

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 43 Southcote Lane

Application No: 190721/HOU

Proposal: Single storey side extension to form granny annex and enlarged rear extension to single dwellinghouse.

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Adams

Date received (valid from): 09/05/2019

Target Decision date: 27/06/2019

Case officer: Tom French

1. Site description and Surrounding Area

The application site contains a two storey semi-detached dwelling on the east side of Southcote Lane. The application property has an existing rear extension and the site has provision for off road parking to the front of the property and a rear amenity area approximately 27m deep and 10m wide.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential with semi-detached (many of which have been extended to the side giving the impression of linked semi-detached) properties to the east side of Southcote Lane and Monks Way and large detached, semi-detached and flats to the west of the Roads. It is notable that in terms of character and appearance, the east side of Southcote Lane and Monks Way are closely associated.

The application building is not listed, nor is it located within a conservation area.

2. The Proposal

Householder planning permission is sought for a single storey side and rear extension to form an attached granny annex. The proposed extension would project 2.9m from the existing side elevation and 5.6m beyond the rear elevation of the existing extension (total length 18.5m).

3. Consultation

Neighbours consultation:

No.s 41 & 45 Southcote Lane and 34, 36 & 38 Kenilworth Avenue have been notified of the application and a site notice has also been displayed at the site.

No responses have been received.

Transport consultation:

The RBC Transport Development Control Advisor provided a consultation response raising no objection to the proposal subject to conditions requiring the vehicle parking spaces be provided in accordance with the approved plans and that the extension shall only be used for purposes ancillary to the principle dwelling.

4. Plans and Documents Considered

The Council, in reaching its recommendation, has taken into consideration the following plans & documents:

Drawing No.:

- 01 B - Side Extension & Internal alterations

As received: 02/05/2019

5. Relevant Planning History

None

6. 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.

7. Relevant Planning Guidance

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. The Development Plan for Reading relevant to the application site comprises the Reading Local Development Framework '*Core Strategy*' 2008 (Altered 2015) and '*Sites and Detailed Policies Document*' 2012 (Altered 2015).

The '*National Planning Policy framework*' ('NPPF') states clearly that its content is to be a material consideration in the determination of applications. The 'NPPF' states that due weight should be given to the adopted policies of the Local Development Framework (LDF) (Core Strategy and Sites and Detailed Policies Document) according to their degree of consistency with the 'NPPF' (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the 'NPPF', the greater the weight that may be given). Accordingly, the 'NPPF' and the following development plan policies and supplementary planning guidance are relevant:

8. Relevant Policies

The application has been assessed against the following policies:

National

National Planning Policy Framework;

National Planning Policy Guidance;

RBC Local Development Framework

Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015)

CS7 Design and the Public Realm
CS23 Car / Cycle Parking

Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015)

DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity)
DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)
DM10 (Amenity Space)
DM12 (Access, Traffic & Highway Related Matters)

Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003)

9. Appraisal

Design, impact on the host dwelling, character of the area and street scene

The proposed extension would be to the side of the application property and as such would be visible from the street scene along Southcote Road. The proposed would extend to the common boundary with no.45, which is also extended to the boundary, and as such would remove all gapping between the properties at ground floor level. Whilst sub-optimal, this type of relationship is very common along the east side of Southcote Lane and Monks Way - where many properties have been extended to the boundary at ground floor level, forming a low level visual terracing effect.

There are numerous examples of full width side extension (many of which do not appear to have been granted planning permission but are so numerous that they still undoubtedly strongly contribute to the character of the street scene), including at no.s 23 (granted application number 910993), 31 (granted application number 101918), 51 (granted application number 940338) Southcote Road and 1 (a two storey side extension, granted application number 030670), 43 (granted application number 090178) and 47 (granted application number 990684) Monks Way. It is noted that a full width side extension was refused at 27 Monks Way (application number 141943), however the reason for refusal of that application related to the proposal projecting forward of the existing building line and not the width of the extension.

In light of the above, and in the context of the numerous single storey side extensions for which no planning history can be found (including Southcote Lane no.s: 25, 33, 45, 47, 53, 55, 57 & 59 with many further examples along Monks Way), it is considered that the proposed side extension would not be significantly out of character with the wider street scene or out of pattern with the surrounding area.

It is also acknowledged that the total length of the side extension would be 18.5m, which in normal circumstances would be considered excessive. However, given the prevailing existing neighbouring context (similar extensions on the boundary with the host property), on this occasion there would not be demonstrable harm from the public realm to warrant a sustainable reason for refusal on these grounds.

The proposed extension would project 0.9m forward of the existing front elevation, in line with the bay window, and the pitched roof to the front of the extension would extend across to the bay window to form a porch. As the proposed development would not project forward of the existing bay window (and having regards to the provisions for building porches under permitted development rights without planning permission) and would still be set back from the existing front elevation of the neighbouring no.45. Further the proposed extension would be single storey with a width less than half that of the original dwelling. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not be significantly harmful to and would respect the character of the host dwelling in terms of design, scale and massing.

