

# TONY THORPE ASSOCIATES

## CHARTERED TOWN PLANNERS

The Studio, 1 Durrant Way, Tilehurst, Reading, Berks, RG31 6TR.

Telephone: 0118 942 1855. Fax: 0118 942 1815

Mobile: 07831 432582 Email: [tony.thorpe.planning@talktalkbusiness.net](mailto:tony.thorpe.planning@talktalkbusiness.net)

---

## **DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT**

### **PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:-**

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DETACHED BUNGALOW AND FOUR ADVERTISING HOARDINGS, REPLACEMENT WITH TWO END-TERRACE 4 BED DWELLINGS.

### **SITE LOCATION:-**

103/105 ADDINGTON ROAD AND ADVERTISING HOARDINGS FRONTING ERLEIGH ROAD RG1 5PZ

### **PLANS AND DOCUMENTS:-**

|              |             |                                                         |
|--------------|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| AJT/01       | 1:1250 @ A4 | Location Plan.                                          |
| 18/23/02A    | 1:200 @A3   | Proposed Site Plan, Roof Plan, Section and Street View. |
| 18/23/01A    | 1:100 @A3   | Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations.                    |
| AR291218.DWG | 1:100 @A0   | Existing Site Plan & Topographical Survey.              |
| 18/23/03     | 1:100 @A3   | Existing Elevations.                                    |

Transport Statement.  
Tree Survey and Arboricultural Method Statement.  
Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment.  
CIL Documentation.  
Heads of Terms for affordable housing S106.

### **1.00 BACKGROUND**

#### **1.01**

103 Addington Road is a two storey end terrace property. 105 Addington Road is a detached bungalow set forward of the row of Victorian terraces (see Photo 1. overleaf). The site is located on the corner of Addington Road and Erleigh Road. There are four advertising hoardings along the Erleigh Road boundary with street trees along both Addington Road and Erleigh Road. The surrounding area consists of predominantly residential properties of varying styles and design.

#### **1.02**

The site was formerly one of the termini of the Reading Tramway System which accounts for its unusual shape, mixed use and layout.

#### **1.03**

The proposal is to demolish the bungalow, remove the advertising hoardings and on the new corner plot thus created attach two further terraced dwellings as an extension to the existing terrace. The new dwellings will front Addington Road following the same front building line and having identical eaves and ridge height to aid assimilation. The existing unattractive concrete frontage space will be replaced by two front gardens and the advertising hoardings replaced by rear gardens with bounded by a fence and brick wall.

#### 1.04

In arriving at the most appropriate design solution we have worked closely with the Councils Planning Officers. Two alternative design solutions ('Book End' and 'Turn Corner') were considered by the Reading Design Review Panel (DRP). The 'turn corner' design was considered to be both too prominent in views along Erleigh Road and to be overdevelopment. Informed by this expert architectural advice the simpler 'book end' solution has been adopted. In essence this is simply a continuation of the existing terrace with the retention of a grassed half-moon shaped 'green buffer' adjoining the highway junction.

#### 1.05

The site is surrounded on three sides by street trees (all Limes in good condition) which will all be retained unaffected by the proposal. The inclusion of on-site parking would have necessitated damage to at least one tree and the access would be too close to the junction. Therefore at an early stage the Council advised that there should be no onsite car parking. The accompanying Transport Statement provides a detailed justification.



**PHOTO 1.** Airphoto of the site. The 4-sheet advertising hoarding, bungalow and end elevation of 103 Addington Road are all visible centre.

## 2.00 THE PROPOSAL

#### 2.01

As can be seen from Photo 1. above the site is dominated by the plan end wall of the existing Victorian terrace. Since the bungalow and advertising hoardings are redundant 20<sup>th</sup> century anomalies it makes good sense to visually improve the site by demolishing them and extending the terrace up to the position it would have had if site had not been first used as a tram terminus.

## 2.02

The existing bungalow has been damaged by settlement and is out of character in the existing street scene due to bad design, materials and projection in front of the building line. The four sheet advertising hoardings are intended to be visually intrusive to attract attention. They detract from the street scene and the removal of both the bungalow and hoardings can be seen as a planning gain.

## 2.03

The cleared site will have an area of some 375m<sup>2</sup>. The Reading Design Review Panel noted that the policy preference is for amenity space to match the building footprint. This has been achieved by means of rear garden space only so the front gardens and retained half-moon grass verge are a bonus in terms of amenity space.

## 2.04

The developable area of the site is defined by the front and rear building lines of the terrace, the root protection areas of the three roadside trees the 45° daylighting zone from windows of adjoining properties and amenity space requirements. The site does not lie in a conservation area and there are no heritage assets nearby. The two attic windows on the end elevation of 103 Addington Road will be replaced under permitted development by a rear dormer (shown on plan) so loss of daylight/sunlight to the end terrace is not an issue.

## 2.05

The Reading Design Review Panel placed particular emphasis on the view of the development from Erleigh Road that will be opened up by the removal of the advertising hoardings. Informed by their advice the proposed rear extensions feature pitched roof detailing mirroring that used on the Addington Road frontage so that in effect the development is 'double-sided'. The proposed street view shown on plan 18/23/02A shows this to good effect.

