

PLANNING REF : 251071
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 21 Milton Rd Milton Road
: Earley, Berks
: RG6 1EN
SUBMITTED BY : The ACER The Whitegates Residents Association
DATE SUBMITTED : 28/05/2025

COMMENTS:

Two Storey Side and Rear Extension plus Garage Conversion to habitable dwelling.

-Objection from ACER, The Whitegates Residents Association

The supporting documentation with this application makes claims that this development is very considerate of the neighbours, however, examination of the drawings shows this application to fall short of this claim in three particular instances. Furthermore, this application does not comply with the relevant sections in the Borough Design Guide or Policy CP3 which requires development to be of appropriate character to the area without detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users and their quality of life.

Please note the following:

1. The existing kitchen extension is inset by one metre from the boundary, in compliance with current practice and in accordance with the Borough Design Guide Principle R16 which includes extensions as described on page 56. The proposed development moves this side wall close to the boundary. This is unacceptable, particularly at second storey level, as this would give a terracing effect contrary to the rhythm of the street where there is clear separation of properties contributing to the character of the area. In addition the visual domination of the two-storey rear extension so close to the boundary will detract from the pleasure of users of the garden at no 3.

2. Extensions are required to be subservient to the main building in order to retain the character of the building and avoid a terracing effect. This requires the extension roof to be lower and the front wall of the extension to be set back from the main house wall. Neither of these requirements are evident in the drawings.

3. The rear roof section of the side extension finishes in a vertical gable end. This is unacceptable as it would both be out of character with the roofs of this area, all of which were constructed as sloping hip-end roofs. In addition the protrusion of the gable end at this location would cut off direct sunlight into the garden of no.3, causing shadowing due to the sun's traverse in the afternoon from the direction of no.5.

4. The statement that the front garden parking will be to high standards is welcomed, but porous hard standing area is not specified, and the green soft landscaping implied on the side of the front garden is not specified. Both Policy TB06 and the Borough Design Guide on page 57 specify porous hard standing and soft landscaping in front gardens used for parking. Plants need to be visible above the fencing if it is to comply with the street scene, which is predominantly green vegetation in front gardens clearly visible when driving along the road.

5. It is ACER's experience that 4 bedroom houses typically have car

ownership of 4 cars. Although the parking provision meets the current WBC Parking Standards, this development would be expected to have overspill parking on the road outside neighbouring properties, which is unacceptable.

Summary: The mass, and domination of the second storey close to the boundary is unacceptable. It needs to be set back by 1 m from the boundary and the gable end needs to be a hip -end to be in character and minimise shadow in the garden of No.3. The extension is not subservient to the main house. The parking area is not clearly specified. ACER therefore request a refusal as not complying with either Design Principle R16 or Policy CP3, which requires development " of an appropriate scale mass build form height" and to "integrate with their surroundings - without detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users and their quality of life".