

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT - Application No. 191186/FUL

Address: 105 Addington Road, Reading

Proposal: Erection of two end-terrace 4 bed dwellings following demolition of existing detached bungalow and removal of four advertising hoardings

Case Officer: Ethne Humphreys

Determination Date: 18/09/2019; EOT agreed until 18/06/2021

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site comprises a detached bungalow located on the northern side of Addington Road, on the corner with Erleigh Road and close to the junction with Cardigan Road. The bungalow is set forward of the adjacent row of terraces along Addington Road. There are four advertising hoardings along the Erleigh Road boundary with street trees along both Addington Road and Erleigh Road.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential with properties of varying styles and design.

The site is within an area potentially contaminated land and within an Article 4 Area which prevents the change of use from C3 dwelling to C4 HMO without planning permission.

Proposal:

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of two end-terrace 4 bed dwellings following demolition of existing detached bungalow and removal of four advertising hoardings.

The application and plans originally included dormer windows to the front and rear of No.103 Addington Road. This element of the proposals has subsequently been omitted from the scheme. A revised location plan has been received reflecting the application site and notice served on the occupiers of No.103 Addington Road.

The proposed materials would include:

- Brickwork to match the adjoining terrace
- Slate to match the adjoining terrace
- White uPVC windows and doors to match the adjoining terrace
- Brick wall to match the dwellings and close boarded timber fencing stained dark brown

Plans Considered:

Drawing No: Location Plan AJT/01

Received 12th November 2020

Drawing No: Existing Site Plan/Topographical Survey AR291218

Drawing No: Existing Elevations 18/23/03

Received 18th July 2019

Drawing No: Proposed Floor Plans 18/23/01 Rev C

Drawing No: Proposed Elevations (Front and Rear) 18/23/04 Rev D

Drawing No: Proposed Elevations (Side plus Attic Details to No.103) 18/23/05 Rev C

Received 1st October 2020

Drawing No: Proposed Site Plan and Sections 18/23/02 Rev F

Received 23rd October 2020

Design and Access Statement

Arboricultural Method Statement 24th June 2019

Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Survey Ref: R2278/b July 2019

Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Ref: R2148/a January 2019

Transport Statement January 2019

Received 18th July 2020

Relevant Planning History:

190225 Demolition of existing detached bungalow and four advertising hoardings, replacement with two end-terrace 4 bed dwellings and erection of rear dormer window to No.103 Addington Road. Withdrawn.

970051 Demolition of existing bungalow and replace with a one bedroom bungalow. Permitted.

Consultation Responses:

Natural Environment: Further to additional information, no objection subject to condition.

Transport: No objection subject to condition.

Environmental Protection: No objection subject to condition.

Ecology: No objection subject to condition.

Reading Design Review Panel: Two possible design options were presented to, and considered by, the Reading Design Review Panel on 15th November 2018, a 'turn the corner' proposal and a 'stop-end' proposal. Overall, the panel considered that the 'stop-end' approach was more appropriate, that it would be more successful in integrating with the Addington Road terrace as well in views from Erleigh Road. The panel considered it important to try and continue the massing, height, materials and detailing of the terrace although not necessarily in a pastiche way.

Neighbouring properties were consulted and a site notice erected. 2 letters of support and 4 letters of objection received (2 from the same property) concerned with:

- Use of properties as HMOs
- Lack of parking
- Disruption to traffic
- Construction disruption
- Safety of land/subsidence

Further to the removal of 103 Addington Road from the red line, a neighbour notification letter formally notifying of the proposals was sent to this property for the requisite time period. No response received.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS WITH APPLICANT/AGENT

The agent was advised that the proposed flat roof dormer windows would be unsympathetic to the dwellings and surrounding area and the plans were revised to incorporate gable roof dormer windows which is more appropriate.

The agent was also advised that a financial contribution towards affordable housing would be required and 3 independent valuations were submitted. The Council's Valuer considered the valuations to be low compared to recent residential comparables within the local area. In short, officers consider that a full affordable housing contribution of £19,750 (for one net dwelling) could and should be provided. This was agreed with by the agent and secured via legal agreement.

Pre-application advice was sought under 181298 which looked at 2 design options - a 'book end' approach and 'turn the corner' approach. The proposals were also discussed at the Reading

Design Review Panel. In short, the 'book end' approach such as that proposed was considered more acceptable.

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.

Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

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'. For this Local Planning Authority the development plan is now in one document - the Reading Borough Local Plan (November 2019), which fully replaces the Core Strategy, the Sites and Detailed Policies Document and the Reading Central Area Action Plan.

Accordingly, the National Planning Policy Framework and the following development plan policies and supplementary planning guidance are relevant:

Reading Borough Local Plan 2019

- CC1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction
- CC3: Adaptation to Climate Change
- CC5: Waste Minimisation and Storage
- CC6: Accessibility and the Intensity of Development
- CC7: Design and the Public Realm
- CC8: Safeguarding Amenity
- CC9: Securing Infrastructure
- EN12: Biodiversity and the Green Network
- EN14: Trees, Hedges and Woodland
- EN15: Air Quality
- EN16: Pollution and Water Resources
- EN17: Noise Generating Equipment

- H1: Provision of Housing
- H2: Density and Mix
- H3: Affordable Housing
- H5: Standards for New Housing
- H7: Protecting the Existing Housing Stock
- H10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space
- H11: Development of Private and Residential Gardens
- TR1: Achieving the Transport Strategy
- TR3: Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters
- TR5: Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Revised Sustainable Design and Construction SPD December (2019)

Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD adopted October 2011

Affordable Housing SPD adopted July 2013

Section 106 Planning Obligations SPD 2013

DCLG Technical housing standards - nationally described space standards (2015)

Tree Strategy (2020)

Appraisal

The Principle of the Development

The NPPF states that LPAs should “encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value”. The NPPF definition of ‘previously developed land’ excludes private residential gardens.

Therefore, it is clear that the priority for development should be on previously developed land, in particular vacant and derelict sites and buildings. However, that does not mean that the development of private residential garden land is unacceptable in principle, rather that previously developed land should be the first choice for housing development.

The Council’s LDF Policy H11 Development of Private Residential Gardens requires that new residential development that involves land within the curtilage of private residential gardens will be acceptable where:

- a) It makes a positive contribution to the character of the area;
- b) The site is of an adequate size to accommodate the development;
- c) The proposal has a suitable access;
- d) The proposal would not lead to an unacceptable tandem development;
- e) The design minimises the exposure of existing private boundaries to public areas;
- f) It does not cause detrimental impact on residential amenities;
- g) The emphasis is on the provision of family housing;
- h) There is no adverse impact on biodiversity, and
- i) The proposal does not prejudice the development of a wider area.

Therefore, while the proposed site is not ‘previously developed land’, the principle of redevelopment is considered acceptable providing the criteria outlined in Policies are met, discussed below.

Furthermore, it is considered that the principle of providing Class C3 residential use at the site is acceptable in that this aligns with the broad objectives of Policy H1. More specifically, the proposals would assist the Borough in meeting its annual housing targets. The proposal, of 2 x 4 bed family dwellings, set within the context of the size and nature of the site, is considered acceptable subject to the replacement buildings being appropriate in design terms (as discussed separately below). Although both units are of an identical size (thereby not providing a mix), given the small number of units created this is satisfactory in this instance. It is recommended that a condition is secured whereby no change to the unit mix (2x4-bed units) shall be made to the development hereby permitted without written approval from the Local Planning Authority. This is to safeguard the mix altering to potentially unacceptable mixes in the future, while also having a dual benefit of not altering the sales values of units (which could improve scheme viability) without this being managed and assessed by the local planning authority.

Design, Impact on Street Scene and Character of the Area

Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) states that “All development must be of high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area of Reading in which it is located. The various components of development form, including: Layout: urban structure and urban grain; landscape; density and mix; Scale: height and massing; and Architectural detail and materials”.

The site has a prominent corner position and as stated above, it is recognised that the existing bungalow is an anomaly within the street scene both in terms of its design style and siting forward of the adjacent terrace. Furthermore, the bungalow is somewhat untidy in appearance and the front of the site, with broken boundary wall does little to enhance the appearance of the property. Overall, the bungalow is at odds with the surrounding properties which are of similar character and appearance. The bungalow is not considered to be of any specific architectural merit, is not listed, locally listed or within a conservation area. Furthermore, the loss of the advertising hoardings, which significantly detract from the character of the area, is welcome. Within this context, there is no in-principle objection to the existing building being demolished in design/conservation terms, subject to the replacement buildings being appropriate in all other respects (which is detailed further below).