## 2.06

Internally each dwelling provides a ground floor lounge with a large family orientated kitchen/diner to the rear letting on to the rear garden via bi-fold doors. On the first floor are two bedrooms, one with a small en-suite. On the second floor are a further two bedrooms with en-suites. Rear garden privacy is provided by means of a 1.8m high brick wall and close-boarded timber fence. The existing shared fence with 103 Addington Road is retained. Front gardens are 'open plan' replacing the present unattractive brick and concrete.

## 2.07

Articulation and brick detailing mirrors the design of the existing Victorian terrace whose frontage features polychromatic brick with extensive use of terracotta mouldings above windows and doors and a leaf and flower motif band and decorative lozenge at first floor level. In contrast the return and rear frontage of the terrace is plain brick. However since the proposal will be viewed from three sides the design continues the decorative banding to the side and rear.

## 2.08

Internal space standards exceed local and national technical housing standards, private amenity space matches building footprint and the open front gardens and retention of the grass verge adjoin the junction all contribute towards openness.

### **3.00 ACCESS PRINCIPLES AND SOLUTIONS**

#### **3.01**

The Councils response to our pre-application consultation concluded that Transport would not support an application which included new accesses from either Addington Road or Erleigh Road. A car free development may be acceptable but any subsequent planning application would need to provide a rationale explaining why this would be appropriate in this location. Future occupiers will not be entitled to Residents Parking Permits.

#### **3.02**

The accompanying Transport Statement by Highway Planning Ltd provides the necessary rationale for a car free development and should be read in conjunction with this statement. It concludes that the car free nature of the development will not have an adverse impact on the safety of road users or the amenity of local residents.

### **4.00 TREES AND LANDSCAPING**

#### **4.01**

Please see the accompanying Tree Survey and Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS). The site is located on a prominent corner plot adjacent to the highway junction of Erleigh Road, Addington Road and Cardigan Road. There are three street trees (Limes) around the periphery of the site which are managed as pollards. The trees are not currently subject of a Tree Preservation Order as they are Council owned.

#### **4.02**

The trees form part of a prominent avenue of street trees which continues along the surrounding roads of Addington Road and Erleigh Road and is a fundamental component of the character of the area. Any suitable redevelopment of this site will need to demonstrate that the trees can be retained in a healthy condition with a sustainable relationship to the new development without resulting in undue pressure for the trees to be removed following the redevelopment of the site.

#### **4.03**

Natural Environment Trees initially expressed concern because the original scheme proposed two onsite parking spaces which would have placed undue pressure on the Lime located on the Addington Road frontage. Since Transport has determined that this should be a car free site this concern no longer exists.

#### **4.04**

The scheme has evolved in consultation with our Arboriculturalist and the footprint of the proposed building mostly avoids the Root Protection Areas of the adjoining trees. Drawing 18/23/02A and the AMS explain how the use of a small section of piled foundations with a separating membrane will overcome any objection and ensure that the trees can be retained in a healthy condition with a sustainable relationship to the new development.

## **5.00 COMPLIANCE WITH ECOLOGICAL AND CLIMATE CONTROLS**

### **5.01**

The proposal will comply with the requirements of the Building Regulations. Therefore we can confirm that the proposed dwelling will accord with the spirit and purpose of local and national policy and incorporate on-site renewable energy and/or an efficient supply of heat, cooling and power.

### **5.02**

There is an existing building to be demolished on the section of the site to be developed and roof works will need to be carried out to allow the extension of the existing terrace. This all has implications for bat-roosts and the accompanying Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment by John Wenman Ecological Consultancy addresses the requirement for further information. It concludes that no evidence of roosting bats was found during the roost assessment of the end terraced house and bungalow but that further emergence and/or re-entry surveys may be required by condition.

### **5.03**

There are no ponds or evidence of use by any protected species therefore no further specific mitigation is necessary. There is no evidence of animal access routes and the proposal will not lead to fragmentation of habitat or the green network. Since there are trees around the periphery of the site the provision of bird boxes is unnecessary.

### **5.04**

There will be access for the disabled to ground floors and the small size of the site ensures that the proposal will be disabled friendly. Local topography is comparatively level so hand and powered wheelchairs will have no difficulty negotiating the local area and reaching public transport. Materials left over from demolition will be recycled and building materials will be obtained from sustainable sources.

## **6.00 POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

### **6.01**

The site is located within the defined settlement boundary of Reading. In accordance with Policy DM11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) of the adopted Sites and Detailed Policies Document, together with national policy relating to residential development set out in the NPPF, development should be directed to sustainable sites such as this. Accordingly there is a presumption in favour of residential redevelopment.

