

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Caversham Heights

App Ref: 240424/HOU

Address: Jasmine Cottage, The Warren, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7TQ

Proposals: Proposed single storey rear extension, front porch and garage conversion.

Case Officer: James Schofield

Applicant: Mrs Lindi Filbee

Target Decision date: Originally 27 June 2024; Extension of time agreed until 2 August 2024

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is a detached dwelling at the end of The Warren, a long primarily residential road in Caversham. This site was bought by the owners of The Chase next door leading to a less formal boundary arrangements being in place at the time of the site visit. The original dwelling was a relatively small brick dwelling with a gable-ended roof. Later, a flat rooved side extension was added to its eastern elevation. This site backs directly onto the Thames and is within flood zone 3.

Site visit date: 22/07/2024

Site visit photos:



2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Proposed single storey rear extension at a depth of 4.89 metres at the full width of the dwelling (8.4 metres) with a combination of hipped and gable rooves joined to the host dwelling with a flat roof section. The proposal includes a small side extension at depth and width of 1.95 and 2.85 metres respectively with a lean-to roof accommodating a porch. Plans considered;

Arboricultural Development Report

Flood Risk Assessment

Drawing No. 3919-100 Rev A Location Plan

Drawing No. 3919-101 Existing Ground Floor Plan

Drawing No. 3919-102 Existing First Floor Plan

Drawing No. 3919-103 Existing Elevations 1 of 2

Drawing No. 3919-104 Existing Elevations 2 of 2

Drawing No. 3919-200 Rev B Block Plan

Drawing No. 3919-201 Rev C Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Drawing No. 3919-202 Rev B Proposed First Floor Plan

Drawing No. 3919-203 Rev B Proposed Elevations 1 of 2

Drawing No. 3919-204 Rev C Proposed Elevations 2 of 2

Drawing No. 3919-205 Rev B Proposed Site Plan

As received on the 2nd of May 2024

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Application: 02-00588-FUL (021262)

Description: Demolition of existing dwelling. New five bedroom house.
Decision: Refused 8th of August 2002

Application: 03-01309-FUL (030178)
Description: Demolition of existing house and replacement with a new house.
Decision: Permitted 5th of January 2004

Application: 08-01407-FUL (081344)
Description: Prior approval for proposed demolition of Jasmine Cottage.
Decision: Withdrawn on 10th of November 2008

Application: 08-01408-APPCON (081428)
Description: Discharge of conditions 2, 7, 10, 13, 16, 17 and 19 relating to Planning Consent 03/01309/FUL.
Decision: Discharged on the 24th of December 2008

Notes: Some permitted development rights were removed for the approved replacement dwelling which was ultimately not built. As such, these decisions did not affect the PD rights of the existing dwelling.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

Rose Cottage, The Warren, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7TQ
The Chase, The Warren, Caversham, Reading, RG4 7TQ

One letter of support was received from the neighbouring site at Rose Cottage.

Natural Environment

The trees officer has no objections provided a condition that the proposal be implemented as per the arboricultural method statement submitted.

Transport

The Transport Officer had no objections.

Ecology

The Planning Officer spoke with the Ecology Officers about the need for a bat survey on the site. The agent indicated that the roof had been “repaired and reroofed in late 2023/early 2024.” On that basis the Ecology Officer did not think a bat survey was necessary.

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

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

EN1 (Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment)

EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network)

EN18 (Flooding and Sustainable Drainage Systems)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPD 2021

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 scale of the proposal is relatively large, and the cumulative impact of extensions on the footprint of the dwelling is considerable at approximately 177% (an increase from around 41 metres² to 113 metres²). However, the scale of the proposal site is very large, and the same is true of the adjacent sites to either side. Furthermore, the distance between the dwellings is also very large. The scale of the proposal is considered to be acceptable and not considered to result in any cramped overdevelopment of the site.

The appearance of the existing side extension was detrimental to the original dwelling. The proposed rear and side extension proposed here are much more sympathetic and help to reassert some of the features present in the original dwelling. The changing of the roof over the two-storey side extension from a flat roof to a gable-ended roof is particularly helpful in this regard and would result in a more coherent appearance.

The proposal satisfies the character considerations of local policies H9 and CC7.

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.

Given the nature of the site, the distance from adjacent dwellings, and the single-storey extensions being proposed, no significant negative overbearing, sunlight, or privacy effects are considered to arise.

Further to this analysis, the proposal is considered to accord with the aims of local policies H9, H10, and CC8 on amenity.

Flood Risk

The proposed development is within Flood Zone 3. Policy EN18 indicates proposed development will be directed to areas at lowest risk of flooding in the first instance following the Sequential and Exceptions Test set out in the NPPF. Paragraph 164 of the NPPF indicates that “applications for some minor development and changes of use

should not be subject to the sequential or exception tests but should still meet the requirements for site-specific risk assessments...” Footnote 51 indicates that this includes householder development, small non-residential extensions (with a footprint of less than 250 m²) and changes of use; except for changes of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home or park home site, where the sequential and exception tests should be applied as appropriate.

The proposed extensions are within the size threshold and the flood-risk assessment indicates they will implement flood-proofing measures where appropriate.

As such, the proposal accords with the local Policy EN18 as it is deemed acceptable by the Environment Agency’s standing advice for development proposals of this size.

Trees

Part ‘b’ of Policy EN12 indicates that all development sites should not result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. These aims are supported by Policy H9 which states that an extension will only be acceptable where it does not result in the loss of biodiversity within gardens.

The site does not have any notable vegetation, protected trees or identified Green Links which could be negatively impacted by the proposal beyond those identified in the Arboricultural report. The Natural Environment Officer came to the conclusion that this was sufficient, and that a condition should be included requiring the method statement to be implemented should the proposal be approved and subsequently built.

The proposal is not considered likely to result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity provided the method statement is observed. As such the proposal is considered to accord with the biodiversity and sustainability considerations of Policies H9 and EN12 of the local plan as long as a condition is included requiring the Arboricultural Method Statement be implemented.

Biodiversity and sustainability

Part ‘b’ of Policy EN12 indicates that all development sites should not result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. These aims are supported by Policy H9 which states that an extension will only be acceptable where it does not result in the loss of biodiversity within gardens. Paragraph 99 of the government Circular 06/05: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and Their Impact Within The Planning System states that the presence or otherwise of protected species, including bats, must be established before planning permission is granted, and otherwise all relevant material considerations must be addressed first.

Further to discussion between the agent and the Ecology Officer, it was deemed that there was no need for a bat survey to be conducted due to recent repairs and reroofing of the roof. However, given the areas suitability, an informative regarding bats should be included in the Decision Notice.

The proposal site does not have any notable vegetation, protected trees or identified Green Links which could be negatively impacted by the proposal beyond those identified in the Arboricultural report. The Natural Environment Officer came to the conclusion that this was sufficient, and that a condition should be included requiring the method statement to be implemented should the proposal be approved and subsequently built.

The proposal is not considered likely to result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. As such the proposal is considered to accord with the biodiversity and sustainability considerations of Policies H9 and EN12 of the local plan.

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 (TL1)
2. Approved plans (AP1)
3. Materials to match (M1)
4. Arboricultural Method Statement (as specified) (L4A)

Recommended Informative:

1. Bats & works to roofs (I12)