

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 112 Mayfield Drive

Application No: 181229 / HOU

Proposal: Second storey side extension

Applicant: Mr J Wooldridge

Date received (valid from): 13/07/2018

Target Decision date: 07/09/2018

Agreed Extension of Time:

Case officer: Tom French

1. Site description and Surrounding Area

The application site contains a two storey semi-detached dwelling on the west side of Mayfield Drive. The application property has an existing attached garage to the side elevation, an existing conservatory to the rear elevation and a two storey bay to the front elevation. The application site provides off road parking space to the front of the property and includes a rear amenity space approximately 15m deep and 10m wide.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential and characterised by semi-detached properties of equivalent scale to the application property.

The application building is not listed, nor is it located within a conservation area.

2. The Proposal

A householder planning permission is sought for a first storey extension above the existing garage. The proposed extension, following revisions during the course of the application, would be set back 1m from the existing front elevation of the garage and 0.6m from the ridge of the main roof. The rear elevation of the proposed extension would align with the rear elevation of the existing single storey ground floor extension.

3. Consultation

Neighbours consultation:

No.s 110 and 114 have been notified of the application and a site notice has also been displayed at the site from the 18th July 2018.

One representation has been received. The comment received raises concerns regarding increase pressure on the availability of parking spaces during construction, that additional cars parked on the road would reduce visibility of residents leaving their drive ways and may hinder the access for the emergency services. It was also questioned if restrictions would be placed on the time at which building works are permitted.

Transport consultation:

The RBC Transport Development Control Officer provided the following comments:

There are no transport objections as the proposed development will have no transport implications. The proposal is acceptable in Transport terms in that it will retain the

existing parking provision on the driveway at the front of the property which complies with the requirements within the Council's adopted Parking Standards and Design SPD. There are no change to the existing access arrangements.

4. Plans and Documents Considered

The Council, in reaching its recommendation, has taken into consideration the following plans & documents:

Drawing Title:

- 112, Mayfield Drive, Caversham, Reading, RG4 5JT (Location Plan)
- Block Plan 1:200
- Google Maps

As received: 13/07/2018

- Proposed First Floor Extension For Mr & Mrs J. Wooldridge, 112 Mayfield Drive, Caversham - Existing Front View; Proposed Front View (Revised Showing Reduced Height of New Roof & 1 Mtr Set Back)
- Proposed First Floor Extension For Mr & Mrs J. Wooldridge, 112 Mayfield Drive, Caversham - Existing Side Elevation; Proposed Side Elevation (Revised Version As Advised By Tom French)
- Proposed First Floor Plan of Proposed First Floor Extension For Mr & Mrs J. Wooldridge, 112 Mayfield Drive, Caversham (Revised Version As Advised By Tom French)

As received: 26/09/2018

- Proposed First Floor Extension For Mr & Mrs J. Wooldridge, 112 Mayfield Drive, Caversham - Revised Rear Elevation As Advised By Tom French, Showing Reduced Ridgeline

As received: 01/10/2018

5. Relevant Planning History

None

6. 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.

7. Relevant Planning Guidance

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’) 2012 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:

8. Relevant Policies

The application has been assessed against the following policies:

National

National Planning Policy Framework;
National Planning Policy Guidance;

RBC Local Development Framework

Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015)

CS7 Design and the Public Realm

Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015)

DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity)

DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

DM10 (Amenity Space)

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

9. Appraisal

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

Being to the side of the application property, the proposed extension would be visible from the street scene along Mayfield Drive. Considering the scale and massing of the host building and existing attached garage, combined with the extension complying with the general thrust of SPD guidance and the proposed extension would be increasing the existing footprint of the property, in terms of scale the proposed development would not be significantly out of character with the host dwelling or surrounding area. The proposal would be set back from the existing front elevation of the garage by 1m and set down from the ridge of the main roof by 0.6m. As such the proposal would appear subservient

to, and in proportion with, the main house. The existing spaciousness to the boundary would be retained and the proposal would not appear unduly cramped.

The extension would not project beyond the existing attached garage or single storey ground floor rear extension. Made with materials to match existing and a hipped roof to match the main house, the proposal is considered to integrate satisfactorily with the character of the host dwelling and visual amenity of the surrounding area.

The host dwelling would retain sufficient amenity space to the rear elevation, which is considered adequate for a dwelling of this size and relative to the character of amenity spaces to surrounding dwellings.

The proposal would accord with Policies CS7, DM9 and DM10, as well as the SPD guidance on side extensions.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

The neighbouring properties potentially affected by the proposed development are 110 and 114 Mayfield Drive, located to the south and north of the application site respectively.

The proposed development would be to the south of the application property and therefore would not affect the amenity of the adjoining neighbour at no.114.

