

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Emmer Green

App Ref: 221503/HOU

Address: 2 Courtenay Drive, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8XH

Proposals: Demolition of detached garage and erection of a two-storey extension

Case Officer: Ryan Allen

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Masri

Date received (valid from): 8 October 2022 **Target Decision date:** 9 December 2022

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

Site visit date: 01/11/22

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The application site is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse situated on a corner plot between Courtenay Drive and Peppard Road. The streetscene demonstrates a pattern in terms of design and character. The property is not a listed building, nor is it located within a conservation area.

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing garage to the properties rear and the erection of a two-storey extension in its place. The extension seeks to stand at approximately 4.48m wide x 10.51m in total depth.

Plans considered:

Received 08/10/22

Design and Access Statement

Site Plan - Drawing No. 507-103 rev. A

Location Plan - Drawing No. 537-104 rev. A

Existing Plans - Drawing No. 545-101 rev. A

Existing Elevations - Drawing No. 545-102 rev. A

Proposed Plans - Drawing No. 545-105 rev. B

Proposed Elevations - Drawing No. 545-106 rev. B

Received 05/12/22

Proposed Plans - Drawing No. 545-105 rev. C

Proposed Elevations - Drawing No. 545-106 rev. C

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

337 Peppard Road, Emmer Green, Reading, Berks, RG4 8XG

4 Courtenay Drive, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8XH

Letters of representation have been received as follows:

Objection

We are the closest neighbours to the subject property. We have no problem with the concept of demolishing the detached garage and erecting a two-storey extension, but we consider that the detail of the submitted proposals as submitted is not sufficiently consistent with the defining characteristics of this part of Emmer Green and will also adversely affect the light, outlook and privacy we currently enjoy.

Whereas the submitted elevations correctly show the site boundary in relation to our property, the submitted plans omit the two 1.5m wide chimney breasts on our property - a prominent feature protruding 300mm beyond the south face of our property - and hence are misleading. The proposed offset of the two-storey extension of 1m to the site boundary would thus result in an effective separation between the two buildings of less than 1.5m which is inconsistent with the street scene locally. With one exception, there are no examples on the west side of Peppard Road, along the service road either side of Courtenay Drive, where two-storey elements of neighbouring dwellings are separated by such a small distance. Indeed, on the other side of Peppard Road between Yarnton Close and Rosehill Park, where two-storey elements adjoin they are generally separated by a significantly greater distance. In the majority of situations, the two-storey part of a dwelling adjoins the single-storey part of the neighbouring dwelling. In some cases the separation is between single storey elements. This is a defining characteristic of this part of Emmer Green.

The south elevation of our property includes a window at the western end which would face the proposed extension. This will adversely affect the light, outlook and privacy we currently enjoy. We appreciate that the proposed set-back of the upper-storey by around 700mm from the existing west elevation will help mitigate this to some degree, but we consider that this will be insufficient.

We consider that these issues would be addressed to our satisfaction by minor changes to the layout proposals, secured by conditions as set out below, should the application be consented:

- A minimum separation of at least 2m, measured from the chimney breasts on our dwelling to the proposed extension, to maintain consistency with the defining characteristics of this part of Emmer Green.*
- A minimum set-back of the upper-storey by 1m from the existing west elevation so that, at least, it will be clear of our side-facing window.*
- The balcony must be a Juliet balcony essentially consisting of a balustrade connection to the building facade thus preventing use of the flat roof in order to safeguard privacy.*

Internal Consultees:

Transport

Proposed works will result in the loss of the detached garage. The submitted site plan is illustrates 2 off road parking spaces on the front drive which is to be widened to facilitate the proposed parking layout. Water run-off from private property onto the public highway is not permitted. An appropriate method of drainage needs to be provided within the property curtilage including the use of suitable permeable surfacing materials.

If the existing access to be widened a license from the Highways Department will be required and illustrated on plans. Google images also illustrate a lamp column outside the property near the vehicle crossing, this will need to be identified on plans, it should be noted that a 1m distance must be retained between the lamp column and extended access.

In principle there are no Transport objections, however revised plans confirming the position and extent of the dropped crossing is required.

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)

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.

Officer concerns with the initial proposed where the scale of the proposal in relation to the existing dwelling and the design of the proposal in reference to the character of the streetscene. The streetscene comprises of houses similar in scale and design; presenting a well-established pattern along the street in reference to design. Alongside the concerns regarding the design in relation to residential amenity (elaborated upon in the following paragraph), officer concerns were also in relation to the aforementioned established pattern on the streetscene. Side extensions in the area adhere to the pattern by being set back from neighbouring properties by a minimum of 2m and design characteristics in the area adhere to similar catslide roof designs. Revisions illustrating officer concerns were requested and ultimately accepted. Such revisions demonstrated a change in the roof-design to match the existing streetscene pattern and siting the proposal a minimum of 2m away from the neighbouring property. Revisions were

also considered to reduce the bulk of the extension to render the proposal subservient, and ultimately more complementary to the host dwelling. Thus complying with policies CC7 & H9 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019).

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.

With the initial plans submitted, officers considered concerns were with the scale of the proposal in relation to the neighbouring property. Considerations were that the scale of the proposal would cause an overbearing effect on the neighbouring property and be un-neighbourly. Requests for revisions to take concerns into consideration by reducing the overall bulk of the proposal, and siting the replacement two-storey side extension a minimum of 2m away from the neighbouring property were made and ultimately received. The revised plans illustrated the requested minimum 2m distance between the host and neighbouring dwellings; considered sufficient space to lessen any potential detrimental overbearing and privacy impacts on the neighbouring property. The single-storey, flat roof aspect of the proposal to the west elevation is considered to mitigate any privacy or overbearing impacts a larger scale proposal at the same location could pose. In reference to the potential privacy issues regarding the inclusion of the aforementioned flat-roof aspect of the proposal, a condition is recommended to ensure mitigation of such issues arising, ensuring no use as balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area. Similar considerations are extended to the Juliette balcony included to the two-storey aspect and the raised patio the western elevation; both of these are not considered to compromise residential amenity to neighbouring properties in terms of privacy due to their design.

The alteration to the side garden area of the proposal that's to be replaced with permeable surfacing to establish further parking spaces is considered negligible given the context of the application site. A large garden to the side/rear of the property remains when considering the proposal, thus ensuring no garden space is not compromised.

Overall, the proposal is considered compliant with policies CC8, H9 & H10 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019).

Parking Provisions

Transport comments raised regarding the proposal given the inevitable loss of garage space, therefore parking space, and the alterations to the front garden area to facilitate this. The current garage is not used as a parking space and is therefore not considered to result in a material loss of parking space at the application site. The alterations to the front garden complete with new permeable surface is considered to negate any assumed loss in parking space by ensuring sufficient parking spaces are retained, in line with the Reading Borough Council Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD (2011). Concerns raised regarding the lamp column and drainage in the area are also considered to not pose harm to the area considering the proposal and the context of the site. Plans illustrate changes to the front garden itself to facilitate extended access to the property in reference to the parking changes at the site. Currently, plans do not show a change or proposed future change to any dropped crossing/curb that exists outside of the property. If this is to be considered for the future, it is advised that a separate license from the Highways Department would be required. Overall, the proposal is seen

to be considered compliant with policy TR3 & TR5 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019).

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
AP1
M3
DC1
PD5