

## DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

**Ward:** Katesgrove

**App Ref:** 231134/HOU

**Address:** 1 Nelson Mews, St Giles Close, Reading, RG1 2SF

**Proposals:** Conversion of garage to a habitable room, new driveway, dropped kerb and external alterations to the dwelling.

**Case Officer:** James Schofield

**Applicant:** S Hotomega

**Date received (valid from):** 10 August 2023      **Target Decision date:** 10 October 2023

### 1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The dwelling is part of a modern infill development including flats. The proposal site is at the end adjacent to a ginnel leading to Crown Street. Google maps shows a silver birch tree within the proposal site, however, this was removed some time prior to the application being made.

**Site visit date:** 07/09/2023

**Site visit photos:**



### 2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Conversion of the existing garage to a habitable room, construction of a new driveway and external alterations to the dwelling. ,

Plans considered:

Dwg No. P1 Location and Block Plans

Dwg No. P2 Existing Plans A3

Dwg No. P3 Proposed Plans A3

Dwg No. P4 Existing Elevations A3

Dwg No. P5 Proposed Elevation A3

As received 11<sup>th</sup> of August 2023

### 3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant.

### 4. CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

2 Nelson Mews, St Giles Close, Reading, RG1 2SF  
20 Crown Street, Reading, RG1 2SE  
12-18 Crown Street, Reading, RG1 2SE

No letters of representation have been received.

**Trees Officer**

The trees officer had concerns regarding the loss of the silver birch tree, however, this was already gone prior to the application being made.

**Transport Officer**

Highways had no objections to the loss of the garage or the location of the new driveway. However, they did point out the need for the applicant to apply to highways for permission for a dropped kerb and the necessity for the applicant to pay for necessary upgrades to utility covers and manhole covers capable of sustaining the weight of vehicles, and similar changes to the drainage gully will be necessary, all at the expense of the applicant. The highways officer requested plans be updated reflecting these changes and visibility splays, however, matters relating to the relocation of utilities etcetera are not relevant planning matters, and are instead relevant to the implementation of the dropped kerb, and as acknowledged by the highways officer, the visibility situation will not be appreciably different from the existing case. As such, no amended plans were sought by the planning officer in this instance.

**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)  
TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking)  
EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network)  
EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodlands)

**SPG/SPD**

## **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 proposed ground-floor side extension is considered to result in an acceptably sympathetic alteration to the character of the existing modern development. It is acknowledged that the repeating pattern of the garage doors being on the left-hand side relative to the front door for the Nelson Mews development would be broken if the development were to be built. However, 1 Nelson Mews is a smaller dwelling at the end of the Mews, and similar to the taller development at the other end of the development, already has a slightly different orientation of the repeating forms present in the front elevation. Changes appear to be minimal and acceptable.

The siting and scale of the proposed extension acceptable.

As such, the proposal does not accord with the aims of policies CC7 and H9 of the Local Plan (2019) with respect to character, scale and siting.

### **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 extension would, by virtue of its siting and scale not harm the residential amenity of any nearby dwelling including that of the host dwelling.

Further to this analysis, the proposal is considered to not accord with the aims of policy CC8 and H10 of the Local Plan (2019).

### **Ecology**

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 within the proposal site, protected trees or identified Green Links which could be negatively impacted by the proposal.

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. Time limit (standard) [TL1]
2. Approved plans [AP1]
3. Materials (to match) [M1]

Informatives:

1. Access construction
2. Highways