With regards to no.110, the existing 1m gap to the common boundary would be retained; the proposed extension would be to the north of no.110 and would not project beyond either the front or rear elevations of no.112. As such it is considered that, whilst acknowledging a change in context, the proposal would not have any significant detrimental impacts upon the amenity of no.110 in terms of overbearing effect or loss of light.

Two first floor side facing windows are proposed. One would serve the proposed bathroom and as such it is considered reasonable to attach a condition stating that the window must be of obscured glaze and non-opening below 1.7m; in order to safeguard the amenities of no.110 from overlooking and loss of privacy.

The rearward first floor side facing window is shown to serve what appears to be a proposed living/dining/kitchen room. As existing there is a first floor side facing window located towards the rear of the application property. Whilst acknowledging this context, the proposed window will be significantly closer to the boundary with No. 110 than existing. It is therefore considered that the proposed side facing window would significantly alter the existing situation in terms of privacy and overlooking. As such it is that the proposed first floor side facing window would result in a significant detrimental impact on the living environment of occupiers of neighbouring no.110 and is therefore required via condition to be obscure glazed and fixed shut upto 1.7m (floor to ceiling height). The room would be served by a second window on the rear elevation (which would not be obscure glazed), which is considered adequate.

In addition, a condition will detail that no further windows on the side elevation at first floor level shall be installed without the consent of the local planning authority (again to protect neighbouring amenity).

Subject to conditions the proposal accords with Policy DM4.

Other Issues

Use

Although the floor plans indicate a living/dining/kitchen at first floor, there is nothing in itself to suggest that a separate dwelling is sought to be created by the proposal. It is therefore not considered necessary to include a condition restricting the use of the extension to be purely ancillary to the single dwellinghouse. In any event this would require separate permission (if sought in the future).

Community Infrastructure Levy

The proposal would not be liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Transport

Following the consultation response from the RBC Transport Development Control Officer (see above) and considering that the proposed development would not alter the existing parking provision, there are no transport related objection to the proposal.

Neighbour consultation response

As advised by the RBC Transport Development Control Officer the proposed development would provide sufficient off road parking to the front elevation to accord with the council's adopted Parking Standards and Design SPD and there is no proposed alteration to the existing access. As such it is not considered that the provision of off road parking spaces should form a reason for refusal of this application.

Whilst it is not considered necessary to control hours of work by condition, the developer is reminded that construction and demolition associated with the approved development will be subject to environmental health law. An informative to this effect is considered sufficient.

10. Recommendation

Grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission was granted.

Reason: to prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions, and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of this development shall match those of the existing building.

Reason: To ensure that the new development appears in keeping with the existing building, in the interests of the character of the area, in accordance Policy DM9 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015).

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Proposed First Floor Extension For Mr & Mrs J. Wooldridge, 112 Mayfield Drive, Caversham - Existing Front View; Proposed Front View (Revised Showing Reduced Height of New Roof & 1 Mtr Set Back)
- Proposed First Floor Extension For Mr & Mrs J. Wooldridge, 112 Mayfield Drive, Caversham - Existing Side Elevation; Proposed Side Elevation (Revised Version As Advised By Tom French)
- Proposed First Floor Plan of Proposed First Floor Extension For Mr & Mrs J. Wooldridge, 112 Mayfield Drive, Caversham (Revised Version As Advised By Tom French)

As received: 26/09/2018

- Proposed First Floor Extension For Mr & Mrs J. Wooldridge, 112 Mayfield Drive, Caversham - Revised Rear Elevation As Advised By Tom French, Showing Reduced Ridgeline

As received: 01/10/2018

Reason: because permission is granted in respect of the development as detailed in the approved plans only.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order) the two proposed first floor side elevation windows hereby approved shall be non-opening and glazed with obscure glass on parts below 1.7m as a minimum when measured from the floor level of the respective rooms, before occupation of that room, and shall be permanently maintained thereafter as non-opening and obscure glazed.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises from overlooking and loss of privacy in accordance with Policy DM4 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015).

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and/or reenacting that Order) no further windows (above and beyond the two windows shown on the side elevation plans hereby approved) shall at any time be placed in the side first floor

elevations of the first floor extension hereby permitted without the grant of a separate planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises from overlooking and loss of privacy in accordance with Policy DM4 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015).

Informatives

1. Your attention is drawn to the terms and conditions of this permission. Any development which is carried out but which differs materially from the approved plans and details, or does not comply with any condition(s) or planning obligation(s) attached to the permission may result in the Council taking action to remedy the breach of planning control. If you are in any doubt please contact the Council.
2. The applicant's attention is drawn to Building Regulations requirements. Please contact Building Control on 0118 937 2449 for advice.
3. The construction (and demolition) of the development will be subject to environmental health law and the applicant is referred to:
<http://beta.reading.gov.uk/environmentalprotection>
4. The decision to grant planning permission follows the positive and proactive consideration of the issues raised by this planning application and issuing the decision within the agreed time period.