

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Kentwood

App Ref: 240389/HOU

Address: 16 Overlanders End, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6PS

Proposals: Single storey front extension.

Case Officer: James Schofield

Applicant: Mr Balavignesh Selvakumar

Target Decision date: Originally 29th May 2024; EOT agreed until 28 June 2024

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is a mid-terrace dwelling at the end of a cul-de-sac. Dwellings are on the north and western side of the road, while the southern side is principally used for car parking. The dwellings typically have a front projection, originally for garages, but in some cases these have been converted to internal space for the host dwelling. Each site, including the proposal site, has a driveway capable of accommodating at least one parked car.

Site visit date: 25/06/2024

Site visit photos:



2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Single storey front extension. Plans considered:

Location Plan

Dwg No. PL-10 Existing and proposed block plans

Dwg No. PL-11 Existing ground and first floor plans

Dwg No. PL-12 Proposed ground floor plans

Dwg No. PL-13 Existing front and LHS elevations

Dwg No. PL-14 Existing rear and RHS elevations

Dwg No. PL-15 Proposed front and LHS elevations

Dwg No. PL-16 Rear and RHS elevations

As received on the 27th of March 2024

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

15 Overlanders End, Tilehurst, Reading Rg, 31 6PS

92 Overdown Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6NJ
17 Overlanders End, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6PS

Two letters of representation have been received as follows:

The adjacent neighbour at number 17 Overlanders End regarding various details which could impact upon their front projection including the gutters and the re-routing of an existing extraction vent of a downstairs toilet. While these are important matters, they are not planning matters, and the resident is encouraged to look into ensuring any and all arrangements and agreements they make work within the legal [framework of the Party-Wall Act](#).

Another neighbour submitted a comment which concerns the side-facing window on the proposed front projection. The comment suggests obscure-glazing, and while this is discussed below in the amenity section of this report, suffice it to say that the planning officer agrees with this and is the formal recommendation.

Transport Officer

The transport officer was concerned that the level of on-site car-parking would reduce from two spots to 1, and requested an amended parking plan showing two-parking spots on site. It is noted that the transport plan only contains parking spot maximums and that the level of parking offered by the site, and the wider road, would appear to be sufficient and the council would prefer not to require the loss of a front garden area in this instance. Should car parking become an issue in the future the resident is capable of expanding their on-site car parking provision under permitted development rules.

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.

5. LEGAL AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

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. Material considerations include relevant policies in the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) - among them the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework 2024

National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 onwards

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

TR3 (Access Traffic and Highway-related Matters)

TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD 2011

6. APPRAISAL

Character and Appearance

Policy H9 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 and 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. Policy CC7 also sets out relevant considerations for design.

The design of the proposal appears to closely resemble the prevailing design of dwellings on this street, and it is noted that the front projection would be less than half the width of the host dwelling and not extend beyond the front projection of the neighbour. The proposed materials would match the host dwelling which is appropriate.

This analysis reveals that while front projections of this size and scale are normally resisted by the council, in this instance the particular design of the dwellings on the street ensure the proposal is sympathetic in this instance. As such, the proposal is deemed to accord with local policies CC7 and H9.

Residential Amenity

Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not result in an overbearing impact on neighbours. Policy H10 seeks to ensure that the amenity of gardens and other outdoor areas are not compromised. Policy CC8 states an extension to a house will be acceptable where it will not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties.

Given the location and scale of the proposal relative to the layout of neighbouring dwellings, the capability for this proposal to negatively impact the residential amenity of neighbouring sites is limited. However, the side-facing window pictured in Elevation A on Dwg No PL-15 could result in views into adjacent front windows of adjacent sites. However, a condition requiring this window be obscure-glazed is considered sufficient.

As such, with this condition in place, the proposal would accord with the amenity considerations of local policies CC8 and H9.

Transport

As discussed above in relation to a response from our Transport officer, a reduction in the amount of on-site car parking would result from the proposal. However, not beyond the threshold or to such an extent that it would impact the safe operation of a public road. The area is reasonably well served by public transport being close to Tilehurst train station. It is the goal of adopted policy to encourage a gradual shift toward the use of public transport, and allowing for a natural gradual reduction in the level of car parking, where safety would not be impacted, is part of achieving this strategy. It is noted that requiring the reconfiguration of the front garden to accommodate two spots would result in the loss of much of the remaining garden, and that this is counter to other policy goals of the council which seek to retain front gardens and public facing green areas.

7. CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed as set out above and is considered to be acceptable on that basis, subject to the following conditions.

8. RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Conditions:

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to match
4. Obscure glazed window