
**19 GROSVENOR ROAD
CAVERSHAM
READING
RG4 5EJ**

PLANNING SUPPORTING STATEMENT

Day Tanner Ltd
Suite 1A, Market House
19/21 Market Place
Wokingham
RG40 1AP

February 2018

1 Summary

- 1.1 This statement accompanies the submission on behalf of our clients of our house holder planning application for extensions to the dwelling at 19 Grosvenor Road, Reading.
- 1.2 Planning application reference 162359 was submitted for the erection of a single storey side extension with accommodation in the roofspace on the east side following the demolition of the existing garage, a single storey rear extension with terrace above, a rear verandah and a single storey extension to the west side but was withdrawn by notice dated 17 February 2017 following concerns raised by the planning officer, Mr Jonathan Markwell.
- 1.3 The main points of contention expressed at that time were that the side extension was considered to be out of scale and character with the existing house and that the first floor level roof terrace and screen would constitute an incongruous addition to the house and result in unacceptable amenity impacts on the neighbouring property. The ground floor extension of itself was considered to be an appropriate addition in the context of established development in the area.
- 1.4 Since then we have sought formal pre-application advice from officers on a number of schemes, and which now forms the basis of this submission, with the latest advice from Mr Richard Eatough in an email dated 19 February 2018 saying, informally, that the scheme “looks better”.

2 The Site

- 2.1 The site is located on the southern side of the northern section of Grosvenor Road, close to the junction with Greystoke Road, and within a private residential enclave off Peppard Road, approximately 1 km to the north of Caversham and within easy reach of the town centre.
- 2.2 The existing building is of substantial construction and sits to the western side of a large plot, which in the context of others plots in the immediate area,

appears double the width. The house follows an established building line along the road and is two storey with some accommodation in the roof.

- 2.3 The roof form is varied, with a full hip to the western end and a forward projecting gable to the eastern end, and with a small gable element sitting above the east facing roofslope, as shown in the image below.



Figure 1: Existing house viewed from Grosvenor Road

- 2.4 According to the Environment Agency Interactive Flood maps the site is not within an area liable to flooding and the house is not listed. The site lies within a wholly residential area and there is evidence of other houses in the vicinity having extensions approved, including directly opposite the site at no. 24 Grosvenor Road.
- 2.5 Grosvenor Road is a private road within a residential area of mixed housing, including large detached properties on generously-sized plots and more densely developed blocks of terraced housing.
- 2.6 The prevailing scale of development in the area is two and three storey and of Victorian/Edwardian and Georgian appearance, although some later developments maybe exhibit less detail. There is a fairly distinct building line along Grosvenor Road and generally provision for off-road car parking.
- 2.7 Materials used in the area tend to be a mix of facing bricks with render panels in evidence and tile hanging to old and newer buildings. Roofing materials tend

to be a mix of clay and slate tiles. Examples of other properties close to the site are shown overleaf.



Figure 2: 2 storey detached houses immediately to west at nos 17 & 17A



Figure 3: Semi-detached Georgian houses to the west at nos 15 & 13

3.0 Proposals

- 3.1 The main changes to the scheme as now proposed over the previously withdrawn application are a substantial reduction in the scale of the side extension and removal of the previously proposed roof terrace and screen to the rear. The previous application also proposed an attached garage following removal of an existing detached garage on the eastern side and which may have added to the perception of unacceptable scale.
- 3.2 The current application reduces the width of the side extension considerably over the previously withdrawn scheme and proposes a detached garage to replace the existing garage on the eastern side of the plot. An existing outbuilding to the rear would be retained with this current application, linking to the rear kitchen extension, with the roof raised by 330mm and incorporating a rooflight.
- 3.3 We have removed the roof terrace and screens from the rear extension which would maintain a flat roof, also with a rooflight, and with a large glazed folding door system to take full advantage of the southern aspect to the rear and allow ease of transition from the internal to external spaces.
- 3.4 The proposed side extension has been pulled away from the eastern boundary over that previously proposed and with the garage now detached there is a greater sense of space to the eastern side of the plot. The side extension itself is set down from the main ridge and set back from the existing front wall, creating a clearly subservient addition, and the design maintains the hipped nature of the existing roof. A dormer is proposed to the front elevation with a pitched roof matching the angle of the existing gable to the front and with a flat roofed dormer to the rear to maintain continuity with the existing dormers to the rear.
- 3.5 It should be noted that our clients are committed to ensuring that the side extension fits seamlessly with the existing fabric either by using reclaimed or bespoke handmade bricks and by re-pointing the entire front of the house.

4 Development Plan

4.1 The main policy considerations for householder extensions applications would appear to be Policy DM9 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document and the Councils SPG on House Extensions.

4.2 **Policy DM9** states that an extension to a house will be acceptable where it:

- Respects the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design;
- 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; and
- Does not present a large blank façade to public areas.

4.3 The **SPG** on house extensions states that side extensions should normally be designed to be smaller in scale than the main house, which can be achieved by setting the roofline down from the main ridge and setting the proposed front elevation back in from the original front elevation.

5 Policy Appraisal

5.1 Having regard to the above guidance, the extensions are considered to be respectful of the host dwelling and the character of the area more generally and allow the resultant building to sit comfortably on the plot with breathing space to the side boundaries.

5.2 It is noted from the streetscene drawings that the house at No. 21 is a small bungalow and this may have been seen as a constraint to development on the subject site. However, we are aware that the new owners of no. 21 are considering submitting an application for extensions to or replacement of that dwelling which could reasonably be assumed to result in a two, or possibly 3, storey dwelling on that site. Of course, a determination can only be made on what exists at the time but it is considered here that the distance of the side extension from the eastern boundary and with the lower roof of the garage within the gap, the proposals do not overwhelm No.21 as it stands and would not preclude further development on that site.

- 5.3 The extension to the rear of the house is not considered to be particularly contentious and was found previously to be acceptable. It is separated from the western boundary by the existing outbuilding to be retained and is set off the boundary by 2 metres. There is no roof terrace proposed and it is noted that it was that element together with the screening panels that caused concern to the owner of No.17a at that time.
- 5.4 We have been through a number of iterations with this project trying to meet the restrictions of planning guidance whilst also meeting our client's requirements for additional space and circulation. We are of the opinion that the current scheme is an appropriate response to those varying requirements and that the resultant building would sit comfortably in the streetscene without detriment to the amenities currently enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers.
- 5.5 Given the nature of the site and the somewhat varied character of the area we are hopeful that this scheme can be viewed favourably by officers and that planning consent will be forthcoming.

February 2018