

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Target Date: 25/09/2018

Application No: 181317/HOU

Address: 10 Links Drive, Reading

Proposal: Part two storey, part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension

Case officer: Ethne Humphreys

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the south west side of Links Drive, towards the end of the cul-de-sac. There is a change in site levels, and No.10 is higher than No. 11, to the south east of the site. The surrounding area is residential in character and consists of mostly semi-detached properties, many of which have been extended.

Proposal:

This is an application for a proposed part two storey, part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension. At the front, the extension would have an overall width of 3.8m and depth of 8.1m. The single storey rear element would have depth of 3.1m and width of 8m. The materials would match those of the host property.

Plans Considered:

Drawing No: Site Location Plan and Block Plan 16008 001

Drawing No: Existing Ground Floor Plan 16008 005

Drawing No: Existing First Floor Plan 16008 006

Drawing No: Existing Front Elevation 16008 007

Drawing No: Existing Rear Elevation 16008 008

Drawing No: Existing Side Elevation 16008 009

Received 28th July 2018

Drawing No: Proposed Site Plan 16008 020 Rev A

Drawing No: Rear Elevation 16008 013 Rev A

Drawing No: Front Elevation 16008 012 Rev A

Drawing No: Side Elevation 16008 013 Rev A

Drawing No: Ground Floor Plan 16008 010 Rev A

Drawing No: First Floor Plan 16008 011 Rev A

Received 10th September 2018

Relevant Planning History:

None.

Consultation Responses:

Transport: Further to revised plans, no objection subject to condition.

Ecology: Further to additional information, no objection.

Neighbour letters were sent to No's 9 and 11 Links Drive and No's 21 and 23 Lawrence Road.

No letters of neighbour representation received.

Summary of discussions with applicant/agent:

The agent was advised that, due to its scale/bulk and detailed design, the proposed extension would appear contrived and incongruous, failing to integrate with the host dwelling, out of keeping with the surrounding area. Revised plans were received amending the design and omitting the dormer window, which is considered acceptable.

The agent was also advised that a bat survey was required, and revised plans adhering to the council's parking standards was required.

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

CS26: Biodiversity and Geology

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

DM4: Safeguarding Amenity

DM9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

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

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

The proposed 'wrap-around' extension would have a relatively large footprint. However, it would utilise the footprint of the existing garage and outbuilding to be demolished and as such would not be overly excessive. The plot is large and there would remain a substantial amount of rear amenity space. As such, it is considered that this specific plot could accommodate the extension without resulting in a cramped appearance or over development of the plot such to warrant a refusal.

Due to the overall scale/bulk and detailed design, the plans were originally considered to result in a contrived and incongruous form of development that would not relate well to the character of the host dwelling. Revised plans were received omitting the dormer window on the front elevation and incorporating a fully hipped roof (rather than the half hip originally proposed). The roof would be set down slightly from the main roof ridge and the side element of the extensions set slightly back from the main front elevation at first floor to achieve a level of subservience. The setting in of the extension at first floor combined with the change in site levels helps to mitigate the loss of the spacious gap between No's 10 and 11 to a sufficient degree.

Whilst the side extension is slightly contrived in its design (front porch not fully integrated), it is not considered to be overtly out of proportion to the main dwelling. At the rear, flat roof

additions generally fail to improve the appearance of a dwelling. However, given its single storey nature it would remain subservient to the host property and would not be readily visible from the public domain. Given the above, the proposals are not considered to result in any significant adverse effect on the visual amenities of the wider area. The materials would match those of the host property, helping the extension to integrate with the main dwelling which is appropriate.

Further to the above, there are examples of first floor and two storey side extensions within the immediate vicinity and as such the proposed extension would not be out of keeping with the character of the area.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

The neighbouring properties potentially affected by the proposals are No's 9 and 11 Links Drive, located to the north west and south east of the site respectively. In relation to No.9 the adjoining semi, given the position of the two storey side extension on the south east side of the dwelling there would be no loss of amenity. The proposed single storey rear extension would project approximately 2.7m past the rear of No.9 and the roof would be flat to minimise the impact. Given the relatively small scale nature, it is not considered to result in any material loss of light or overbearing impact to the occupiers of this property.

In relation to No.11, due to the change in site levels, this property is sited lower than No.10. It is also set slightly further back in its plot than No.10. No windows are proposed in the flank elevation facing this property and as such there would be no material loss of privacy. The proposed two storey side extension would project forward of No.11; however, whilst visible, it would not breach a 45 degree line to the nearest habitable room window. The roof would be hipped away to minimise the impact and given the distance to No.9 itself of approximately 2m and the intervening garage it is not considered to result in any significant material loss of light or overbearing impact to the occupiers of this property. Similarly, given the distance from the single storey extension to No.9 itself, its flat roof design to minimise the impact and its position to the north, it is not considered to result in any significant material loss of light or overbearing impact to the occupiers of this property.

Notwithstanding the above, owing to the large flat roof nature of the rear extension proposed, it is considered necessary to include a condition stipulating that the flat roof area shall not be used as a roof terrace, and any access out onto this area shall be for maintenance/means of escape purposes only. This is in order to prevent any detrimental

impacts of overlooking and/or noise and disturbance of the neighbouring premises, in accordance with the requirement of Policy DM4 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015).

Impact on parking/highways

According to the Councils Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD, the site falls into Zone 3, Secondary Core Area where the parking requirement for a 3 bedroom dwelling is 2 parking spaces. Revised plans were received increasing the garage (6m long by 3m wide) and complying with the Council's parking standards. Further to this, the applicant has demonstrated that 2 spaces can still be parked on site in tandem and the requested condition is not considered necessary in this case. No transport objection.

Impact on ecology

Further to additional information, 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.

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

Conditions

Time

Plans

Materials to Match

No Windows

Flat Roof

Informatives

Terms and Conditions

Building Regulations

Construction and Demolition

Encroachment

Bats

Positive and Proactive