

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Target Date: 18/01/18

Application No: 182059/HOU

Address: 11 Haldane Road, Reading RG4 7PS

Proposal: Proposed single storey side extension forming single garage and room to the rear, conversion of existing garage and detached garage to the rear of the garden using existing drop kerb and gates.

Case Officer: Anthony Scholes

1. Site Description and Surrounding Area

- i. The development site is located on the eastern side of Hemdean Road, at the junction of St David's Close. The housing within the area is generally 1960 - 1970 buildings, where Haldane Road generally contains detached bungalows, with St David's close containing detached two storey dwellings. The development site is identified as potentially contaminated land as a result of the historic use of land as a gravel pit and pottery.

2. Proposal

- i. The proposal is for a single storey side extension measuring 3m by 9.78m on the façade facing the secondary street frontage (St David's Close), the conversion of the attached garage to a dining room, requiring the removal of the roller door and replacement with a window, and the erection of a single detached garage access from an existing dropped kerb to the rear of the property adjacent to the property at 1 St David's Close. The detached garage is proposed to be 3m (width) x 5m (length) x 2.9m (max height) and setback 2.5m from the property boundary. Materials have been proposed to match the existing.

3. Internal Consultations

- i. RBC Transport Development Control
A response was received from transport officers citing no objection to the proposed development. Notably, the dimensions of the proposed garage do not conform to the Council's current standards where it is recommended that the internal dimensions of a single garage are 7m long x 3m wide; however as plans also illustrate additional off road parking at the front of the property utilising the existing access point, the proposed provision would be deemed acceptable. Officers recommended approval subject to a condition and informatics. *Officer comment: there is ample parking space; no conflict with Policy CS24 and no condition required.*
- ii. RBC Environmental health officers
No consultation has been undertaken with environmental health officers. However, as the land is identified as being potentially contaminated land, standing advice from environmental protection applies. See condition and informative.

4. External Consultations

- i. A site notice was displayed for 21 days, occupiers of adjoining properties were notified by mail. No responses have been received.

5. Plans/Documents Considered

- i. The agent supplied the following, received on 26 November 2018:
Drawing No. TQRQM18323123201707 - Location Plan

Drawing No. TYL/2018/003 Existing and proposed floor plans and elevations
Drawing No. TYL/2018/002.a Existing and proposed floor plans and elevations

The agent supplied amended plans, received on 8 January 2019:
Drawing No. TYL/2018/003.a Existing and proposed floor plans and elevations

The agent supplied amended plans, received on 17 January 2019:
Drawing No. TYL/2018/003.a Existing and proposed floor plans and elevations
No amendments were including in this plan, the only change included the plan being printed onto a full size A3 for printing and viewing purposes.

6. Relevant Planning History

- i. None

7. Equality Act 2010

- i. 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.

8. Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

- i. 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') 2018 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:

- ii. The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

National
National Planning Policy Framework 2018;
National Planning Policy Guidance;

Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008)
CS7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CS 24 (Car/Cycle Parking)

Sites and Detailed Policies Document (Oct 2012)

DM4: Safeguarding Amenity

DM9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

Reading Borough Council Supplementary Planning Documents

Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD (2011)

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

9. Appraisal

i. The main issues are considered to be:

- Effect of development on the public realm
- Amenity
- Other matters

ii. Effect of development on public realm

The proposed development will result in the side extension being 1m from the property boundary to St David's Close. The side extension includes the continuation of the gable end roof to a apex height of 4.24m. This would result in a 9.76m long wall 1m from the property boundary. Only a small portion of the façade facing St David's Close is proposed to be 4.24m in height, with the remainder to be 2.6m high. Although this is in close proximity to the boundary, and would generally be unacceptable on most sites, in this instance the secondary frontage contains a 1.2m high fence tapered to 1.8m high to the rear of the property, and, an established hedge above the portion of the fence that is 1.2m high. The streetscene itself appears to be that of a back land infill development (St David's Close), evident by the proximity of the property at 7 Haldane Road to St David's Close, and therefore the construction of the extension in its proximity to the boundary would be considered acceptable in this instance, given that it is single storey only.

The alterations to the main façade (facing Haldane Road) would have a negligible impact on the overall appearance of the area and are considered acceptable.

The proposed detached garage to be accessed from the dropped kerb adjacent to no. 1 St David's Close and to be located 2.5m from the St David's Close boundary, and 1m from the adjoining property would similarly not have an impact on the streetscene due to the existing fencing and the small scale nature of the development.

iii. Amenity

DM9: House extensions and ancillary accommodation states an extension 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**
- 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**

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 lighting; **NO**
- Vibration; **NO**
- Dust and fumes; **NO**
- Smell; **NO**
- Crime and safety; **NO**

iv. Other matters

CIL - The extent of the works are such that the proposals will not be CIL liable.

10. Conclusion

- i. Having regard to the material considerations and all matters raised, the Local Planning Authority considers that the balance of considerations therefore weigh in favour of granting consent subject to conditions.

Recommendation

GRANT, subject to conditions

11. Conditions:

1. Time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to match
4. To cover any new contamination being identified

Informatives:

1. Terms and conditions
2. Positive and proactive
3. Building regulations
4. Complaints about construction
5. Encroachment and Party Wall
6. Highways
7. Contamination