

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Thames
App Ref: 191803
Address: 62 Rotherfield Way, Reading, RG4 8PL
Proposal: Second storey side, single storey front extensions, part conversion of the garage and conversion of the roof space with a rear flat roof dormer.
Case Officer: Mr James Schofield
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Goble
Date received (valid from): 11 November 2019
Target Decision date: 7 February 2020

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

Rotherfield Way is an arterial suburban street, as such it sees above average traffic volumes. Dwellings are typically semi-detached with generous slopping gardens. The site falls within a habitat of moderate suitability for use by protected species of bats.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application seeks permission for a single storey front extension to the garage, garage conversion, second/third storey side extensions and various alterations to the roof and fenestration layout. This would provide increased accommodation at first and second floor.

Plans considered:

Drawing No. 34219-01 Existing Ground Floor Plan
Drawing No. 34219-02 Existing First Floor Plan
Drawing No. 34219-03 Existing Second Floor Plan
Drawing No. 34219-04 Existing Roof Plan
Drawing No. 34219-05 Existing Elevations
Drawing No. 34219-06 Proposed Ground Floor Plan
Drawing No. 34219-07 Proposed First Floor Plan
Drawing No. 34219-08 Proposed Second Floor Plan
Drawing No. 34219-09 Proposed Roof Plan
Drawing No. 34219-10 Proposed Elevations
Drawing No. 34219-11 Block and Location Plans
As received 10 November 2019

Drawing No. 34219-11 Rev A. Block and Location Plans
Bat Survey
As received 22 January 2020

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

APP Ref: 12-00594-CLP | 121092
Proposal: Single storey pitched roof rear extension.
Decision: Permitted
Decision date: 21/5/2012

4. CONSULTATIONS

Neighbours

A site notice was displayed on 18/11/2019 and all adjoining neighbours were consulted by letter and no responses were received.

Ecology

Officers indicated the site is part of a habitat of moderate suitability for use by commuting or foraging bats being a tree lined residential road with gardens associated corridor and Rotherfield Way Copse 150 m to the northeast. And as such a bat survey would be required prior to any permission being granted.

Transport

Transport indicated that the proposed parking plan would interact with street furniture on a busy road, and that an alternate parking plan addressing these concerns would be required.

5. 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.

6. 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 Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

National Planning Practice Guidance

Reading Borough Local Plan (adopted 2019)

CC7: Design and the Public Realm

CC8: Safeguarding Amenity

EN12: Biodiversity and the Green Network

H9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

TR3: Access, Traffic and Highway-related Matters

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

7. APPRAISAL

7.1 *Principle of development*

Residential extension and alterations are supported in principle by Policy H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the Local Plan (2019) subject to a number of criteria ensuring the effects of such extensions and alterations respect its context and are not harmful. These considerations will be examined in more detail in the following sections.

7.2 *Character and scale*

Policy CC7 of the Local Plan states that, development must be of a high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area in Reading in which it is located. Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it: respects the character of the house, the pattern of neighbouring properties and building lines.

The proposed porch extension removes a repeating feature in this functional post-war semi-detached dwelling by virtue of extending the porch forward of the front elevation to make it flush with the attached garage. While different from the established pattern, there is no resulting harm to the character of the dwelling or the wider context due to the extension responding positively to the established depth of the existing garage and roof patterns seen higher in the front elevation. The low quality of the established design detail to the existing porch relative to that proposed is considered the primary reason for this, specifically, making the front door as prominent as the garage door and incorporating a pitched rather than flat roof are positive contributions which improve design coherence, ease of wayfinding and general architectural interest. Because the garages in these semi-detached dwellings are sited forward of the main door, they are very prominent features in the streetscene. The proposal includes a garage conversion which does not harm the character of the dwelling or the wider area because the retention of a garage door maintains consistency in the streetscene.

The proposed first floor and roof side extensions are at the same width as the existing ground floor foot print. When taken together, these extensions are set back and down from the main dwelling as viewed in the streetscene. Furthermore, the design detail includes the incorporation of established elements in the existing roof design seen elsewhere on Rotherfield Way. The rear dormer, while large, would not harm the appearance of the dwelling due to siting to the rear of the dwelling.

For the reasons discussed above, the development is not considered to cause any harm to the character or appearance of either the dwelling or the wider area, and therefore, accords with the aims of Policy CC7 and the design considerations of Policy H9.

