

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 9 Surley Row, Reading

Application No: 172096/HOU

Proposal: Single storey front extension, single storey rear extension, proposed outbuilding in rear garden.

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Evans

Date received (valid from): 29/11/17

Target Decision date: 01/03/18 (originally 24/01/18, but extension of time agreed with applicant)

Case officer: Jonathan Markwell

1. Site Description and Surrounding Area

- i. The application site comprises a detached single dwellinghouse located on the south-west side of Surley Row. The property was built following the granting of planning permission in 2011 (see relevant history section below). It includes relatively high brick boundary walls to the front and on the boundary with No's 13 & 15 to the north-west. The immediate surrounding area is predominantly residential, with a combination of similarly expansive detached houses (particularly to the south - largely set in generous grounds) and some terraced /semi-detached properties to the north (more densely located).
- ii. The application site building is not listed, but is located within Surley Row Conservation Area. The property is not explicitly referenced within the appraisal, but page 8 of the appraisal does note that "All buildings within the conservation area, whilst of varied design, recognise the character of the area in terms of scale and retain the essential linking feature of the area that is the high brick walls". No. 2 Surley Row (Fir Tree House), directly opposite the application site on the north-east side of Surley Row, is Grade II listed, as is White Cottage further to the north.
- iii. Although there are no TPO trees within the application site, there are a number of mature trees within the site, including a conifer and willow close to the existing shed in the rear garden. The conservation area appraisal specifies at p8 that trees generally are an important element of the character and quality of the area.

2. The Proposal

- i. A householder application for planning permission is sought for three main elements. First, a single storey front extension is proposed, which would connect to an extant garage (approved as part of 111125 at the site, but only partly implemented at the time of the officer site visit) and the existing house, to create an additional room of accommodation within the single dwellinghouse.
- ii. Secondly, a single storey rear extension is proposed to the single dwellinghouse at ground floor level. This would provide an enlarged dining room within the ground floor area.
- iii. Thirdly, a single storey outbuilding in the rear garden is proposed, covering (and going beyond) the footprint of the existing shed within the garden. This is shown to include a garden room and shed.
- iv. During the course of the application revised / additional plans were submitted to address a number of inaccuracies / inconsistencies specified on the originally proposed plans, summarised as including:

- Clarification regarding the status of the garage to the front of the property shown on the existing plans. This, barring part of a single wall, was not in place at the time of the officer site visit (only a white wall and hardstanding). The applicant clarified that the garage has been part implemented under permission 111125 and revised the plans accordingly.
- The elevation plans were amended (both existing and proposed) to specify the elevations as north-east/south-east/south-west/north-west (as per previous applications at the site), as the north-east-south-west annotations originally specified were not accurate.
- Separate proposed elevation plans were provided to show the proposed front extension within the context of the boundary wall to the front of the application site and the boundary wall / neighbouring building No. 13.
- It was witnessed during the officer site visit that a window/lightwell on the north (side) elevation at basement level was in place, as per the proposed elevation plan. Accordingly, the existing elevations plan was revised to reference this existing element.
- A section plan through the proposed outbuilding, through the proposed rooflight and also indicating the extent (or not) of any foundations associated with this element of the proposals was provided.
- A section plan through the proposed front extension, showing the projection of the rooflights proposed and an indication of the floor to ceiling heights within this part of the proposal was provided.
- Annotations were added on the proposed north elevation to specify the proposed areas of brickwork and details of the materials for the 'barn style sliding doors'.
- Enlarged cricket nets (over and above those existing, as seen during the officer site visit) were omitted.

- v. Moreover, the location of the outbuilding to the rear of the property (away from trees) and the front extension rooflight was altered during the course of the application. These changes, and additional information, were not of a nature which was considered worthy of formal public re-consultation taking place.

3. Consultation

i. Neighbour Consultation

Neighbour letters were sent on 01/12/17. A site notice was erected on 08/12/17. A press notice was published on 07/12/17.

One response was received from a nearby occupier, solely seeking details as to the position of the proposed cricket nets.

Officer note: Proposed cricket nets were omitted from the proposals during the course of the application. It is noted that some cricket nets presently exist, but these did not appear (based on the officer site visit) to be a recent addition.

ii. Internal Consultation

RBC Transport

Transport does not have any objections to this application as the proposed extensions do not change or impact on the existing parking arrangements.

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.

RBC Natural Environment - original observations

There appears to be no reason to fell the conifer, as shown on the site plan - unnecessary tree felling in a conservation area should be avoided. Officers expect the retention of the tree unless there are sound arboricultural reasons not to do so.

