

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Whitley

App Ref: 191297/HOU

Address: 8 Stockton Road, Reading, RG2 8AP

Proposals: Proposed single storey side and rear extension and outbuilding.

Case Officer: Mr James Schofield

Applicant: Mr T Kocurek

Date received (valid from): 6 August 2019

Target Decision date: 1 October 2019

1. INTRODUCTION

The development site is a semi-detached residential dwelling and detached single garage located on the Southern side of Stockton Road.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposed development is for the demolition of the existing garage and erection of:

- A single-storey side and rear extension in matching brick with a hipped roof using materials to match the existing main dwelling. Proposal also includes two glazed sun roof windows at rear over the proposed dining room.
- A single-storey porch/mudroom at front entryway with hipped roof to match existing roof of main dwelling.
- A small outbuilding with hipped-roof to match the existing dwelling and UPVC siding.

Plans considered

Dwg No. 1 - Existing Floor Plans

Dwg No. 2 - Existing Elevations

As received 6 August 2019

Dwg No. 3 Rev. A - Amended Existing Block Plan

As received 22 August 2019

Dwg No. 4 Rev. A - Amended Proposed Floor Plans and Outbuilding

Dwg No. 5 Rev. A - Amended Proposed Elevations

Dwg No. 6 Rev. B - Amended Proposed Block plan

As received 16 September 2019

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 *The following addresses were consulted by letter.*

6 Stockton Road, Reading, RG2 8AR

69 Lamerton Road, Reading RG2 8AS

71 Lamerton Road, Reading RG2 8AS

No responses have been received.

4.2 *Transport*

No objections subject to conditions.

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 Policy

National Planning Policy Framework
National Planning Practice Guidance

Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008)

CS7 (Design and the Public Realm)

Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012)

DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity)
DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)
DM10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space)
DM12 (Access, Traffic and Highway-related Matters)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

7. APPRAISAL

7.1 CS7: *All development must be of high design quality.*

- A. *Development will maintain and enhance the character and appearance of the area of Reading in which it is located.*

To assess this, the following has been considered - does the proposal fail to include development components which maintain and enhance the area of Reading in which it is located in terms of:

- Layout, urban structure and grain;

NO

- Landscape;

NO

- Density and mix;

NO

- Scale, height and massing;

NO. While the outbuilding does employ a relatively high-roof, it is considered that the siting the proposed outbuilding in the westernmost corner of the site reduces the potential for the development to have an adverse effect on neighbouring amenity.

- Architectural detail and materials;

NO. An effort to use styles and materials which draw upon or improve upon those extant is employed by the majority of elements in the proposed development. The only exception is the use of UPVC siding on the proposed outbuilding. However, due to its scale and siting being considered to result in effective concealment, there would seem to be little to no harm.

B. Makes a positive contribution to the urban design objectives of CS7.

To assess this, the following has been considered, within reason, does the proposal fail to make a positive contribution to the following urban design objectives in terms of:

- Character - a place with its own identity and sense of place;

NO

- Continuity and enclosure;

NO

- Quality of the public realm;

NO

- Ease of movement and permeability;

NO

- Legibility - clear image and easy to understand;

NO

- Adaptability - capable of adaptation over time;

NO

- Diversity - meets a wide range of needs;

NO

C. Makes a positive contribution to the site and area specific objectives of CS7.

To assess this, the following has been considered, within reason, does the proposal fail to make a positive contribution to the following objectives:

- Responding positively to the local context and creating or reinforcing local character and distinctiveness, including protecting and enhancing the historic environment of the Borough and providing value to the public realm;

NO. Amended plans employ a hipped rather than flat roof on the side and rear extension, which is considered to positively reflect the predominant roof typology and symmetry of the semi-detached dwellings in the area. The proposal also employs this roof type on the proposed porch which is similarly viewed positively. Furthermore, the porch and side/rear extension propose to use brick and windows to match those existing which suggests a relatively sympathetic addition to the streetscene.

- Create safe and accessible environment where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine quality of life or community cohesion;

NO

- Address the needs of all in society and are accessible, usable and easy to understand by them;

NO

- Are visually attractive as a result of good high quality built forms and spaces, the inclusion of public art and appropriate materials and landscaping;

NO

7.2 DM4: Safeguarding Amenity states an extension to a house will be acceptable where it will not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties.

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties in terms of:

- Privacy and overlooking;

NO

- Access to sunlight and daylight;

NO

- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development;

NO

- Noise and disturbance;

NO

- Artificial light;

NO

- Vibration;

NO

- Dust and fumes;

NO

- Smell;

NO

- Crime and safety;

NO

7.3 DM9 states: An extension to a house will be acceptable where it:

A. Respects the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design;

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- Does the proposal employ scale, location, materials or design which detract from the appearance or special qualities of the building;

NO

- Reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree;

NO

- Require the loss of trees in the garden or put significant trees at risk;

NO

B. Respects the character and pattern of neighbouring properties and the street as a whole in terms of scale, location, materials and design, and any important existing building line; Respects neighbour's amenities and does not present a large blank façade to public areas.

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- significantly reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight enjoyed by neighbouring properties;

NO

- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies;

NO

- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design;

NO.

- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing;

NO

7.4 DM10 states: An extension to a house will be acceptable where it:

- A. *Dwellings will be provided with functional private or communal open space that allows for suitable sitting-out areas, children's play areas, home food production, green waste composting, refuse storage, general outdoor storage and drying space. Houses will be provided with private outdoor space whereas flats may be provided with communal outdoor space, balconies and/or roof gardens.*

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- reduce the amount of private or communal open space to a level which would not be functional for the uses described above in A;

NO

- B. *The design of outdoor areas will respect the size and character of other similar spaces in the vicinity, clearly identify whether they are private or communal spaces, ensure that they are appropriately related to main entrances, enhance safety and the perception of safety for future residents and the general public, and not be compromised by the relationship of other buildings which may be detrimental in terms of overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing.*

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- reduce or change the size, character or design of the outdoor open space to degree which would make it dissimilar to others within the vicinity;

NO

- create an inappropriate relationship between the private or communal open space and main entrances;

NO

- fail to enhance safety and the perception of safety within the private or communal open space within the realm of reason;

NO

- create a detrimental relationship with other buildings in terms of overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing;

NO

7.5 DM12 states: An extension to a house will be acceptable where:

Proposals involving either the construction of a new site access, or a material increase in the use of an existing site access, directly onto the Classified Highway Network will not be acceptable if they would be likely to result in the encouragement of the use of the network for short local trips or compromise the safe movement and free flow of traffic on the network or the safe use of the road.

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- be likely to result in the encouragement of the use of the network for short local trips;

NO

- compromise safe movement or free flow of the road network;

NO

8. CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed and the proposed works are considered to be in accordance with the above relevant policies and planning permission can be granted.

9. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT

Schedule 2



iShare printing

Scale: 1:1000

Printed on: 17/9/2019 at 16:18 PM

© Crown copyright and database rights 2019 Ordnance Survey 100019672



Reading
Borough Council
Working better with you

Site location