

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Target Date: 16/10/2018

Application No: 181479/HOU

Address: 85a Westbourne Terrace, Reading

Proposal: Single storey rear and side extension

Case officer: Ethne Humphreys

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application property is a two storey detached dwelling with attached garage located on the southern side of Westbourne Terrace. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with properties of varying design and sizes, many of which have been extended.

Proposal:

This is an application for a proposed single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing side garage. The extension would have an overall width of 8m and overall depth of 8.1m. The extension would be constructed out of materials to match the existing dwelling.

Plans Considered:

Drawing No: Proposed Ground Floor Plan HEARD-0718-01

Drawing No: Proposed Elevations HEARD-0718-02

Drawing No: Existing Plans and Elevations HEARD-0718-03

Drawing No: Section A-A HEARD-0718-04

Drawing No: Section B-B HEARD-0718-05

Drawing No: Block and Location Plans HEARD-0718-06

Received 21st August 2018

Relevant Planning History:

None.

Consultation Responses:

Transport: No objection subject to informatives.

Ecology: No objection.

Neighbour letters were sent to No's 85 and 87 Westbourne Terrace and No 81 Waverely Road.

One neighbour letter received, not objecting to the proposal itself but raising concern about access across the rear of the site - *officer note*: land ownership is not a material planning consideration and would be a civil matter between the parties involved.

Summary of discussions with applicant/agent:

None. No formal pre-application advice was sought prior to the submission of this application.

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.

Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

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

Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy, 2008 (amended 2015)

CS7: Design and the Public Realm

CS24: Car/Cycle Parking

CS36: Biodiversity and Geology

Sites and Detailed Policies Document, Oct 2012 (amended 2015)

DM4: Safeguarding Amenity

DM9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

DM12: Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters

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

Supplementary Planning document - Revised Parking Standards and Design (2011)

Appraisal

The main issues are considered to be:

- Design, impact on the host dwelling, character of the area and street scene
- Impact on neighbouring amenity

- Impact on parking/highways
- Impact on ecology

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

Whilst the proposals would utilise the footprint of the existing garage to be demolished, the proposed 'wrap-around' extension would have a large footprint. Notwithstanding, the extension would be single storey in nature with low eaves height and it would be constructed out of materials to match the main dwelling which would help integrate the extension with the host property.

Given the nature of the proposals, the side extension would clearly be visible from the street scene. However, it would be set back from the main front elevation and would not be too dissimilar from the current views of the existing garage in this location.

There would be a distance of 1m to the western side boundary and, whilst there would be a reduction in the amount of rear garden space, it would still be comparable to the amenity space of surrounding properties which is acceptable. It is considered that this specific plot can suitably accommodate the extension without giving a feeling of overdevelopment or crampedness. As such, whilst large, given the above, and in this specific instance, it is not considered to be so incongruous so as to result in any adverse effect on either the character of the host property or the visual amenities of the street scene to sustain a reason for refusal.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

The neighbouring properties potentially affected by the proposals are No's 85 and 87 Westbourne Terrace located to the south east and north west of the site respectively.

In relation to No.87, this property has a porch feature on the side elevation adjacent No.85a, with a window on the flank elevation. The proposed side extension would project marginally forward of this porch feature and would project past it towards the rear. At the rear of No.87 there is a conservatory close to the common boundary with No.85a and it appears that a side extension is under construction albeit there is no planning history for this. The proposed extension would clearly be visible to the occupiers of No.87; however, it would be no closer to the common boundary than the existing garage and the roof would be hipped away to minimise the impact. Whilst there would be some loss of light to the porch feature this is not considered to be unacceptable in the context. Similarly, given the nature of the conservatory

of No.87, which receives light from all aspects, the extension is not considered to result in such a significant material loss of light or overbearing impact such to warrant a refusal on this basis.

In relation to No.85, the proposed extension would clearly be visible to the occupiers of this property and there may be some loss of light to the nearest habitable room window. However, the extension would be offset from the common boundary and its proposed depth of 2.8m complies with the recommendation in RBC's Design Guide to House Extensions. Whilst visible, it is not considered to result in any significant material loss of light or overbearing impact to the occupiers of this property such to warrant a refusal on this basis.

As such in overall terms, considering all nearby residential occupiers, no significantly harmful amenity impacts would occur, subject to conditions and in compliance with policy DM4.

Impact on parking/highways

The proposals would result in the loss of the garage and therefore the loss of a parking space.

The application also states that existing parking will be retained at the front and rear of the property accessed via Lundy Lane (this is not part of the public highway). This has not been illustrated on submitted plans; however the development site is located in an area designated as a Residents Parking Permit Area; Zone 07R therefore parking is controlled and regulated through the residents permit scheme. No transport objection as parking will be controlled and monitored via the existing residents parking scheme and there will be no detrimental impact on the volume of on street parking.

Impact on ecology

The Council's Ecologist has confirmed that there are no ecological objections to this proposal. In any event, as bats are protected species, this is covered by separate European legislation.

CIL

The floorspace involved in the proposed works is below 100sqm and the proposals do not involve the creation of a new dwelling. Accordingly, the proposals are not CIL liable.

Other Matters

All material planning considerations addressed in the above report.

Conclusion

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 planning permission subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION:

Grant, subject to conditions and informatives