

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Norcot

App Ref: 220745/HOU

Address: 206 Norcot Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG30 6AE

Proposals: Two storey side extension and single detached garage, extension to existing dropped kerb (amended description).

Case Officer: Marcie Rejwerska

Applicant: Mr Mark Redman

Date received (valid from): 20 May 2022 **Target Decision date:** 10 March 2023 (ext.)

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling on the corner of Norcot Road and Birch Avenue. The property is accessed from Norcot Road and has an existing single garage at the side of the property. The surrounding area is predominately residential, comprised of detached and semi-detached properties in similar character. The property is not listed nor in a conservation area.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Planning permission is sought for a two storey side extension to mirror the adjoining neighbouring property. The proposed extension would measure 3.91m width x 7.16m depth, with a hipped roof to match the existing and a single gable dormer to the side elevation. New windows are proposed at the front, rear and side elevations.

The proposal also includes replacement of the single detached garage and replacement with new single detached garage with a study on the first floor above.

The proposal also initially included a new driveway entrance which has been removed from the proposal as it was not considered acceptable. The proposal now includes extension of the dropped kerb located by the existing access point on Norcot Road.

Plans considered:

RTP-00222-013-A, Proposed garage, dated 19 May 2022, received 23 May 2022

RTP-00222-014-A, Proposed garage sections, dated 19 May 2022, received 23 May 2022

RTP-00222-002-0, Existing ground floor plan, dated 1 May 2022, received 23 May 2022

RTP-00222-003-0, Existing first floor plan, 1 May 2022, received 23 May 2022

RTP-00222-005-0, Existing roof plan, 1 May 2022, received 23 May 2022

RTP-00222-006-0, Existing elevations, 1 May 2022, received 23 May 2022

RTP-00222-007-A, Proposed ground floor plan, 18 May 2022, received 23 May 2022

RTP-00222-008-A, Proposed first floor plan, 18 May 2022, received 23 May 2022

RTP-00222-009-0, Proposed second floor plan, 18 May 2022, received 23 May 2022

RTP-00222-010-A, Proposed roof plan, 18 May 2022, received 23 May 2022

RTP-00222-011-A, Proposed elevations, 18 May 2022, received 23 May 2022

RTP-00222-012-A, Proposed 3D illustrations, 18 May 2022, received 23 May 2022

RTP-00222-001-D, Location and site plans, 20 December 2022, received 20 December 2022

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Internal consultations:

Transport - Norcot Rd is a classified Rd and therefore visibility splays of 2.4m x 90m are required from the new access, these have not been illustrated however I am happy that these can be achieved. A license will be required from the Highways Department.

In situations where a neighbouring property already has an established legal vehicle crossing as is the case in this instance, and there is insufficient space/gap between the crossings to install 'transition kerbs' and 'full-height kerbing infill', it may be necessary to extend the existing dropped kerb from the neighbouring property to create the new vehicle crossing.

It is noted that gates will serve the existing area, normally we would request that these are set back into the site for a minimum of 5m, however given that these are already in place, the gates are acceptable in this situation.

There are no Transport objections to this application.

Trees - The proposed new access is directly adjacent to a mature RBC Cherry tree, and most likely within its Root Protection Area - I'm not convinced this (trunk and canopy) are accurately represented in relation to the proposed access, as they should be.

This species will have shallow roots, at best, if not surface roots hence putting in an access would require careful consideration and arb input, which has not been provided as the application form does not even acknowledge that trees are 'within falling distance' of the proposal, when clearly they are. It would seem that crown lifting would also be required to appropriate clearance.

On the assumption that there are no plans to fell this tree, the application is not acceptable as there is a failure to demonstrate no harm to an amenity tree, contrary to EN14 and our adopted Tree Strategy.

Comments no longer relevant as proposed new access removed from proposal.

External consultations:

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

6 Birch Avenue, Tilehurst, RG30 6BL

Letters of representation have been received as follows:

1 objection citing concerns over the proposed new driveway entrance.

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

National Planning Practice Guidance

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

TR3 (Access Traffic and Highway-related Matters)

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.

Although the proposed side extension is not set back from the front elevation, the proposal is considered acceptable as it mirrors the existing two storey extension of the adjoining neighbour. Due to the orientation of the dwelling the proposed extension is not considered overbearing or excessive in scale and the design is sympathetic to the character of the main dwelling and the surrounding area.

The proposed first floor extension over the existing garage is considered acceptable. The slope of the land on Norcot Road aids in preventing the structure from appearing overbearing or visually dominant. Although uncommon for the area, the garage is not considered harmful in its appearance nor scale.

The proposed extension of the existing dropped kerb is acceptable and will improve the existing access to the site.

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.

- Privacy and overlooking;

- New windows are not considered to pose a risk of overlooking. A condition is recommended to secure obscure glazing to the rear of the proposed study above the garage.
- Overbearing effects;
 - No identified risk
- Sunlight and daylight;
 - No identified risk

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

GRANT PERMISSION

Recommended Conditions:

TL1

AP1

M1

DC3

PD3

PD6