There is a distinct rhythm to the terraces within the row and the proposal, forming a continuation of the terrace, would largely respect this rhythm. The eaves and ridge height would match that of No.103 Addington Road with materials to match which is appropriate. The provision of grass areas to the front of the site, whilst in practical terms might not be an appealing space for relaxing given its proximity to the busy main road, would, as an area of soft landscaping, help to soften the appearance of the site which is welcomed in this prominent location. Whilst the bins would be stored at the front of the site this is the same as the remainder of the terrace and would be partly hidden by the front boundary wall.

It is recognised that whilst the proposals would not be forward of the Addington Road building line, they would be forward of the Erleigh Road building line. However, the grass verge would be retained and there is a significant distance to No.90 Erleigh Road. The proposals are considered an improvement on the hoardings, which are an eyesore and severely detracting from the area and the somewhat untidy appearance of the bungalow, which is also out of character in itself.

The proposed front dormer windows would be of a similar appearance to those of the remainder of the terrace, of which there are many. Whilst set down slightly further in the roof slope than the existing, they would align with the windows below and given the sites prominent corner plot location this set down is considered to soften the appearance and is not considered to be so conspicuous to warrant a refusal on this basis. Whilst 'box' dormer windows were originally proposed on the rear elevation, these were considered to be out of keeping with the prevailing character of the area and have been replaced with gable dormer windows which is considered more appropriate.

Overall, the scheme is considered to represent an opportunity to enhance this prominent corner plot and the applicant has taken on board the comments raised under the pre-application advice and received from the Reading Design Review Panel which is welcomed.

To ensure suitable quality of materials, it is considered reasonable and appropriate to secure further details (and samples) of the proposed materials by way of a suitable worded condition. With this condition secured and in light of the above, it is considered that the proposals would not adversely harm the character of the surrounding streetscape or give rise to an overly dominant or incongruous addition to the street scene such to warrant a refusal.

In compliance with Policies H10, H11 and CC7.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

Residential amenity is assessed against Policy CC8 which requires developments to not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing properties in terms of: Privacy and overlooking; Access to sunlight and daylight; Visual dominance and overbearing; Harm to outlook; Noise and disturbance; Artificial lighting; Vibration; Dust and fumes; Smell; and Crime and safety.

The existing bungalow currently projects forward of No.103 Addington Road and the remainder of this terrace. The proposals would be flush with the terrace at the front and whilst would project past the rear of No.103 would not breach a 45 degree line to the nearest habitable room window. As such there would be no material loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact to the occupiers of this property.

No.103 Addington Road has two first floor windows on the flank end elevation of the terrace. As a consequence of the proposed attached properties, these would be removed and built against thus removing the light/outlook source. As referenced above, the application and plans originally included dormer windows to the front and rear of No.103 Addington Road to provide appropriate replacement light/outlook. Whilst this element of the proposals has been omitted from this scheme, the occupiers of No.103 Addington Road have constructed a dormer window and two rooflights on the front elevation and a dormer window and rooflight on the rear elevation. Furthermore, the two windows on the flank elevation have been bricked up. As such, the proposals are not considered to result in any harm in this respect. Given the nature of the works, this would also be covered by the Party Wall Act.

Whilst the occupiers of No.90 Erleigh Road would notice the increase in height from single storey bungalow to two storey dwellings, given the distance between the dwellings they would not result in any material loss of light or overbearing impact. The windows would face across the front of 90 Erleigh Road and are not considered to result in any material loss of privacy.

In general terms it is noted that the proposed dwelling could be subject to significant further extensions and alterations under subsequent permitted development rights, which could negatively impact on the amenity of nearby occupiers. In order to manage this it is considered necessary and reasonable to have secured a condition to remove permitted development rights under Classes A (alterations, B (roof additions) and E (outbuildings). In addition, a further condition is also required in respect of protecting the amenity of neighbours during the construction period. A construction method statement will be secured via condition and is required from a highway safety perspective too. As such in overall terms, considering all nearby residential occupiers, no significantly harmful amenity impacts would occur, subject to conditions. Policies CC8 and H11.

Amenity of Future Occupiers

Policy H5 (Standards for New Housing) seeks that all new building housing is built to high standards. Policy EN16 (Pollution and Water Resources) seeks to protect future occupiers from the impacts of pollution and Policy H10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space) seeks that residential developments area provided with adequate private or communal outdoor amenity space.

It is considered that the proposals would provide an overall good standard of accommodation throughout with rooms providing suitable outlook, natural lighting and ventilation. Albeit not all bedrooms would be regular in shape (second floor accommodation), they would largely comply with the space standards as set out in Policy H5. Whilst one of the bedrooms to each dwelling (served by the loft space) would fall just below the requirement, given this would be a fourth room to each dwelling, it is not considered that the shortfall in this specific instance would result in any significant harm to the overall standard of accommodation.

