

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 40 Balmore Drive, Reading

Application No: 181401/HOU

Proposal: Single storey side and rear extension and associated works

Applicant: Dr Stephens and Dr Day

Date received (valid from): 13/08/18

Target Decision date: 08/10/18

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 west side of Balmore Drive, close to upper most part of this cul-de-sac. The property is one of a pair of semi-detached properties (the other half being No. 38) and is the last property prior to the horseshoe shaped top of the cul-de-sac. The neighbouring No. 42 is therefore set back and away from the host property.
- ii. The immediate surrounding area is residential in nature, with relatively generous plots and an abundance of vegetation. The application site is not listed, nor within a conservation area.

2. The Proposal

- i. Planning permission is sought for what is specified on the application form as a single storey rear and side extensions and alterations to existing corner extension. In effect, this is a single storey extension which wraps around the rear and side (north) elevations. Furthermore, a number of associated works are also shown to be proposed, such as the removal of two windows on the side elevation at first floor level (infilled to match existing), provision of obscure glazing to the first floor bathroom window on the front elevation and the provision of two additional rooflights in the rear roofslope.
- ii. During the course of the application various inaccuracies and inconsistencies on the originally submitted plans were corrected, the height of the parapet level was reduced from 3.15m to 3m and a section plan was submitted to indicate the projection of the rooflights.

3. Consultation

i. Neighbour Consultation

Consultation letters were sent to neighbouring occupiers on 15/08/18 and 29/08/18. The applicant has indicated that a site notice was displayed by the applicant from 23/08/18. No responses have been received.

ii. Internal Consultation

RBC Transport Planning

In accordance with the Council's current standards a 3+ property in Zone 3 is required to provide 2 off road parking spaces. No plans have been submitted illustrating the existing or proposed parking provision; however it is shown that there is sufficient space at the front of the property to accommodate two off-road vehicles which would be comply with our standards, though this has not been illustrated on the plans submitted.

Transport does not have any objections to this proposal, as the proposed extensions do not have any transport implications or impact on other road users

RBC Natural Environment

Having considered the officer site visit photographs, it is confirmed that there are no concerns with the proposals. More specifically, given the overall new footprint (compared to existing) and the nature of the closest vegetation, no concerns are raised.

Ecology Consultant

The application site comprises a semi-detached house where it is proposed to erect a single storey rear and side extensions and to carry alterations to existing corner extension. Considering the extent of the works, the fact that only a small part of the roof will be affected, and the new roof lights will replace existing ones, it is considered unlikely that the works will affect bats or other protected species. As such, there are no objections to this application on ecological grounds.

4. Plans & Documents Considered

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

239-01-A1-A Existing, as received 08/10/18

239-A1-09-A Proposal 8a, as received 08/10/18

239-A3-11 Proposed Section 1, as received 08/10/18

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
 - Natural Environment and Ecology
 - CIL

ii. Design

There are a variety of additions to the side rear of properties along Balmore Drive, some single storey in nature and others two storey in nature. Within this context the proposed single storey side and 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 would (if executed in line with the plans - as secured via condition) constitute a high quality addition in finished design, with the brick slip detail a welcomed feature. There is a slight setback on the front elevation and at single storey it would remain subordinate to the original house. Furthermore, a generous gap to the boundary with No. 42 would remain, meaning the extension would not give rise to the plot appearing cramped. Although a flat roof design is not predominant in the area, the neighbouring pair does include such a feature, as part of a garage side extension; accordingly a degree of uniformity is maintained.

Furthermore, the proposed materials would match those of the existing building, barring the contemporary aluminium bi-fold doors on the rear elevation. 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 38 & 42 Balmore Drive. 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. From the extent of the ground floor extension, although more openings are proposed towards No. 42, these would only be at ground floor level and therefore no significantly detrimental loss of amenity would occur. In terms of the impact on No. 38, it is acknowledged that the 2.5m depth extension on the boundary will create a new relationship between the properties. However, this depth is fairly limited and more would be permissible under permitted development rights. Notwithstanding this, initial officer concerns were raised with the overall height of the extension being 3.15m (in a straight vertical line), which was considered excessive and unneighbourly (from an outlook / sense of enclosure perspective). During the course of the application this was reduced to 3m, which is the maximum height permissible under permitted development rights. Within this context the revised height is considered adequate and sufficient outlook and access to day/sunlight would remain for No. 38. In all other amenity based considerations (as per DM4) the proposals are considered to be satisfactory.

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 at ground floor level. The roof level rooflights would provide additional outlook within the loft room.

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 & Ecology

As per the natural environment and ecology observations above, there are no natural environment or ecology 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)