

18 November 2020

FAO Helen Robertson
West Berkshire District Council
Council Offices
Market Street
Newbury
Berkshire
RG14 5LD

Your contact is: James Schofield, Planning

Dear Ms Robertson,

Thank you for your letter dated 14th September 2020 regarding the proposed development at 201 Overdown Road. The proposal is to for a front porch, two storey side extension, single and two storey rear extension.

The case officer has reviewed the proposal and makes the following comments:

Character & Design

The area is characterised by mid-twentieth century semi-detached dwellings typical of suburban Reading. Reading Borough Council's (RBC) Householder SPG discourages the closing of gaps between semi-detached dwellings where such development would harm the character of the site and or its context. The SPG also encourages side extensions to be set back and down from the main dwelling. These points appear to be addressed by the proposal and would likely comply with RBC policy and guidance in this respect.

The design of the proposal is deemed to be adequately sympathetic to the dwelling and its surroundings if the proposal were being assessed by RBC.

Transport & Flood prevention

The conversion of the garage to internal space and relocation of parking to the front garden would likely comply with RBC policy and guidance; but not best practice. RBC officer's would very likely encourage amendments which sought the use of permeable paving and/or use of a soakaway system to be used/kept in place thereafter to minimise the impact the development (and more importantly the cumulative impact of this type of development) would have on the sustainability of the urban drainage system of the town, and those of other settlements downstream on the river Thames. The proposed two parking spaces would comply with RBC's

upper maximum as identified in the adopted transportation strategy; this would likely be two parking spaces for a house of this size, type and location.

It was also considered that the area of land adjoining the pavement would be public land, however the applicant has declared they own all the land in question (outlined on the location plan and Certificate A has been signed on the application form). The view of the WBC Highways Authority may be of use on this matter as work to the kerb is likely necessary for the proposed parking plan.

Amenity

It is noted that this Officer has not conducted a site visit and cannot meaningfully comment on any potential for the proposal to impact the residential amenity of neighbouring sites to either side (WBC). It is deemed that no material impact would result on the residential amenity of neighbours for those houses opposite the rear elevation of the proposed development site (RBC) due the significant gap between the proposed site and these dwellings.

Other considerations

There are no listed trees or locally listed buildings within RBC deemed relevant to the proposal by this officer.

Conclusion

No objections.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

James P. Schofield BCN
Planning Officer