Whilst light to the front of the basements may be slightly restricted (acknowledging the lightwells) given these would be non-habitable rooms it is not considered to be so harmful to warrant a refusal.

The proposed garden space for each dwelling would not be too dissimilar to other gardens within the immediate vicinity and considered acceptable for the size of the dwellings. In order to help ensure future residents maintain sufficient amenity space (and to protect neighbouring amenity as above) it is proposed to remove PD rights in relation to Class A (enlargement improvement or alteration), B (roof additions) and Class E (outbuildings).

Therefore, in overall terms and having applied a critical planning balance to the consideration of the scheme as a whole, the units are considered to provide an overall suitable standard of accommodation, in line with Policies EN5 and H10 in particular.

Environmental Health Issues

The development lies on the site of an historic gravel pit which has the potential to have caused contaminated land and the proposed development is a sensitive land use.

In terms of contaminated land, Environmental Protection colleagues recommend the standard four-stage conditions to ensure that the possible presence of contamination is thoroughly investigated and removed/mitigated if necessary (3 of the conditions are pre-commencement). The proposal is considered to accord with Policy EN16.

Impact on Natural Environment

Policy EN14 seeks to extend the Borough's vegetation cover and that development should make provision for tree planting whilst Policy CC7 seeks proposal should include appropriate landscaping. Policy EN12 seeks that developments should retain, protect and incorporates features of biodiversity.

There are three street trees (limes) around the periphery of the site which are managed as pollards. The trees are not subject to a Tree Preservation Order but they are Council owned. The trees form part of a prominent avenue of street trees which continues along the surroundings road of Addington Road and Erleigh Road and is a fundamental component of the character of the area.

An Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Survey has been submitted as part of the application. The Council's Tree Officer has confirmed that this is satisfactory and has raised no objections to the proposals. Confirmation of the location and runs for services and means of drainage was requested. This was provided and considered acceptable. No objection from the Council's Tree Officer subject to conditions in respect of landscaping and tree protection. In

compliance with Policy EN12.

A Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Survey Report has been submitted as part of the application. The Council's Ecologist has confirmed that whilst the surveys were not undertaken strictly in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust (two dusk surveys undertaken as opposed to one dusk and one dawn re-entry) that the findings of the survey were likely to be accurate and he is satisfied that the bungalow is unlikely to host roosting bats.

As such, since the proposals are unlikely to affect bats or other protected species, there are no objections on ecological grounds to the application. Given the nature of the scheme, it would also be appropriate to ensure that ecological/biodiversity enhancements are provided and this can also be secured by way of condition in compliance with Policy EN12.

Impact on Parking/Highways

Policies TR1, TR3 and TR5 seek to address access, traffic, highway and parking relates matters relating to development.

Addington and Erleigh Road are both classified roads and are within Zone 2, the primary core area but on the periphery of the central core area which lies at the heart of Reading Borough, consisting primarily of retail and commercial office developments with good transport hubs.

In accordance with the adopted Parking Standards and Design SPD, the proposals would be required to provide parking provision of 2 parking spaces per dwelling. The Design and Access Statement states that this is to be a car free development. As previously advised in Transport Comments for application number 190225, given that this application has been submitted for 2 X 4 bedroom C3 houses it is assumed that these will cater for families and therefore the lack of provision of car parking spaces is an area of concern given that parking is almost to capacity. However, as a Residential Parking Permit Scheme operates in this area and has recently been extended to incorporate additional roads, unauthorised on street parking can be controlled and monitored via the administration of the scheme. The applicant should be made aware that any future residents of the potential development would not be eligible to apply for residents or visitor parking permits and this will be covered via suitably worded conditions and informatives.

The plans originally were annotated such that a dropped kerb illustrated on the plan was to be removed. The applicant was advised that this is not a dropped crossing but is a pedestrian

crossover and part of the public highway which cannot be abandoned. Revised plans were received removing this element from the scheme.

There are a number of utility cabinets on the boundary of the proposed development site. Any relocation required would need to be met by the applicant and would need to be discussed with the appropriate utility body.