7.3 *Amenity*

Policy CC8 requires development to refrain from causing a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties or unacceptable living conditions for residents. And Policy H9 compliments these aims by indicating that acceptable development will not present an overbearing impact on neighbours or public areas.

As demonstrated on plans, the first and second floor elements of the proposal would not obstruct the 45-degree line for views for residents of either 60 or 64 Rotherfield Way. The southerly aspect of the dwellings along Rotherfield Way and the distance between these

elements and adjacent properties are considered likely to prevent a detrimental loss of light for residents.

The ground floor elements of the side and rear extensions are deemed to avoid any concerns about detrimental impact on neighbour's privacy, sunlight or overbearingness by virtue of siting and lack of habitable room windows. No views into adjacent neighbour's private outdoor amenity space is introduced which differ from those already established elsewhere in the existing rear elevation.

The site enjoys a large rear garden and the proposed development would leave over half the plot undeveloped.

Subsequent to the above analysis, whilst constituting a relatively comprehensive change to the dwelling, in this instance and based on the sites individual circumstances, the proposed development is deemed to accord with Policy CC8 and the overbearingness considerations of Policy H9.

7.4 Biodiversity and sustainability

Part 'b' of Policy EN12 indicates that all development sites should not result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. These aims are supported by Policy H9 which states that an extension will only be acceptable where it does not result in the loss of biodiversity within gardens. Paragraph 99 of the government Circular 06/05: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and Their Impact Within The Planning System requires the establishment of the presence or otherwise of protected species through surveys prior to the granting of planning permission in most instances.

The Ecology Officer indicated the site is part of a habitat of moderate suitability for use by commuting or foraging bats due to the tree lined nature of this residential road, its large well-established gardens and the Rotherfield Way Copse being less than 150 m to the northeast. As such, a statutory requirement for a bat survey was established. This was subsequently provided by the agent and was verified by the Ecology Officer to have been conducted correctly and to demonstrate there was no meaningful risk of harm to any protected species of Bats.

The site does not have any protected trees or identified Green Links which could be negatively impacted by the specifics of the proposed development under consideration. However, the rear of the garden is noted as constituent to a Green Link.

The proposal is not considered likely to result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. As such the proposal is considered to accord with the biodiversity and sustainability considerations of Policies H9 and EN12 of the local plan and to accord with the requirements of Paragraph 99 of the government Circular 06/05.

7.5 Highway safety

Policy TR3 indicates proposed development will accord with the most up-to-date objectives of the Local Transport Plan, comply with the adopted standards of the Transport Authority and refrain from having a material detrimental impact on the function of the transport network.

Initially the proposal removed a parking space through the conversion of the garage and changed the parking plan forward of the house to include a third off-street outdoor parking space in an alternative location than that already established. The Transport Officer noted the location of the three parking spaces illustrated on Drawing No. 34219-11 Block and Location Plans were inadequate and did not demonstrate the proposal complied with Policy TR3 of the Local Plan (2019) due to the parking space interacting with street furniture in a manner which would obstruct vision of drivers. A revised plan was received on the 22nd of January 2020 which demonstrates the existing parking plan without any proposal for increased parking provision.

Taken with the garage conversion, a loss of one parking space maintains compliance with the parking standards of the adopted parking strategy which requires two parking spaces. While this resolves safety concerns raised, the loss of a parking space is considered acceptable subject to a condition requiring the retention of the existing parking plan and removal of permitted development rights for hard standing forward of the dwelling. This ensures that any changes to the parking plan can consider the continued safe operation of the transport network as per the requirements of Policy TR3 of the Local Plan (2019).

8. CONCLUSION

In light of the above assessment the proposal is considered to accord with the requirements of the development plan. As such, the proposed development is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

9. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT

10. CONDITIONS

1. TL1 Standard time-limit
2. AP1 Standard approved plans
3. M3 Materials as specified
4. Parking Plan Changes require planning permission
5. Hardstanding PD rights forward of the house removed

APPENDIX
Site Photos

Photographs taken in the course of a site visit conducted on the 6th of February 2020.



View of the side/west elevation as viewed from the street.



View of the front/north elevation; note the receding/angled porch and flat roof.



View of the front/north elevation in the context of being a semi-detached dwelling.



A view of the rear/south elevation as viewed from the end of 60 Rotherfield Way's garden.



A view of the rear/south elevation as viewed from the end of 60 Rotherfield Way's garden.



A view of the side/west elevation and the boundary treatment with 60 Rotherfield Way.