It is also proposed to add a pitched roof to the existing rear extension (introducing rooflights) and infill the area between the existing rear extension and proposed side extension. As this is to the rear of the property (and so not visible from the street scene) and would not project beyond the rear of the existing extension, it is considered that the proposed rear extension would not be significantly out of character with host dwelling or surrounding area in terms of scale, massing or design.

The extension would be finished with materials to match existing and the flat roof with pitched front is considered to integrate satisfactorily with the character of the host dwelling and visual amenity of the surrounding area.

The host dwelling would retain sufficient amenity space to the rear elevation, which is considered adequate for a dwelling of this size and relative to the character of amenity spaces to surrounding dwellings.

The proposal would accord with Policies CS7, DM9 and DM10.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

The properties potentially most affected by the proposed development are 41 Southcote Lane and 45 Southcote Lane, located to the north and south respectively.

With respect to no.41, the proposed infill rear extension would not project beyond the existing rear extension at the application site, nor would it project beyond the existing rear extension at no.41. Whilst the proposal includes the addition of a pitched roof in place of the existing flat roof, it is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact in terms of loss of light or overbearing effects. The bulk of the proposed rear extension (that would project 5.6m beyond the rear of the existing extension) would be set off the boundary with no.41 by 5.8m and as such would not have any significant adverse effects in terms of loss of light or overbearing. A set of north side facing glazed patio doors are proposed. As these would be sited at ground floor level, set off the boundary by 5.8m and considering the existing boundary treatment between the application site and no.41; it is considered that there would not be a significant detrimental impact in terms of privacy or overlooking.

With regards to no.45, the proposed extension would abut the common boundary and would project 5.6m beyond the existing rear elevation (9m beyond the original rear elevation), however it would not project beyond the existing out building at the application site or the existing rear extension at no.45. As such there would not be any adverse effects in terms of loss of light or overbearing. Further, the proposal would be single storey with no south facing side window. As such there would not be any significant detrimental impacts in terms of privacy or overlooking.

As a flat roof is proposed, it is considered reasonable and necessary to include a condition preventing the flat roof area from being used as a terrace, in order to protect neighbouring amenity.

The proposals are considered to be too distant from properties fronting Kenilworth Avenue, or any other nearby properties, to cause significantly harmful amenity impacts.

The proposal accords with Policy DM4.

Other Issues

Transport

Further to the consultation response from the Transport Development Control Advisor (see above), it is considered necessary to include a condition stating that the extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until all the parking spaces have been provided and that those spaces shall be retained thereafter. This is to ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities to meet the needs of the current and future occupiers.

Annex use

The submission outlines that the side extension will form a granny annexe, with this being shown in the proposed layout, with access internal within the existing layout (rather than creating a separate front door on the Southcote Lane frontage). Although there is nothing specific within the submission to suggest that the extension would in the future operate as a separate dwelling which could be let or sold separately, it is considered reasonable and necessary to ensure this is the case via planning condition. Given the scale and nature of the proposals and the facilities indicated (bathroom and access to the rear garden), it is conceivable that with relatively minor internal alterations (which could be undertaken without planning permission) that the proposed extension could be separated to form a separate dwelling. It is therefore considered necessary to include a condition to ensure that the extension and converted garage would remain ancillary to the host dwelling, and not as a separate standalone dwelling. With this condition secured the proposal accords with Policies DM4 and DM9.

Community Infrastructure Levy

The proposal would not be liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), given the floorspace created is below 100sqm.

10. Recommendation

Grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission was granted.

Reason: to prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions, and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of this development shall match those of the existing building.

Reason: To ensure that the new development appears in keeping with the existing building, in the interests of the character of the area, in accordance Policy DM9 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015).

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing No.:

- 01 B - Side Extension & Internal alterations

As received: 02/05/2019

Reason: because permission is granted in respect of the development as detailed in the approved plans only.

4. The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until all vehicle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with the approved plan. The spaces shall be kept available for parking at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities to meet the needs of future occupiers and reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which could be a danger to other road users to accord with Policy CS24 & CS24 and Policy DM12.

5. The roof area of the side extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises from overlooking and loss of privacy in accordance with Policy DM4.

6. The side extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the use of the principal dwelling, *43 Southcote Lane*, as a dwellinghouse.

Reason: To accord with the terms of the application, and to ensure that separate occupation of the extension would not detract from the amenities or living conditions of neighbouring residential properties (or the character of the locality) in accordance with Policies DM9 and DM4

Informatives

1. Your attention is drawn to the terms and conditions of this permission. Any development which is carried out but which differs materially from the approved plans and details, or does not comply with any condition(s) or planning obligation(s) attached to the permission may result in the Council taking action to remedy the breach of planning control. If you are in any doubt please contact the Council.
2. The applicant's attention is drawn to Building Regulations requirements. Please contact Building Control on 0118 937 2449 for advice.
3. The construction (and demolition) of the development will be subject to environmental health law and the applicant is referred to:
<http://beta.reading.gov.uk/environmentalprotection>
4. The decision to grant planning permission follows the positive and proactive consideration of the issues raised by this planning application and issuing the decision within the statutory time period.