

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Kentwood

App Ref: 201067/HOU

Address: 9 Rydal Avenue

Proposals: Two storey extension to the side and rear of property, Single storey front porch extension, Rebuilding of single storey rear extension/conservatory, Internal reworking of plan, Attic conversion with roof dormer, Conversion of existing garage into studio suite.

Case Officer: Mr James Overall

Date received (valid from): 27 July 2020

Target Decision Date: 21 September 2020

Extended Decision Date: 2 November 2020

PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The application site is located on the Southern side of Rydal Avenue and comprises a semi-detached property. The conjoined neighbouring property (#7) is link detached to #5, which is an anomaly within the street.

The proposal seeks several alterations to the appearance of the property, of which two can be seen from the street scene.

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Date Received
Location Plan & Block Plan	Existing	0001N-PP-01	27 Jul-20
Floor Plans & Elevations	Existing	0001N-PP-02	27 Jul-20
Block Plan & Site Plan	Proposed	0001N-PP-03 Rev A	9 Sept-20
Floor Plans & Elevations	Proposed	0001N-PP-04 Rev A	9 Sept-20
Parking Layout	Proposed	0001N-PP-05	9 Sept-20
Visuals	Proposed	N/A	27 Jul-20

PLANNING HISTORY

None.

CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

- 25 Thirlmere Avenue
- 27 Thirlmere Avenue
- 7 Rydal Avenue
- 11 Rydal Avenue

One letter of representation has been received, which stated:

“We note that the proposed flat roofed elements to the rear could be used as balconies/raised platforms, which would lead to a harmful loss of privacy to neighbours through overlooking. Whilst we note that the rear fenestration is proposed to have Juliet balconies which should prevent occupants using the flat roofs, should the council be minded to approve the application, we would request the attachment of conditions to expressly prohibit occupant’s access to these areas”.

RBC Transport

According to the Councils Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD, the site falls into Zone 3, Secondary Core Area where the parking requirement for a 4 +bedroom dwelling is 2 parking spaces.

In order to determine whether the property will retain an acceptable level of parking, the applicant is requested to submit a parking layout demonstrating that 2no. vehicles can be parked on the site frontage. For information, parking spaces should be designed at 4.8 metres long by 2.4m wide. To accommodate 2 vehicles, the hard-standing area on property frontage should have minimum dimensions of at least 4.8m wide (along the boundary entry point) and a minimum 4.8m length (this is the minimum depth of property frontage required). Note: This is a minimum requirement; a greater size may be required to allow for property access/doorways etc. The parking areas should be constructed in permeable materials so not to increase the surface water run-off from the site.

Please ask the applicant’s agent to submit amended plans addressing this issue before determining the application.

Having received amended plans on 9th September, the Transport Officer stated:

“The revised plans demonstrate that two parking spaces can be accommodated across the site frontage which complies with the required parking provision. However, the dropped kerb will need to be extended to accommodate the proposed parking layout.

Therefore, there are no transport objections subject to...conditions and informatives”.

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 policies in 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'

Reading Borough Local Plan (November 2019)

CC1: PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
CC2: SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION
CC7: DESIGN AND THE PUBLIC REALM
CC8: SAFEGUARDING AMENITY
TR3: ACCESS, TRAFFIC AND HIGHWAY-RELATED MATTERS
TR5: CAR AND CYCLE PARKING AND ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING

SPG/SPD

Revised Sustainable Design and Construction (2011)
The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015

Assessment

Principle

Extending residential properties is usually acceptable in principle as long as the design complies with Policies within the Local Plan relating to design and character, as well as residential amenity (both for the occupiers and the neighbours).

In some instances, extensions can be undertaken via permitted development; where planning permission is not required; however, in this case a Householder application has been received and therefore the development will need to be assessed against the Policies set out within the Local Plan.

