

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Thames
App Ref: 191892
Address: 49 Matlock Road, Reading, RG4 7BP
Proposal: Single and two storey rear extension, replacement garage and single storey front extension with porch.
Case Officer: Mr James Schofield
Applicant: Mr N Parris & E Garvey
Date received (valid from): 27 November 2019
Target Decision date: 29 January 2020

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

Matlock Road is a suburban street characterised by a mix of semi-detached houses in generous plots. This application relates to a semi-detached dwelling with a large garden. Trees line the rear boundary such that views of the dwellings opposite the rear of the dwelling are obscured.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed development is for a single-storey garage replacement, and part-single part-two-storey rear extension at 4.8 meters depth.

Plans considered:

Drawing No. 19/790-01 Existing Plans
Drawing No. 19/790-02 Existing Elevations
Drawing No. 19/790-03 Proposed Plans
Drawing No. 19/790-05 Site/Location Plans
As received 28 November 2019

Drawing No. 19/790-04 Proposed Elevations
As received 2 December 2019

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

APP Ref: 161350
Proposal: Demolition of existing conservatory and detached garage. Erection of new part single storey, part two storey rear extension with associated internal alterations.
Decision: Permitted
Decision date: 28/9/2019

4. CONSULTATIONS

Neighbours

All adjoining neighbours were consulted by letter and no responses were received.

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

H9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

EN12: Biodiversity and the Green Network

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

7. APPRAISAL

7.1 Principle of development

The application seeks permission for side and rear extensions to an existing residential dwelling. Such domestic works 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 part single part two-storey rear extension would largely occupy the footprint of an existing outmoded lavatory building and conservatory. The proposed replacement garage would occupy the site of an existing garage and shed. The proposed depth of the rear extension at 4.8 metres does exceed the recommended 4 metres for rear extensions in the Council's design

guide. However, whilst guidance, the proposal is not deemed to be an inappropriate scale or siting in relation to the original dwelling or area, and therefore is deemed not to cause any harm in this respect.

The proposed replacement garage, while utilitarian in design, appears very similar to that already existing.

The design, scale and layout of the single-storey front extension is a departure from the style which already exists at 47 Matlock Road. However, the scale of the proposal remains relatively small and clearly appropriate to a porch. The design would integrate design elements seen elsewhere in the front elevation- which at present appears to be the most utilitarian parts of 47 & 49 Matlock Road. Furthermore, it is considered the mock-Tudor style which characterises the façade of these two specific dwellings would be augmented by non-repeating elements provided they are also competently and completely integrated into the existing character; which the proposal is considered to do. This is due to the visual language used in mock-Tudor architecture and particular to the site.

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 two-storey elements of the proposal would not obstruct the 45-degree line for views for residents of either 47 or 51 Matlock Road. The south-westerly aspect of the dwellings along Matlock Road and the distance between the two-storey 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 its single-storey height.

As demonstrated on the plans, the two-storey elements of the proposal would not obstruct the 45-degree line for views for residents of either 47 or 51 Matlock Road. The south-westerly aspect of the dwellings along Matlock Road and the distance between the two-storey elements and adjacent properties are considered likely to prevent a detrimental loss of light for residents.

The proposed development would not introduce any new views into neighbouring gardens, obstruct sunlight or introduce development which would be overbearing for neighbours. 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 large extension, 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, and should provide a net gain for biodiversity wherever possible through new tree planting, wildlife friendly landscaping and other ecological enhancements. 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.

The site does not benefit from any protected trees or identified Green Links. 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.

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. M1 Materials to match

APPENDIX

Site Photos

Photographs taken in the course of a site visit conducted on the 23rd of January 2020.







