

Design and access statement for 246 Peppard Road, Caversham. Mr and Mrs Clark.

Proposed new single storey rear extension, plus new dormer to rear, at second floor level.

Use.

The use of this semi detached dwelling will remain as is, i.e. class C3 of the 2015 UCO, as residential.

Site description.

Number 246 currently occupies a very large plot relative to its footprint, certainly by contemporary standards. It is approximately 84m in length and 9m in width making it just over 0.075ha in extent. The dwelling sits well back from Peppard Road at some 21m from the carriageway edge. Adjacent to the north is number 248 a detached dwelling with conservatory to the rear, on an even larger plot. To the south lies number 244 the party dwelling in the pair. As the site visit will show this is currently undergoing a single storey rear extension relating to application App 152272. In addition, this dwelling also has a flat roofed rear dormer constructed at 2nd floor level as granted by certificate of lawfulness App 130214. Presently on the northern boundary edge of number 246, party to number 248, lies a single storey detached garage and modest shed. Both these are to be demolished as part of this application. It is patently clear that the application site lies well within the defined settlement boundary of Greater Reading as identified in the current Draft Local Plan. Accordingly the principle of expanding the dwelling via an extension is acceptable, subject to the normal development management criteria.

Policy.

The applicants architect, in preparing this scheme has had close regard to the advice contained in the Council SPG on house extensions [particularly in regard to potential light loss on neighbours], and the advice contained in policies CC8 and H8 in the Draft Reading Borough Local Plan of 2017. He has also had regard to the advice on good design as identified in NPPF2 published in July of this year.

The proposal.

As noted above the red line application site is substantial. It is proposed to demolish the present garage and shed to the rear and replace this with a flat roofed single storey extension to the rear: on the south aspect it is to be just 3.8m in depth –about the same as the present rear extension being built at number 244. On the north side the extension is to be 11m in depth from the rear wall --but a number of mitigating factors apply. Firstly the extension is brought 0.9m away from the party boundary which will assist in reducing any impact on number 248. Secondly the current structures in the rear garden already have an impact on the boundary and extend a distance of 18m from the rear building line, so it is argued this extension impact will be minimal, and indeed even less, than these present buildings. Thirdly the extension is flat roofed with a parapet wall height of just over 3m to the south side, and just 2.9m on the northside alongside number 248 where where the parapet has been omitted. Accordingly, although it is recognised that number 248 lies to the north, and so potential loss of light is a factor to be taken into account, it is considered any additional loss of light will be negligible over and above what occurs already. It is noted that the present tree on the boundary is planned to be felled soon to accommodate the boundary fence and the new extension, which currently reduce light to the north. I.e natural daylight will rise as a consequence.

The second point to note is that the back to back distance to the rear will remain significant, given the plot length, to number 28 Abingdon Drive to the east –the distance from the rear edge of the new extension to the plot boundary will still be 38m.

Moving onto the rear dormer at second floor level. This is sought by the applicant in order to increase capacity in the household for a growing family with 4 children, without the need to increase the dwelling footprint or at first floor level. It will provide additional bedroom space and en suite bathroom. Firstly the design of this ties in well and reflects the scale and elevation of the current dormer on number 244. Secondly there will be virtually no impact on the street scene caused by the new dormer—the current visual gap between number 246 and 248 will be satisfactorily maintained, the principle of which is a key point in the Councils design guidance. Thirdly there is the issue of overlooking. Whilst it is of course possible that there will be a degree of increased overlooking of the neighbour's rear garden to the north, from the new dormer, this will be at an oblique angle and there is already a loft bedroom and rooflight looking to the rear. Secondly the garden of number 248 is so long that any privacy loss will be diminished. Thirdly it is noted that the rear garden of number 246 is already overlooked by the neighbours dormer, which is a situation “expected” and normally experienced in an urban context such as Peppard Road. It is accordingly the applicants view that the new dormer will not be harmful to adjoining amenity and so fully comply with policy CC8 in the RBLP.

Permitted Development

The applicant did consider submitting a certificate of lawful proposed development for the new dormer alone, to ascertain if the Council considers it to be permitted development in its own right.

Whilst the scale mass and bulk/positioning of the new dormer is considered by the applicant to be permitted development under Class B of Part 1 of the 2015 GPDO as amended, [since it does not exceed 50m³ in volume, does not face a highway, does not exceed the present roof height or overhang beyond present eaves] it is considered that given the proposed external facing materials will be at variance to the as existing dwelling and will match the cladding proposed for the north side of the extension along the boundary with number 248, plus the fact that a Juliet balcony is proposed: these two factors might mean that planning permission is indeed required. This is mentioned since it is specifically prayed in aid of favour of granting permission.

Car Parking.

A site visit will indicate the very large area of space available on the site frontage of no 246, for parking for at least 3 vehicles, with adequate turning space so that cars can access the highway in forward gear. None of the development impinges upon parking space as the present garage is not used for such parking and indeed is not required, given the above. Space will still remain on site should sheds be required [under permitted development rights] for cycle storage.

Building Design Concept.

As regards design the applicant considers that the approach and materials taken [ie flat roofed with vertical cedar boarding for the external walls is acceptable, albeit at some variance to the present pebble dash of the main dwelling. This will create visual interest, by way of contrast. In any event it is to the rear of the dwelling. No listed buildings or conservation areas are to be affected.

The alternative and contemporary cladding also reflects the modern and eco-friendly SIPPs panel construction to be used within, which are have a low carbon footprint, highly energy and space efficient. The glazing systems by virtue of their size, orientation and high tech solar control glass will offer maximum energy efficiency. The side passage to the side of No.248 is designed to provide direct garden access whilst minimising visual impact. On the south side the recycled composite decking will be a well used sun trap feature. The east orientation of the remaining glazing will warm the spaces in the mornings and increase visual and real connection with the remaining mature tree lined eco garden that will be unaffected by the proposal. The open plan nature of the main living spaces is designed to maintain the large family integrated and unified.

It is not considered that any additional landscaping is required for this development –none on the party boundary to the north is envisaged, as if it were this would reduce the access width to the side for the family occupants.

Conclusion.

The development proposed is both modest and well designed, appropriate in both nature and character to the plot size and host dwelling. It is also considered acceptable in relation to the two principal neighbours on each side, as any potential impact on amenity through overlooking and overshadowing is considered to be minimal. Finally there is virtually no impact on the local street scene and the scheme is certainly not an overdevelopment. It is considered to fully accord with policies CC8 and H8 in the RBLP plus the Council SPG on rear house extensions. It is hoped that the application will thus be approved.

M Butler. October 2018.