Design and Character

Policy CC7 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that the design of proposed developments is undertaken to a high quality, and the scale of schemes does not dominate its surroundings. The overarching focus of the Policy is to support development which fits in with the character of the surrounding area and the street scene and oppose developments which look out of place and upset the surroundings.

The main elements of the proposal which will have an impact upon the character of the area are the front porch and side extension.

Side Extension

The side extension is similar to No.13, which has previously extended; and as such it is considered that the design of the scheme fits in with the character of the area. It is however noted that No.15 has not extended towards No.13 and therefore there was sufficient space to prevent a terracing effect. The gap between No.9 and No.11 is tighter than the above example, and as such this needs to be considered.

No.11 has extended via a porch and continued the main roof slope down to the edge of the garage. The proposal intends to extend the side elevation to be within 0.4 metres of the side elevation of No.11. The side extension will be two-storey with the first-floor setback from the front elevation by 0.45 metres.

It is considered that the two-storey side extension won't create a terracing effect as the ridge of No.11 falls away from No.9 relatively quickly, which will allow the sky to prominently show through the gap. In addition to this, the first-floor setback assists in preventing a terracing effect, by clearly distinguishing the extension from the original.

Porch

As for the porch, this is similarly designed to the neighbouring property, No.11. Many dwellings in the street have porches, which protrude past the front elevation; and as such there aren't any concerns with the proposed porch within this application.

Rear Extension

The proposed rear extension seeks to replace the existing conservatory with an extension of a more permanent appearance. Incorporating the side extension, the application seeks to replace the ground floor rear elevation with folding sliding doors, and to create a more open place interior.

In addition to the replacement of the conservatory, the existing property has a single pitched roof at the rear for the single storey element which protrudes past the first floor. The new single storey elements of the proposal are proposed to have a flat roof. A flat roof is not opposed in this area, as it assists in alleviating any overshadowing concerns which may arise, and flat roofs are not uncommon in this area.

The scheme further seeks to extend out at first floor in order to provide an en-suite to the master bedroom and a communal bathroom. There aren't any concerns with this with regards to design and character of the area.

Dormer

Rear dormers are not common in this area; however, they are possible under permitted development. As such it is considered the principle of a rear dormer is acceptable; however, it's design should be considered against Policy.

The dormer is required in order to provide headspace for an attic bedroom. Whilst it incorporates a flat roof, this is not considered to have any detrimental harm to the character of the main dwelling or wider area.

Conversion of garage

The proposed annex will contain a bedroom and a bathroom. The annex is not of a substantial size, is physically close to the main house and does not have all relevant facilities and therefore unlikely to be used independently from the main dwelling. There are not any concerns with this ancillary accommodation with regards to design.

Residential Amenity

Policy CC8 of the Local Plan (2019) seeks to ensure that the amenity of both the occupiers of the building in question, as well as the occupiers of neighbouring properties; is protected. The main items to consider when assessing amenity is overlooking, outlook and overshadowing.

The proposed scheme has been designed in such a way that there will not be any detrimental harm to neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking, overshadowing or outlook.

Concerns are noted from the neighbouring property at the rear, with regard to the potential possibility that the flat roofs may be used as terraces. Whilst there are Juliet balconies preventing persons from accessing the flat roofs, it is realised that these could potentially be changed to doors after the development is complete under permitted development. As such

in order to prevent the flat roofs being used as roof terraces, a condition will be imposed to restrict such use. This will prevent any harmful overlooking in the future.

As for the occupiers of the dwellinghouse, the proposed alterations are considered to improve the quality of life for the persons living within; and there are not any negatives in terms of their amenity.

The proposed scheme is therefore considered to comply with Policy CC8 with the addition of a condition restricting the use of the flat roofs for the purposes of amenity terracing.

Conclusion

The development is not harmful to the character or appearance of the site or its surroundings and does not have a detrimental impact on the original building or neighbouring properties. As such the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the relevant Policies set out within the Local Plan (2019).

RECOMMENDATION:

Grant Planning Permission