbours consultation:

No.s 7, 9 & 22 Burnham Rise and 329 Peppard Road have been notified of the application and a site notice has also been displayed at the site from the 28th September 2018.

Three responses have been received. The representations objected to the application on the basis of the following:

- The render used is considered to be inappropriate in terms of design
- The overall impression offered by the extension is very ugly

4. Plans and Documents Considered

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

Drawing No.:

- AAN.17.649. 1 - Existing Plans Section and Elevation
- AAN.17.649. 4 Rev. C - Sections
- Site Location Plan
- Block/Site Plan

As received: 20/09/2018

- AAN.17.649. 2 Rev. E - Proposed Plans and Elevations

As received: 20/11/2018

5. Relevant Planning History

None

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

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') 2012 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

The application has been assessed against the following policies:

National

National Planning Policy Framework;

National Planning Policy Guidance;

RBC Local Development Framework

Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015)

CS7 Design and the Public Realm

Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015)

DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity)

DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

DM10 (Amenity Space)

Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003)

9. Appraisal

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

The development that is subject to this application is to the rear of the application property and whilst visible from some locations along Burnham Rise, is not a significant or prominent feature of the street scene. The side and rear extension is set off the common boundary with no.9, the unattached neighbour, by 3.1m and the rear extension is set off the boundary with no.7, the attached neighbour, by 0.1m. Given the semi-detached nature of the application property and the significant separation distance to the boundary with no.9, the development is considered to retain the existing spacious character of the host dwelling and the extensions do not appear unduly cramped.

The extension projects a relatively modest 3m beyond the original rear elevation of the application property at single storey and with an overall height of 3.2m (to top of the parapet). The rearward extension is less than the 4m suggested as normally permissible in the SPG - A Design Guide To House Extensions (2003) and is considered appropriate to this location in terms of scale. It is also noted that an extension of this scale and in this location could be designed to fall within the size parameters of permitted development.

Whilst the materials used in the exterior of the extensions do not match those of the original dwelling, there are numerous examples of white render being used along Burnham Rise (no.s 1, 2, 4, 11, 12, 19 & 20) as well 329 Peppard Road that is visible from the rear of the application property. As such the use of render is considered appropriate in this location and the extensions are considered to integrate satisfactorily with the character of the host dwelling and visual amenity of the surrounding area.

The host dwelling retains 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 development accords with Policies CS7, DM9 and DM10.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

The neighbouring properties potentially affected by the development subject to this application are 7 Burnham Rise and 9 Burnham Rise, located to the north and south of the application site respectively.

With regards to no.9, the unattached neighbour, the 3.1m separation distance from the common boundary, combined with the relatively modest extent of the extensions, is

considered sufficient to mitigate any adverse impacts in terms of loss of light or overbearing effects.

Whilst the rear extension is set off the boundary with no.7, the attached neighbour by just 0.1m and the extension is located to the south of no.7; the relatively modest extent of the extension, being single storey and projecting a modest 3m from the original rear elevation, is considered such that the extensions do not appear unduly overbearing or result in a material loss of light.

There are no side facing windows in the extensions and, subject to a condition stating that the flat roof cannot be used as a balcony/terrace area, it is considered that there is no significant detrimental impact in terms of privacy or overlooking.

Subject to condition, the development accords with Policy DM4.

Other Issues

Community Infrastructure Levy

The extensions are not liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Public consultation response

The issues raised in the public consultation have been addressed above under the title: Design, impact on the host dwelling, character of the area and street scene.

10. Recommendation

Grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development hereby is permitted in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing No.:

- AAN.17.649. 4 Rev. C - Sections
- Site Location Plan
- Block/Site Plan

As received: 20/09/2018

- AAN.17.649. 2 Rev. E - Proposed Plans and Elevations

As received: 20/11/2018

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

2. The roof area of the 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. The applicant's attention is drawn to Building Regulations requirements. Please contact Building Control on 0118 937 2449 for advice.
2. 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 statutory time period.