

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Peppard

App Ref: 190347/HOU

Address: 80 Knights Way, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8RH

Proposals: Part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension, new porch, loft conversion and internal alterations.

Case Officer: Mr Anthony Scholes

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Caley & Vanessa Gardiner

Date received (valid from): 27 February 2019

Target Decision date: 24 April 2019

1. INTRODUCTION

The development site is a detached residential dwelling located on the Northern side of Knights Way, containing the end dwelling of a row of terraced dwellings. The property currently contains an attached single garage.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposed development is for a part two storey, part single storey side extension, single storey rear extension, new front porch, loft conversion and additional rear dormer facilitated by removal of the existing attached single garage.

Plans considered:

Drawing No. 18087-SU-006 - Existing typical section

Drawing No. 18087-DD-005 - Proposed elevations (North/West)

Drawing No. 18087-DD-006 - Proposed typical sections

Drawing No. 18087-LO-001 - Location plan

Drawing No. 18087-DD-002 - Proposed floor plans (ground and first floor)

Drawing No. 18087-DD-003 - Proposed floor plans (second floor and roof plan)

Drawing No. 18087-DD-004 - Proposed elevations (South/East)

Drawing No. 18087-SU-003 - Existing floor plans (roof)

Drawing No. 18087-SU-004 - Existing elevations (South/East)

Drawing No. 18087-SU-005 - Existing elevations (North/West)

Drawing No. 18087-SU-001 - Existing block plan

Drawing No. 18087-SU-002 - Existing floor plans

Drawing No. 18087-DD-001 - Proposed site plan (block plan)

As received 28 February 2019

Drawing No. 18087-DD-001 Rev A - Proposed site plan (block plan)

Drawing No. 18087-SU-001 Rev A - Existing block plan

As received 8 April 2019

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter.

59 Grove Road, Emmer Green, Reading, Berkshire, RG4 8LJ

57 Grove Road, Emmer Green, Reading

82 Knights Way, Emmer Green, Reading, Berkshire, RG4 8RH

59A Grove Road, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8LJ

55 Grove Road, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8LJ

78 Knights Way, Emmer Green, Reading, RG4 8RH

No objections 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)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

7. APPRAISAL

7.1 Scale, appearance and design

The proposed development includes a two-storey side extension which includes a continuation of the gabled roof form of the existing dwelling. The SPD 'a design guide to house extensions' states that "two storey side extensions should normally be designed to be smaller in scale than the main house". A number of design elements are considered appropriate, including setting back the front elevation, maintaining the gap between neighbours, and bring the upper floor away from the side boundary.

The proposal is of a lesser width than that of the existing dwelling and has a matching ridge height to that of the main dwelling. Although not generally accepted, the host dwelling benefits from a forward projecting gable, a generous plot, and sufficient distance to adjoining properties. As such, in this particular instance the plot is able to accommodate an extension of this scale whilst maintaining the rhythm and spacing between adjoining properties thereby respecting the character and appearance of the area. The proposed extension also incorporates a single storey element to the front of the two storey side extension, which will have minimal

impact on the terraced row or immediate street scene. Therefore, the proposed two-storey extension is acceptable in this instance due to the specific circumstances described above.

The proposed single storey rear extension is proposed to be 2.9m in length and complies with the SPD (a design guide to house extensions). The proposal also includes alterations to the existing entrance to provide a new front porch. This would be considered acceptable as the front porch would tuck in beside the existing front gable end feature and would not have a significant detrimental impact on the character and amenity of the area.

Finally, the proposal includes a rear facing dormer window being 7m (length) x 2.6m (height) x 2.4m (depth) facilitate the loft conversion to habitable use. The proposed dormer does not comply with advice contained within the SPD 'Design guide to house extensions', however would qualify as permitted development under the GPDO (2015 as amended), although the size of the dormer would not be possible without the related extension. Despite the dormer being inconsistent with council design guidance, the dormer would be read alongside the other much larger extensions and could be undertaken via permitted development rights. As such this element is not considered to give rise to any unacceptable level of harm.

7.2 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:

- detract from the appearance of the original building through the use of ill-matching materials and by not fitting in with the design, scale and proportions of the original building; **NO, the scale of the proposal, although large, has been designed to incorporate features to compliment the original dwelling, and be subservient to its architectural features.**
- reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree; **NO, although a substantial addition, the proposal predominantly extends to the side and retains the majority of the private amenity space to the rear of the property.**
- 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, the two-storey side extension does include a bedroom window facing toward the rear potentially looking over the adjoining gardens, and within close proximity to the boundary of no. 78, but it is considered that the side-by-side relationship is the common relationship between properties within the area and is therefore acceptable.**
- 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, the materials are proposed to match that of the existing dwelling, and a condition will ensure this.**

7.3 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**, as above, the relationship of the properties is similar to that of the existing surrounding properties and is therefore considered acceptable.
- Access to sunlight and daylight; **NO**
- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development; **NO**, the proposed development maintains a gap between the adjoining property and is considered acceptable.
- Noise and disturbance; **NO**
- Artificial lighting; **NO**
- Vibration; **NO**
- Dust and fumes; **NO**
- Smell; **NO**
- Crime and safety. **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