

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Caversham Heights

App Ref: 240134/HOU

Address: 23 Grove Hill, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8PN

Proposals: Single storey rear extension and replacement balcony

Case Officer: James Schofield

Applicant: Ms Kirichek

Date received (valid from): 2 February 2024

Target Decision date: Originally 29 March

2024; Extension of time agreed until 9 May 2024

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is a single detached dwelling appearing as a bungalow in the streetscene, the design of the house, subsequent to alterations, makes use of the steep topography to include a basement level and a converted loft. The dwelling has a balcony off the rear at the same level as the ground floor. The balcony is approximately 3.1 metres deep and the deck is approximately 2.6 metres above the ground.

Site visit date: 21/03/2024

Site visit photos:



2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension with a balcony on its roof at the same level as that of the existing balcony/the level of the ground floor at a depth of 3.3 metres, the result being a “walkout” style rear extension. The proposal was amended to including screening panels similar to that which was previously approved but which is not currently in place. Plans considered;

Drawing No. MAP-C4811-001 Plans - Location

Drawing No. MAP-C4811-111 First Level - Existing

Drawing No. MAP-C4811-141 Roof Level & 3D Views - Existing

Drawing No. MAP-C4811-180 Elevations - Existing

~~Drawing No. MAP-C4811-211 First Level - Proposed (superseded)~~
~~Drawing No. MAP-C4811-240 Roof Level & 3D Views - Proposed (superseded)~~
~~Drawing No. MAP-C4811-280 Elevations - Proposed (superseded)~~
~~Drawing No. MAP-C4811-285 Sections - Proposed (superseded)~~
As received on 26th of February 2024

Drawing No. MAP-C4811-211 Rev A First Level - Proposed
Drawing No. MAP-C4811-240 Rev A Roof Level & 3D Views - Proposed
Drawing No. MAP-C4811-280 Rev A Elevations - Proposed
Drawing No. MAP-C4811-285 Rev A Sections - Proposed
As received on 23rd of April 2024

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Application no: 141218
Description: Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a rear extension.
Decision: Committee permit development with condition number 4 which requires the specified privacy screens be implemented before occupation take place.
Decision Date: 10/9/2014

4. CONSULTATIONS

A site notice was posted by the applicant which expired on the 6th of March. It was noted by the planning officer on his visit on the 21st of March 2024. The following addresses were consulted by letter.

263 Hemdean Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7QW
257 Hemdean Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7QW
265 Hemdean Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7QW
25 Grove Hill, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8PN
21 Grove Hill, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8PN

Letters of representation have been received as follows:
One letter of support from Peter Harding of 21 Grove Hill indicating:

"Ms Kirichek discussed this with me. She assured me it will keep to the existing footprint. It does not affect the view from my kitchen and bedroom windows. I have requested that, whoever she instructs as a builder, no radios should be permitted whilst work is being carried out and that all building materials are kept well away from the dividing fence between No. 23 and No. 21. I therefore do not oppose the application and wish her success in this application."

A condition regarding construction noise is discussed in the subsequent assessment relating to amenity concerns.

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.

5. LEGAL AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

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. Material considerations include relevant policies in the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) - among them the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

National Planning Practice Guidance 2014

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD 2011

6. APPRAISAL

Character and Appearance

Policy H9 states that an extension to a house will be acceptable where it respects the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design and respects the character and pattern of neighbouring properties and the street as a whole in terms of scale, location, materials and design, and any important existing building line. Policy CC7 also sets out relevant considerations for design.

The design of the proposal is considered to be acceptable, and, given its location at the rear of the property would not readily visible from the public domain. The scheme is similar to that approved previously and in situ (see history above) and the proposal is not considered result in any design concerns over and above that previously approved.

The proposal accords with the aims of Reading Borough Council policies CC7 and H9 as it relates to Character and Appearance.

Residential Amenity

Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not result in an overbearing impact on neighbours. Policy H10 seeks to ensure that the amenity of gardens and other outdoor areas are not compromised. Policy CC8 states an extension to a house will be acceptable where it will not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties.

The view from the end of the balcony towards the garden of number 21 Grove Hill.



The view from the end of the balcony towards the garden of number 25 Grove Hill.



The design of the proposal, the layout and topography of the site and neighbouring sites all combine to ensure that the privacy implications of the balcony are the foremost concern relating to the proposal. It is noted that in the original decision giving permission for the existing balcony a condition was included requiring privacy screens be put in place. It is noted that these are no longer in place. However, the site visit allayed concerns regarding the proposal provided the scheme be amended to include screening of a similar size and design to that which was originally approved. The position and size of the proposed balcony is very similar to that of the existing balcony, and with the screening in place the result is considered to be acceptable.

The nature of the site, being a single-detached dwelling on a steep plot, and the similar neighbouring sites ensure that what is effectively a basement extension to form a walk-out level underneath a balcony (actually replaced with roof patio of similar dimensions and location) means there are no concerns relating to overbearing effects or loss of daylight for the site or its neighbours.

The neighbour at 21 Grove Hill submitted a letter of support in which they discussed limiting noise during construction, particularly loud music. An application of this type and location rarely have construction hour conditions placed on them, and it is considered not to be necessary in this case.

Following on from the above analysis, the proposal is considered to accord with the aims of Reading Council Borough policies H9 and CC8 as they relate to amenity

7. CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed as set out above and is considered to be acceptable on that basis, subject to the following conditions.

8. RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Conditions:

1. Standard Time Limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Materials as specified.
4. Installation and retention of privacy screens