In line with the Council's adopted Parking Standards and Design SPD, each dwelling should be provided with 2.0 secure cycle parking spaces. The Design and Access statement and Drawing No 18/23/01 Rev C (Proposed Plan and Elevations) makes reference to a shared provision which is acceptable. Each dwelling should be provided with a Sheffield type stand (2 cycle spaces) housed in a covered and lockable store.

Bin storage should not be further than 15m from the access point of the site to avoid the stationing of service vehicles on the carriageway for excessive periods. Bins storage has been illustrated on the Drawing No 18/23/01 Rev C (Proposed Plan and Elevations) at the front of each dwelling which is considered acceptable.

Given the above, the Council's Transport Officer has confirmed that there is no objection to the application on parking grounds, subject to conditions. Policies TR1, TR3 and TR5.

Sustainability

The Design and Access Statement references the scheme incorporating on-site renewable energy and/or an efficient supply of heat, cooling and power which would be welcomed. Notwithstanding, Policy H5 'Housing Standards' requires that all new build housing integrate additional measures for sustainability. In light of this conditions are recommended to ensure the development meets the following requirements:

- Higher water efficiency standards of 110 litres per person per day; and
- A 19% improvement over building regulations energy requirements

Although secured by planning condition, these new requirements will be administered through the Building Regulations. Confirmation of compliance will need to be submitted to the LPA to discharge the condition.

Affordable Housing

The proposal seeks to create one additional dwelling (one of the two proposed units classed as a replacement dwelling for the existing bungalow) and therefore a contribution towards off-site affordable housing provision is required as part of the application in accordance with Policy H3 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and the Affordable Housing SPD under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

The applicant has agreed to provide a policy compliant contribution towards affordable housing of £19,750 which has been secured by way of a Section 106 agreement.

Further to the above, there is an additional s106 legal agreement obligation which is considered to be necessary and could have knock-on affordable housing implications. A head of term is considered necessary to specify that should the buildings subsequently be extended/alterd (to create further units) or units subdivided (e.g. a 4 bed unit becomes 2 separate 2 bed units) then contributions to affordable housing would apply on a cumulative basis (rather than individual applications basis).

Put another way, officers consider it appropriate to secure via legal agreement a mechanism to ensure that each future part of any future proposal at the site makes an appropriate contribution, having regard to the contribution that would arise from a single assessment across all components. Typically, any additional contribution would take the form of a financial contribution to affordable housing elsewhere in the Borough. It is noted that such an approach was sought and considered appropriate on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate elsewhere in the Borough in June 2018 (see Ref 170251 at City Wall House, 26 West St Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/W/17/3188270).

In respect of both of the obligations proposed, the agent has confirmed that the applicant is agreeable to a S106 Legal Agreement in these regards.

CIL

The proposal would be a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liable development. The applicant has provided the CIL Additional Information Form. Based on the information provided by the applicant and the 2020 CIL rate, this is estimated to amount to £29,549.84 (250m² of the proposals - 62m² (building to be demolished) x £120 per m² x 2020 indexation (£157.18)). An informative will be attached to the decision notice to advise the applicant of their responsibilities in this respect.

Other Issues

In relation to planning conditions, in line with section 100ZA(5) of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended), which came into force on 01/10/18, discussions have been undertaken with the applicant regarding pre-commencement conditions. The applicant has formally agreed to the recommended pre-commencement conditions via return email on 09/11/2020.

Other Matters Raised in Representation

All material considerations considered in the above report.

Concern has been raised that the properties may become HMOs. The proposal is for Class C3 residential units (no indication of HMOs being proposed). If permission was granted and material changes were made to the scheme the applicants would need to apply for permission to these changes; these would then be assessed on their own merits.

While the concerns of the local residents in terms of the disruption including noise and traffic implications that may be caused by the construction works are noted, it is not the planning system's role to obstruct development on this basis. Inevitably, any construction works may lead to some temporary disruption. Ordinarily, the requirements of Environmental Health legislation will seek to limit any harm so far as reasonably practicable. The proposal is for a residential development and is unlikely to result in a significant increase in noise and pollution. A condition is recommended to be attached requiring the need of a construction method statement to be provided prior to commencement of works to minimise any such disruption, as well as an hours condition.

Conclusion

The proposals are considered to be acceptable within the context of national and local planning policies, as detailed in the appraisal above. Ultimately, when applying an overall critical planning balance of all material considerations, the benefits are considered to outweigh the conflicts. As such, full planning permission is recommended for approval, subject to conditions and completion of the S106 Legal Agreement.

RECOMMENDATION:

GRANT subject to conditions and completion of S106 legal agreement.