### **6.02**

The scale, design and massing of the proposed dwelling is complimentary to and makes a positive contribution to the character of the area. It complies with criterion 1) of Policy DM11 in that it relates well to the existing built form and spaces around buildings. With regard to plot to dwelling ratio and proposed density of development the proposal is comparable with adjoining and nearby properties fronting adjoining roads

#### 6.03

DM11 criterion 1) tells us of the importance of a high standard of hard and soft landscaping, particularly at site boundaries. In this case the existing harsh brick wall and concrete to Addington Road and advertising hoardings to Erleigh Road will be replaced by an open-plan frontage to Addington Road, a grassed 'buffer' in-between the end elevation of the terrace and the road junction and a fenced boundary to Erleigh Road. The three trees surrounding the site are retained in their entirety and 'frame' the site in long views from the east.

#### 6.04

DM11 criterion 1) requires compatibility with general building height, materials, elevational details, arrangement of doors, windows and other architectural features. In this case in response to pre-application advice and the characteristics of the site articulation and brick detailing mirrors the design of the existing Victorian terrace. Elevational details, arrangement of doors and windows all continue the rhythm set by the Victorian terrace to which the dwellings are attached.

#### 6.05

In terms of DM11 criterion 2) we submit that at 375m<sup>2</sup> the site is an adequate size and dimensions sufficient to accommodate the proposed dwellings in terms of both setting and space about buildings including amenity space. Useable garden area/amenity space exceeds the proposed building footprint and thus accords with policy.

#### 6.06

In terms of DM11 criterion 3) the pre-application response of Councils Transport Officer confirmed that the site can be car-free (see 3.00 above). A combined bin store and cycle store serves the new dwellings and the frontage HMO. Access width is above standard. The proposal is sustainable and will have no effect of the free flow and safety of traffic on the local highway network. DM11 criterion 4) does not apply.

#### 6.07

In terms of DM11 criterion 5) the proposal does not include any public areas. Accordingly there is no need for additional physical security measures. The front gardens are surveilled by the proposed dwellings and there is a single lockable gate giving access to the rear gardens so the proposal is secure by design.

#### 6.08

In terms of DM11 criterion 6) the core principles of the NPPF state that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers. We consider that the proposal make a positive contribution to the quality of life in Reading. The proposal complies with the Council's minimum distances and angles between properties relating to maintaining privacy and daylight.

#### 6.09

In terms of DM11 criterion 7) these are a 4-bed family-sized dwellings located within walking distance of local schools, shops, open space, public transport and amenities. Accordingly the proposal fully accords with this requirement.

#### 6.10

In terms of DM11 criterion 8) the proposal will have no effect on biodiversity and does not lie in any Special Protection Area (see 5.00 above). There are no roosting bats, ponds or evidence of use by protected species therefore no specific mitigation is necessary and the proposal will not lead to fragmentation of habitat or the green network.

#### 6.11

So far as we are aware the site does not lie in an area of archaeological potential. The site is well above the floodplain, is not contaminated or tipped or liable to subsidence due to underground workings.

#### 6.12

In terms of the DM11 final criterion 9) the proposal will not prejudice the satisfactory development of a wider area and could not in any way prejudice the satisfactory development of adjoining land.

### **7.00 PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION.**

#### 7.01

In accordance with good practice we can confirm that pre-application consultations have been carried out with the Council (RBC ref:- 181298 on the original application) and again with the Councils Reading Design Review Panel. This valuable professional advice has been used to inform the current proposal.

### **8.00 DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS**

#### 8.01

The proposal will attract CIL and the relevant forms accompany this application. The proposal will attract an affordable housing contribution and two independent estate agents valuations will be made available together with the necessary heads of terms to accompany the application.

### **9.00 PLANNING POLICY AND THE PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

#### 9.01

The revised NPPF is a material consideration. It maintains a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which paragraph 11 advises should be applied in both plan-making and decision-taking.

#### 9.02

At paragraph 8 the NPPF identifies three overarching objectives to sustainable development:- economic, social and environmental. The policies of the NPPF taken as a whole, constitute the Governments view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system.

#### 9.03

The provision of new housing in sustainable locations is a clear social benefit which supports strong, vibrant and healthy communities. The NPPF clearly seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing and, as explained above, the application site is considered to be a sustainable location for two additional new dwellings and thus provides the social benefits that justify a presumption in favour of development.

#### 9.04

In terms of the economic role of planning, sustainable growth is supported, including the provision of infrastructure. The applicant will enter into a CIL and S106 agreement with the Council to mitigate the impact of the development on the local infrastructure, services and amenities made necessary by the development and this justifies a presumption in favour of development.

#### 9.05

Contributing to, protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment is fundamental to fulfilling the environmental role of planning. The impact of two new dwelling houses on the character and appearance of the area has been assessed as part of the design process and is considered acceptable. As such it is considered that there are no environmental reasons to justify withholding planning permission for the proposed development.

#### 9.06

For the above reasons the proposal is supported by the economic, social and environmental objectives of sustainable development as required by the revised NPPF. Therefore the proposal constitutes sustainable development and benefits from the presumption in favour of development.

### **10.00 CONCLUSIONS**

#### 10.01

Having regard to the relevant development plan policies and other material considerations as detailed above we submit that there are no sound and clear-cut planning reasons to object to the development. The proposal benefits from the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development, deserves support and we look forward to a favourable determination.

ooOoo