With regards to the Willow, the proposed outbuilding is in close proximity and the RPA shown seems a little small. Based on officer site visit photos, the diameter of the tree appears to be around 50cm (sought to be confirmed by the applicant) which would give an RPA radius of 6m; the outbuilding would clearly then be within this, and hence there is potential for root damage.

It is noted that the application form states that no trees are to be removed or pruned - this is conflict with Proposed Site Plan 3466/203 E (which shows the conifer to be removed) and the position of the proposed outbuilding which (unless built on top of the existing ground level) will sever/prune roots when constructed.

Therefore the following should be provided prior to a decision being made:

1. Provide a proposed site plan with accurate RPA of the Willow and conifer (assuming the latter is to be retained)
2. Explanation for the proposed removal of the conifer, if still proposed
3. Confirmation of whether the outbuilding can be built on top of the existing ground level (removal of turf layer only) and if not, then a preliminary arboricultural statement - at least an Arboricultural Impact Assessment - to explain how it would be constructed
4. Clarify whether the existing cricket nets to be replaced, given the plan shows 'proposed' cricket nets? If so, please clarify whether this would require any ground works?
5. Show the exact position of tree protection measures

The applicant was advised to be mindful of the vigorous nature of Willow roots when proposing a building within its RPA and should therefore allow for this in the design/construction of the outbuilding.

More generally in terms of the principle of the outbuilding (replacing the existing shed), it is confirmed that the proposal as shown this is considered appropriate. If the outbuilding is re-positioned to satisfy tree requirements, a further assessment in terms of the impact on nearby amenity will be undertaken in due course too.

RBC Natural Environment - revised observations following the submission of revised plans / more information

As the outbuilding is now outside the RPA of the Willow, the conifer is retained and the cricket nets removed, no objections are now raised.

A condition to avoid construction works affecting trees would be prudent:

No materials, soil, rubbish or vehicles shall be deposited or stored within the Root Protection Areas (as defined by BS5837:2012) of retained trees and no fires shall be lit, and no raising or lowering of ground levels shall take place within these areas. No drains, pits, ditches or trenches shall be dug in or run across these areas at any time before, during and after the development of the site, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that retained trees are adequately protected, in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy CS38 and Policy CS7

- iii. Reading CAAC
Formally consulted; no response received.

4. Plans & Documents Considered

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

3466/206 Rev A Site Location Plan
3466/100 Rev A Existing Floor Plan
3466/101 Rev A Existing Elevations

3466/205 Rev B Block Plan
3466/203 Rev H Proposed Site Plan
3466/200 Rev H Proposed Floor Plan
3466/201 Rev J Proposed Elevations
3466/202 Rev E Proposed Shed Floor Plans and Elevations
3466/207 Rev A Proposed Elevations With Context
3466/208 Rev A Proposed Section A-A & B-B
All received on 08/02/18

Email from Day Tanner, dated & received 08/02/18

5. Relevant Planning History

101397 - Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of part two storey, part one and a half storey and part single storey replacement dwelling. Refused 15/10/10.

101632 - Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of part two storey, part one and a half storey and part single storey replacement dwelling. Refused 18/10/10:

1. By reason of its bulk, massing, projection forward in the plot, and front hipped cat slide roof form, the front projecting element to the northern side of the property relates poorly to the more regular form and proportions of the main part of the dwelling, appearing as an overly dominant, and poorly integrated addition, rather than a cohesive element of the main dwelling. This results in a dwelling that in respect of its siting, complex form, and forward bulk, fails to respect or enhance the architectural and visual qualities of the Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies CS 7 (Design and the Public Realm) and CS 33 (Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment) of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008), 'saved' policies HSG 5 (Residential Design Standards), HSG 8 (House Extensions), CUD 7 (New Development in Conservation Areas), CUD 14 (Standards of Design in Development), of the Reading Borough Local Plan (1998), the Council's Surley Row Conservation Area Appraisal (September 2010), and National Planning Policy Statement 5 (Planning for the Historic Environment).
2. The proposed siting of the garage would result in the loss of the entire landscaped frontage of the site consisting of a number of evergreen tree species. These trees make a significant amenity contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, serving to soften views along the hard but attractive high walled edges on Surley Row. The loss of these trees, and their replacement with a garage in a prominent forward position on the plot would therefore result in a hard and unrelieved brick wall frontage to the site that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to CS 7 (Design and the Public Realm), CS 33 (Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment) and CS 38 (Trees, Hedges and Woodlands) of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008), CUD 7 (New Development in Conservation Areas), CUD 14 (Standards of Design in Development), the Council's Surley Row Conservation Area Appraisal (September 2010), and National Planning Policy Statement 5 (Planning for the Historic Environment) (2010).
3. It has not been demonstrated that the new dwelling would meet the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 standard, and therefore fails to demonstrate that it would mitigate its impacts on climate change that would otherwise result from the development, contrary to Policy CS1 (Sustainable Construction and Design) of the adopted Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document, Sustainable Design and Construction (2007).

