

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Tilehurst
App Ref: 191418
Address: 1 Woodland Drive, Tilehurst, Reading, RG30 4RT
Proposal: Single Storey Front Extension and Garage Conversion with Internal Alterations and rear lantern roof light.
Case Officer: Mr James Schofield
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Rob Goodsall
Date received (valid from): 29 August 2019
Target Decision date: 24 October 2019

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to a semi-detached residential dwelling located at the corner of Woodland Drive and St Michael Road. It has an angular siting and rounded transitional building line linking St Michael Road and Woodland Drive. The dwelling has had a two-storey side and rear extension inclusive of an attached garage incorporating subservient and sympathetic materials, roof types, roof lines and building lines. The rear was also extended at the ground floor to the same depth of the two-storey extension which includes a flat roof with a lantern roof-light. The dwelling currently includes at least three parking spaces in front of the house.

The area is predominantly characterised by pairs of semi-detached dwellings with elevations which have rendered upper floors, bay windows and brick at the ground floor. Many of the dwellings in this area benefit from a range of extensions and alterations. The other half of this pair of semi-detached dwellings has had a front and side extension.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed development is for various alterations and extensions to the ground floor to provide additional living accommodation and improved enjoyment of the dwelling;

- A single-storey front extension forward of the existing/original porch at approximately 0.6 m to improve the functionality of the porch. Porch includes a gable ended roof. Bricks, tiles, windows and door to match existing.
- A single-storey 0.6 m front extension forward of the garage to accommodate the introduction of a bathroom to the ground floor. Elevation treatments include mock garage door with windows and mono-pitched roof in materials to match existing. Conversion of the use of the garage to a home office. Replacement of external side door to garage with window and brick infill to match existing.
- Replacement of the existing lantern roof-light (height of 0.1 to 0.3 m, width 0.6 m, depth 0.6 m) on the flat roof of the single-storey section of the rear extension with a new larger one. The replacement lantern roof-light is to be achieved with a second smaller flat roof inset back from the edge of the existing flat roof 0.3 m higher. The existing flat roof has a width 1.8 m and depth 1.3 m. Second inset flat roof is to have a width 1 m and depth 0.7 m inset back from the western, northern, eastern and southern edges of the existing flat roof 0.4 m, 0.2 m, 0.4 m and 0.3 m respectively. 0.3 m high supporting walls of the second inset flat roof include vertical windows running the full length of each elevation.

Plans considered

Dwg No: 1WD.MP01 - Existing and Proposed Plan & Elevations

As received 29 August 2019

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

02/00309/FUL: Second storey rear and side extension.
 Permitted 5/4/2002

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 Neighbours

All adjoining neighbours were consulted by letter and a Site notice was displayed. No responses have been received.

4.2 Transport

No objections received; suggested condition ensuring the retention of parking and inclusion of an informative regarding recovery of costs due to damage to the highway.

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 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)

DM12 (Access, Traffic and Highway-related Matters)

7. APPRAISAL

7.1 *Principle of development*

The application seeks permission to convert the attached garage, extend and alter an existing residential dwelling. No change of use is proposed. Such domestic works are supported in principle by Policy DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the SPDP (2012) subject to a number of criteria ensuring the effects of such extension and alterations are not harmful. This will be considered in more detail in the followings sections.

7.2 *Scale, appearance and design*

Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy 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 DM9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it: respects the character of the house, respects the pattern of neighbouring properties, and does not present a large blank façade to public areas.

The proposed single storey front extension forward of the existing/original porch 0.6 meters observes the existing pattern of the dwelling and those adjacent. The proposed design and materials match existing like for like or draw on already extant facets of the dwelling in the design.

The proposed single-storey extension forward of the garage 0.6 meters mirrors the expanded depth of the proposed porch. This avoids the side extension, to which this would be a subsequent extension, from appearing to come forward of the existing building line at the ground floor. This maintains the visual subservience of the side extension. The somewhat unusual transitional/angular siting of the dwelling at the corner of St Michaels Road and Woodland Drive allows for more sympathetic development forward of the dwelling than might be possible elsewhere on either. The introduction of a “mock garage door” element is not deemed to add or detract from the visual appeal and character of the dwelling relative to the existing garage door. Elevation and roof treatments are to use materials to match or reflect those existing. The replacement of the side door to the garage with a window and brick infill is also proposed to use matching materials.

The proposed replacement of the middle window of the single-storey section of the rear extension with French doors does not pose any potential for increased harm on neighbouring amenity relative to the existing window. The use of matching materials ensures it is respectful of the character of the existing dwelling. The proposed replacement lantern roof-light is significantly larger and bulkier than that existing; and is quite different from others in the area. However, originality is *not* tantamount to harm. The result of the higher inset second flat roof with windows running the full length of each 0.3 meter high supporting wall is improved residential amenity offering more natural light and a higher ceiling. It is noted that the proposed roof light actually serves to improve the architectural interest and character of the dwelling. Symmetrical siting of the roof-lantern above the proposed rear French doors helps to integrate both into the fabric of the existing dwelling.

The scale, siting and design of the above discussed proposed porch, extension, altered fenestration and doors are not considered to result in any material harm to the immediate character or appearance of the building or the area and thereby accord with the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) and Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012).

7.3 Amenity

Policy DM4: ‘Safeguarding Amenity’ of the SPDP (2012) 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. The proposal includes a two-storey extension which extends into the rear garden of the host dwelling.

The siting and scale of the proposed porch are relatively modest and do not offer any new opportunities for the overlooking or overshadowing of neighbours.

The same is true for the front extension to the garage. The introduction of a “mock garage door” element allows for the inclusion of smaller windows appropriate to a ground-floor bathroom facing a public road in a sympathetic and clever manner. The replacement of the side door to the garage with a window is considered not to offer views of neighbouring private amenity space.

The proposed replacement of the middle window of the single-storey section of the rear extension with French doors does not pose any potential for increased harm on neighbouring amenity relative to the existing window. Similarly, the proposed replacement roof-light could not offer new views or affect access to light for neighbours due to siting.

The above discussed proposed porch, extension, altered fenestration and doors are not considered to result in any material reduction in outlook or affect privacy in any way. The proposal would not result in any new views into adjoining gardens. In these regards the proposal safeguards residential amenity in accordance with Policy DM4 of the SPDP.

7.4 Parking

The Council’s Transport Officer raised no objections with the loss of 2 parking spaces resulting from the conversion of the garage. The conversion would not result in an unacceptable number of parking spaces retained or any adverse highway impacts. The development site is located within Zone 3 of the parking strategy and so the 3 remaining parking spaces exceed the 2 called for by the strategy. The Transport Officer suggested maintenance of the existing parking provision as a condition of planning permission. However, the current provision is higher than that required by the parking strategy and the policy soon to be adopted by the council focus on reducing reliance on private vehicles. On balance the condition was deemed unnecessary and unduly restrictive. It is considered the proposal safeguards residential amenity in accordance with Policy DM12 of the SPDP and the Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD 2011.

8. CONCLUSION

In light of the above assessment the proposal is considered to accord with the requirements of the development plan and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

9. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT

10. CONDITIONS

1. Standard time limit
2. Standard approved plans
3. Materials to match