

12th August 2020

Planning Statement

Single storey front and rear extensions and granny annexe

20 Burnham Rise, Emmer Green, Reading RG4 8XJ

This statement is to accompany a householder application for the above and should be read in conjunction with drawings:

- P2001-01C Location Plan & Block Plan
- P2001-02A Existing Plans & Elevations
- P2001-03A Proposed Plans & Elevations

A pre-application enquiry was submitted in April 2020 and written advice received back June 2020.

There were four key issues raised in the conclusion:

- the siting of the front ground-floor extension forward of the bay;
- the proposed parking plan;
- lack of detail regarding materials as they pertain to the parking/landscape plan;
- the failure of the annexe to remain reliant on and ancillary to the main dwelling.

The proposal submitted for this application takes on board the pre-application advice and has been very significantly scaled back and other matters clarified to address these issues.

The front ground floor extension has been scaled back. The proposed bay window to the study has been omitted. Instead of echoing the front bay of the house, it is a simple enclosure. The porch element has been pulled back slightly such that the external footprint is now 2.95m² which is within the permitted development allowance for porches. The overall height of the porch has also been lowered. It is possible for this porch to be constructed under PD rules, though the roof pitch would need to be lowered slightly to comply with the maximum 3m height. However, lowering the roof pitch would alien and not aesthetically pleasing. Furthermore, No.20 is not prominent in

Burnham Rise. It is set down from street level; has an unusually deep front garden; obscured by and set back 4m from No.21. Given that the footprint complies with PD, and that a decent pitch actually complements the existing roof forms, I feel it would be counterproductive to force the applicant to follow a 'pure' PD route for this element.

In terms of parking and parking landscape, the number of spaces has been reduced back to the existing two spaces and the block plan annotated to confirm a permeable gravel surface.

The granny annexe remains as per the pre-application. This is very much a priority for the applicant, such that he was willing to forego the substantial two storey side extension. With this omission, and with the fact that the annexe is to the rear, there is minimal impact to the street scene. It was already demonstrated at pre-application that the built form of the annexe complies with PD rules, the question was more about usage. The specific issue being raised is that the annexe is too independent of the house. The danger here is of "creeping development", that it may be rented off, etc. To address this head-on, the applicant would be very willing to enter into a legal S106 agreement to prevent any such unauthorised use.

The granny annexe is for the applicant's father, Mr Kevin Michael Mills (aka Mick Mills). He currently resides at 2 Lowfield Court, Lowfield Road RG4 6NG. He is 72 years old and currently fit and healthy. However, the father wishes to be closer to his son (and vice-versa) so that he can feel more secure and care provided as appropriate into the future. He would like to remain independent for as long as possible, hence why the annexe has both cooking and washing facilities. The generous width of the side passage provides ample access in case of emergency (e.g. transfer by wheelchair or stretcher to an ambulance). The garden steps are to ambulant disabled dimensions and handrails fitted when the need arises. From both mental health and social care points of view, it is by far the best solution to be close to and cared for by family.

In summary, I feel the issues of concern raised at pre-application stage have all been addressed and I would therefore respectfully request that planning permission is granted.

Mustafa | SpaceOffice | 07974 707832