

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Southcote

App Ref: 230629/HOU

Address: 24 Winsor Drive, Reading, RG30 3EQ

Proposals: Erection of a part single, part double storey rear and side extension

Case Officer: Sian Hickey

Applicant: Mrs Shebnam Riaz

Date received (valid from): 10 May 2023 **Decision date (ext):** 5 July 2023

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two storey semi-detached property with a hipped roof. The property is not a listed building, nor does it fall within a conservation area. The surrounding area is predominantly residential.

Site visit date: 08/06/2023

Site visit photos:



2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a part single and part two storey rear and side extension. The ground floor element of the rear extension would be set in from both side boundaries and would have a maximum depth of 4.950m. The first floor element of the rear extension would have a maximum depth of 4.329m. The proposed side extension would replace the existing garage to form additional habitable space. The side element would also be set in from the side boundary and would be set back from the front elevation of the original dwelling.

Plans considered:

Drawing No. PL-01 - Location Plan

Drawing No. PL-03 - Existing and Proposed Block Plan

Drawing No. PL-05 - Existing Ground and First Floor Plan
Drawing No. PL-08 - Existing and Proposed Rear Elevation
Drawing No. PL-09 - Existing and Proposed Side Elevation
Drawing No. PL-11 - Existing and Proposed Section

As received 10th May 2023

Drawing No. PL-04 rev A - Proposed Site Plan
Drawing No. PL-06 rev A - Proposed Ground and First Floor Plan
Drawing No. PL-07 rev A - Existing and Proposed Front Elevation
Drawing No. PL-10 rev A - Existing and Proposed Roof Plan

As received 6th July 2023

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

230200 - Certificate of lawfulness for proposed loft conversion with rear dormer. - Certificate Granted

4. CONSULTATIONS

RBC Transport

Winser Drive is a private road with access from Southcote Lane via Kenilworth Avenue.

The proposed works will result in the loss of the integral garage, submitted plan PL-10 illustrates 2 off street parking spaces on the front drive on an extended part of hard standing.

Parking is being provided in accordance with the Councils current standards and therefore there are no Transport objections.

RBC Ecology

The bat survey [Urban Tree Experts, June 2023 ref: SPH/ET/PEA-23/13.06) has been undertaken to an appropriate standard and concludes that the risk of bats being affected by the proposals is minimal.

There are therefore no objections to this application on ecology grounds.

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

95 Kenilworth Avenue, Reading, Berkshire, RG30 3EH
32 Winser Drive, Southcote, Reading, Berkshire, RG30 3EQ
22 Winser Drive, Reading, RG30 3EQ
26 Winser Drive, Reading, RG30 3EQ
28 Winser Drive, Reading, RG30 3EQ

Letters of representation have been received as follows:

Three letters of objection have been received with regards to the following:

Scale, design, appearance, overbearing, loss of privacy, overshadowing, harm to outlook, bats, road safety and parking.

The material considerations are explored in more depth below.

Discussions with agent

The agent was advised to remove the existing extended garage wall in the front elevation and replace with a side gate to improve the appearance of the dwelling from the front. Subsequently, revised plans were received.

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)
TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking)
EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network)

SPD

Design Guide to House Extensions SPD 2021
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 combined side and rear extensions are large in scale, it is considered that the plot is capable of taking a development of this size. The proposals are considered acceptable in terms of design and the proposed materials are to match those of the existing dwelling. The proposals are not considered to cause harm to the host dwelling. The ridgeline of the roof of the proposed first floor side extension is set down from the existing ridgeline of the roof of the original house, and the side extension is in proportion with the original house overall. The bulk of the development is contained at the rear. The proposed rear extension is part two storey and part single storey. The proposed two storey element is stepped in from both side boundaries, and further stepped in from the boundary of the adjoining property. The rear extension would not be visible from the street scene. Although the side extension would be visible from the

street scene, it is not considered harmful to the surrounding area. The property is set back from the existing street, and the proposed first floor side extension is set back from the front elevation of the existing dwelling. There are a variety of side and rear extensions in the surrounding area, including at both neighbouring properties, therefore, the proposals are not considered out of character.

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.

Although the proposed development is large in scale, there are no identified risks of the extensions causing overbearing effects to the neighbouring properties. The maximum depth of proposed rear extension is 4.950m. Although the depth exceeds the 4m guidance within the SPD, as both adjoining neighbouring properties have single storey rear extensions the proposed depth is not considered harmful as the development would not extend significantly beyond the neighbouring extensions. There are also no identified risks of the proposals significantly reducing the amount of daylight and sunlight for the neighbouring properties. The scheme has been designed to ensure that the first floor elements of the proposed rear extension do not breach the 45 degree line of light. There are no side facing windows proposed and therefore there are no identified risks in relation to privacy and overlooking.

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

Recommended Conditions:

TL1 - Time Limit

M1 - Materials

AP1 - Approved Plans