

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Caversham Heights

App Ref: PL/24/1166 Householder planning permission

Address: 23 KIDMORE ROAD, CAVERSHAM, READING, RG4 7LR

Proposal: Single storey rear extension

Applicant: A. Bird & N. Matthews

Received date: 05-09-2024

Target Decision date: 31-10-2024

Case Officer: James Schofield

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is a detached dwelling with a sizeable garden to the front and rear of the site. The property has strong architectural features, with a Dutch gabled roof to the front which sits over large bay windows at the first and second floors. The dwelling is similar in design and style to its neighbour at number 25. The dwelling, and numbers 21 and 25 to either side, are in a stepped formation. This means number 21 sits slightly back relative to the proposal site, while number 25 projects further into the site. The proposal site has an existing rear extension at a depth of 1.55 metres which has a lean-to-roof. Part of the proposed development site includes a number of trees and shrubs.

Site visit date: 16/10/2024

Site visit photos:



2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposed development is to demolish an existing garage and build a new rear extension in an "L" shaped configuration with a pitched roof over the extension, connected to the main dwelling with a new flat roof over the existing rear extension. The deepest part of the rear extension would be 6.4 metres as taken from the back of the existing extension to the canopy. The canopy is made up of the roof extending

beyond the gable at a depth of 1-metre. This results in a combined depth of 7.4 metres for the new sections, and almost 9 metres for the total depth of all rear extensions. Plans considered;

Drwg No. 3945 – 101 Existing Ground Floor Layout
Drwg No. 3945 – 102 Existing First Floor Layout
Drwg No. 3945 – 103 Existing Second Floor Layout
Drwg No. 3945 – 104 Existing Roof Layout
Drwg No. 3945 – 105 Existing Elevations
Drwg No. 3945 – 220 Block and Location Plan
Drwg No. 3945 – 221 Ground Floor Layout
Drwg No. 3945 – 222 First Floor Layout
Drwg No. 3945 – 223 Proposed Elevations 1 of 2
Drwg No. 3945 – 224 Proposed Elevation 2 of 2
As received on the 5th of September 2024

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Ref: PL/20/1312
Description: Rear extension and remodelling of existing house.
Decision: Refused on 9th of December 2020, appeal dismissed on 18th of June 2021.

Ref: PL/22/0143
Description: Rear extension and remodelling of house.
Decision: Withdrawn on 21st of February 2022.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The site notice was sent to the applicant to be posted on the 10th of September 2024. The applicant indicated it was posted for three-weeks expiring on the 1st of October. The following addresses were consulted by letter.

- 21 Kidmore Road, Caversham, READING, RG4 7LR
- 24 Albert Road, Caversham, READING, RG4 7PE
- 22 Albert Road, Caversham, READING, RG4 7PE
- 23 Kidmore Road, Caversham, READING, RG4 7LR
- 25 Kidmore Road, Caversham, READING, RG4 7LR
- 25a Kidmore Road, Caversham, READING, RG4 7LR
- 26 Albert Road, Caversham, READING, RG4 7PE

No letters of representation have been received.

Ecology

No objections, bat survey is sufficient to allay 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 2019 onwards

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network)

EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodland)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPD 2021

6. APPRAISAL

Character and Appearance

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

The appeal decision PL/20/1312 relates to a substantially different proposal, but in terms of trying to ensure that the high standard of existing character is maintained, it appears the decision has established that a more utilitarian rear extension is acceptable in principle. As such, while the appearance of the proposed rear extension would be modern without being using bold or noteworthy use of forms or materials, the general design is acceptable. The proposal would use similar materials to the existing dwelling and include features like a circular window which offers some architectural interest and does relate to an original feature in the host dwelling.

While the design of the hipped roof being joined to the dwelling by the conversion of the existing lean-to-roof to a flat roof creates the appearance of two separate buildings being joined in an ad hoc and utilitarian manner, the overall impact of this is reduced due to the siting of the rear extension and the avoidance of damaging the positive architectural features of the dwelling.

The scale of the proposal is large relative to the host dwelling. It is noted that the adopted guidance for extensions to householders recommends rear extensions do not exceed 4 metres. The combined depth of the proposed rear extension (including the canopy) and the existing rear extension is over double this. However, the size of the plot goes some way toward mitigating this.

The extension would not be readily seen from the wider public domain and would remain a subservient addition to the property which is acceptable.

Residential Amenity

Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not harm the privacy amenity of neighbouring sites. Policy CC8 states alterations to a house will be acceptable where they will not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties.

Whilst the proposed extension would be deep, the single-storey height, position, and hipped roof design of the roof of the proposal relative to that of adjacent dwellings would ensure the avoidance of any material loss of light or introducing any sense of overbearingness.

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

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 have a small number of trees and shrubs which could be negatively impacted by the proposal. However, it should be sufficient that a condition is included requiring the planting of replacement trees.

With this condition in place, 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.

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 more in-depth bat survey to be conducted.

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

While the proposed extension would appear as a more addition to the characterful dwelling, it is the conclusion of the planning team that it is not sufficiently detrimental to warrant a reason for refusal. As such, it is recommended that the proposal be approved with the following conditions.

8. RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Conditions:

1. TL1 Standard time limit
2. AP1 Approved plans
3. M1 Materials to match
4. Tree planting scheme to be agreed in writing