111125 - Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of part two storey, part one and a half storey and part one storey replacement dwelling (re-submission of 10/01565/FUL). Granted 25/03/11.

111357 - Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of part two storey, part one and a half storey and part one storey replacement dwelling (re-submission of 10/01566/CON). Granted 25/03/11.

111465 - Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 of planning permission 11/00045/FUL. Split Decision 17/02/12.

110571 - Discharge of condition 3 of planning consent 11/00046/CON. Not discharged 08/10/12.

121216 - Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 of planning permission 11/00045/FUL. Split Decision 08/10/12.

Tree applications:

162372 - Remove 3 lateral branches and trim back overhang by 1-1.5m on one conifer at 9 Surley Row. Granted 25/01/17.

162393 - G1 5 x Conifers in the southern rear boundary are felled to just aboveground level. T2 Willow reduce back selected laterals, remove or stabilise dead wood. T3 conifer to be felled. T4 Gleditsia lift canopy. P8 New planting 5 x *Betula ermanii*, alba or fascination heavy extra heavy standard broadly on the north to screen neighbours property but also allowing dappled light into garden. Granted 25/01/17.

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') 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

- i. 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
CS33 Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment
CS36 Biodiversity and Geology
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

RBC Supplementary Planning Documents

SPG - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003)

RBC Conservation Area Appraisals

Surley Row Conservation Area Appraisal 2010

9. Appraisal

- i. The main issues are considered to be:
 - Design & associated matters
 - Amenity
 - Trees
 - Transport
 - CIL
- ii. Design and impact on the character of the surrounding area, including the character and appearance of Surley Row Conservation Area and setting of nearby listed buildings

Considering the front extension first, it is first acknowledged that a proposal from 2010 refused permission for a two storey element roughly in the area where the proposed extension is now sought. The later permission in 2011 overcame this reason for refusal. It is also noted, following the officer site visit, that the garage approved in 2011 had not been built in full (on a single wall had been), but owing to the remainder of the permission evidently having been implemented, it is extant and the application could fully implement this at any time. The proposal, including an inset link, would provide access from the main house to the proposed room; although no access is shown internally to the garage, this could be possible without permission. In light of the context of the refusal in 2010, it could be argued that cumulatively the front extension and garage is at least as harmful as that previously refused (see history above).

However, it is instead considered that given it would only be visible in glimpsed views via the entrance (largely hidden by the characterful high brick walls and vegetation cover - two key features of the conservation area) and that other properties have a variety of additions to the front of buildings (with the conservation area appraisal identifying another key feature being the varied and interesting buildings and building line sometimes including and sometimes behind the wall), the addition would not be significantly harmful to the host building, streetscene or wider conservation area. From the glimpsed views from the public realm (Surley Row) the single storey addition would appear subordinate to the main house. The staggered roofline from the garage to the addition and then the house, is, on balance, considered adequate. The proposed materials, facing brickwork, timber doors, metal crittal windows and a green sedum roof assists in aligning satisfactorily with the host building and the character/appearance of the conservation area. During the course of the application the rooflight has been reduced in scale to ensure it is not a dominant feature detracting from the character of the property/area. Accordingly, with all matters duly considered, this addition is considered acceptable and compliant with the principles of the relevant policies with the context of the application site and surrounding area.

Turning to consider the ground floor rear extension, this represents a modest addition to the host building which raises no design issues, with materials matching the existing.

Finally, in respect of the outbuilding in the rear garden, this is relatively small scale in nature and would be complimentary to the design of the main house, with timber boarding aligning with the outbuilding nature of the space. Policy DM9 states that ancillary accommodation will be

acceptable where it would not be capable of operating as a separate dwelling which could be let or sold separately. In this regard, it is advised that given the nature of the proposal, its location and the context of the main host building, it is unlikely to be a self-contained dwelling or separate business unit. Instead it is considered to more likely to provide ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling, as indicated in the submission by the applicant. However, in order to ensure this, a condition is recommended to be added in this regard.

In terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, this is considered to be preserved by the proposals. The elements to the rear would not be visible from the public realm, while that at the front is considered to align with the character of the host property and not adversely impact on those nearby, some of which already include a variety of additions to the front of houses. In terms of the impact on the setting of listed buildings (as per the site description), owing to the existing boundary walls (a feature of the conservation area) these are considered to be preserved by virtue of the proposed works only marginally extending over the height of these walls (and only in part too).

Accordingly, the scale, location, materials and design of the proposals are considered to suitably comply with policies CS7, CS33 and DM9.

iii. Amenity

Considering first the front extension, owing to the existing brick boundary walls to the front and side of the site no harmful overlooking, daylight/sunlight or outlook/overbearing impacts are envisaged to the north. The only overlooking possible would be via rooflights, with the acute angles involved resulting in the level of harm being negligible. To the south, the distances between the extension and nearby properties is such that no adverse impacts would occur.

The central location and limited depth of the ground floor rear extension means no harmful amenity impacts are envisaged to the south of the site. To the north, no negative impact would occur owing to the extension not going beyond the rear building line of the existing property.

In terms of the outbuilding, given it has a height of 2.5m, it would only extend 0.5m above the height of the boundary fence, thereby downplaying any day/sunlight, outlook/overbearing concerns. No windows are proposed on the side elevation facing the neighbouring property and hence no overlooking/loss of privacy issues are raised either.

It is considered necessary and relevant, owing to the relative size of the front extension and a secondary door being provided and the presence of an outbuilding and possible separate access from Surley Row (in the existing context), to include a condition outlining that neither the front extension nor the rear outbuilding shall become a self-contained dwelling or separate business unit without a separate planning permission being required / granted. This is to ensure that the future occupation of the extension / outbuilding does not adversely affect the amenity of adjoining residential premises/immediate area by reason of noise, traffic congestion and excessive on-street parking and is not used for unauthorised purposes.

For current and future occupiers of the host dwelling, the proposed works will improve the quality of accommodation provided at the site.

iv. Trees

As per the revised observations received during the course of the application (responding to the revised proposals, following initial concerns raised) the proposals are considered to be appropriate in adequately protecting trees. Most notably, the outbuilding has been repositioned

to be located outside of the root protection areas of nearby conifer and willow trees. A compliance condition is recommended to be included on the decision notice in these regards.

The provision of a sedum green roof to the front extension is welcomed.

v. **Transport**

As per section 3 above, Transport officers raise no issues with the proposals. In terms of the practicalities of building the proposed scheme, it is considered that there is ample space within the front amenity area for there to be no need for a construction method statement being secured in this instance.

vi. **CIL**

The floorspace involved in the proposed works is below 100sqm and the applicant has confirmed (via the CIL form submitted with the application) that the proposals do not involve the creation of a new dwelling. Accordingly, 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;

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

3466/205 Rev B Block Plan
3466/203 Rev H Proposed Site Plan
3466/200 Rev H Proposed Floor Plan
3466/201 Rev J Proposed Elevations
3466/202 Rev E Proposed Shed Floor Plans and Elevations
3466/207 Rev A Proposed Elevations With Context
3466/208 Rev A Proposed Section A-A & B-B
All received on 08/02/18

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

3. 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 Policy CS7 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policy DM9 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

4. The front extension or rear outbuilding hereby approved shall only be used for purposes incidental to the residential use of the single family dwellinghouse at No. 9 Surley Row and shall not be used as a separate independent Class C3 dwelling or Class B1 business unit.

Reason: To ensure that the future occupation of the front extension or rear outbuilding does not adversely affect the amenity of adjoining residential premises/immediate area by reason of noise, traffic congestion and excessive on-street parking and is not used for unauthorised purposes, in accordance with Policies CS10 and CS24 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policies DM4 and DM12 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

5. No materials, soil, rubbish or vehicles shall be deposited or stored within the Root Protection Areas (as defined by BS5837:2012) of retained trees and no fires shall be lit, and no raising or lowering of ground levels shall take place within these areas. No drains, pits, ditches or trenches shall be dug in or run across these areas at any time before, during and after the development of the site, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that retained trees are adequately protected, in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality, in accordance with Policies CS7 and CS38 of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015) and Policy DM4 of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015).

Informatives:

1. These works may require separate approval under the Building Regulations. Please contact the Council's Building Control service for further advice on (0118) 937 2449.
2. Your attention is drawn to the terms and conditions of this permission. Any development which is carried out but 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.
3. The determination of this planning application required a number of issues to be resolved, so officers have worked positively and proactively to provide a recommendation for approval within the agreed timescale.
4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/partywall>