

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Thames

App Ref: 221756/HOU

Address: 84 Kings Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 8DT

Proposals: Erection of a single storey rear extension and rear roof dormer with 2no. rooflights and 4no solar panels to the front of an existing dwelling.

Case Officer: Ryan Allen

Applicant: Mr Jason & Jonathon Blackmore & Tweedy

Date received (valid from): 6 December 2022 **Target Decision date:** 31 January 2023

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two-storey terrace dwellinghouse located on Kings Road, Caversham. The immediate streetscene is majority residential dwellings, all with a similar character and design. The application site is not a listed building nor does it fall within a conservation area. The site is located in Flood Zone 2.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Planning permission is sought for a single storey, wrap around rear extension. This would measure at approximately: 7m in depth, 4m in width, 2.2m in ground to eaves height & 3.3m in total height. Also included in the proposal is a flat roof dormer to the rear of the property complete with 2no. rooflights. The dormer seeks to measure at approximately: 3.9m in depth, 7.5m in length & 2.4m in height; with a volume of 35.10m³. 4no. solar panels are also proposed to the roof at the front elevation. The proposal is also a PassivHaus project.

Plans considered:

Received 23/11/22

Design & Access Statement rev. A - dated 22/11/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 001 rev. C - Site Location Plan - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 002 rev. C - Existing Site Plan - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 010 rev. C - Existing Ground Floor Plan - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 011 rev. C - Existing First Floor Plan - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 012 rev. C - Existing Loft Plan - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 013 rev. C - Existing Roof Plan - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 020 rev. C - Existing North and South Elevation - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 021 rev. C - Existing East Elevation - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 100 rev. C - Proposed Site Plan - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 110 rev. C - Proposed Ground Floor Plan - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 111 rev. C - Proposed First Floor Plan - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 112 rev. C - Proposed Second Floor Plan - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 113 rev. C - Proposed Roof Plan - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 120 rev. C - Proposed North & South Elevation - dated 10/22

Drawing No: 086-P- 121 rev. C - Proposed East Elevations - dated 10/22

Received 06/12/22

Flood Risk Assessment - dated 05/12/22

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

82 Kings Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 8DT
86 Kings Road, Caversham, Reading, Berkshire, RG4 8DT
325 Gosbrook Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 8DY
327 Gosbrook Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 8DY

Letters of representation have been received as follows:

Comment

We have had positive conversations with 84 Kings Road and while the plans significantly change the property they could become a relative blueprint for the area.

It is noted that the rear extension retains the right to light to adjoining properties but exact detail of the eavesheight (2.3m) for the side return extension and relevant datum point is unclear. With the ground generally sloping down towards the north end of the property the difference between the northern gable and southern section will be noticeably different. We would like to ensure the eave height is taken from the northern end of the extension in order to retain an element of light to the opposing kitchen and living areas. The use of materials will help to limit the impact from the dormer extension but this will have a detrimental effect to light via overshadowing in its own right.

Detail on the gutters or any integrated guttering system aren't clear from drawings or accompanying explanations. Any guttering should not pass the property boundaries or the ability for others to make similar planning applications. Conversations have taken place about making the side return extension part of a shared party wall but the above should be taken into consideration first and foremost.

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
National Planning Practice Guidance

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

EN18 (Flooding and Drainage)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPD

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 proposal's additions to the front of the property are considered to be an attractive restoration to the front elevation, and the efforts to retain certain prevailing streetscene characteristics are welcomed. Although the proposal seeks to bring the front door forward, resulting in the loss of the existing porch to the front elevation, this is a design aspect that's existing on the streets and is not considered to cause detrimental harm to the character of the immediate streetscene. The roof-lights proposed to the front elevation's roof do not deviate from any established local pattern and are present at a number of properties throughout the street. Whilst solar panels do not appear to be present on the streetscene, on balance, any detraction from the local character is considered to be outweighed by their sustainable design and minimal scale.

In contrast, the sheer massing of the proposal is not respectful to the host dwelling, nor the surrounding area. The overall scale of the extensions is not proportionate to the existing property and would result in an overly dominant appearance due to its bulky nature, particularly when referencing the rear dormer. The large rear dormer which proposes to measure at 35.10m³, is of a less than desirable flat-roof design and is excessive in size; contrary to supplementary guidance present in the Reading Borough Council Design Guide to House Extensions SPD (2019). The single storey rear extension contributes to the accumulative bulk and dominant nature of the proposal, although main concerns with this aspect are elaborated upon in the following sub-section.

The proposal's overarching sustainability efforts are considered ambitious and are a welcome addition to the proposal in isolation. However, with exception of the solar panels, the sustainability efforts on the whole do not mitigate the harm posed by the aforementioned design concerns. The sheer scale of the proposal and overall dominance would pose detrimental harm to the host dwelling and surrounding area; concerns that are not offset when balancing the proposal's sustainable retrofit.

Overall, the proposal is contrary to policies CC7 & H9 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019).

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.

As previously referenced, the accumulative effects of the proposal render the bulk of the proposal excessive and overly dominant. This has dovetailing effects on the residential amenity at the site. Particularly when viewed from the rear, the disproportionate and superior nature of the overall proposal would pose an overbearing effect on neighbouring properties, causing a significant detrimental impact on their living environment.

The single storey, wrap around rear extension is of significant concern for officers due to this aspect of the proposal's relationship with neighbouring property, 84 Kings Road. The majority of the terrace houses in the immediate area have the rear side wall off-set from an adjacent neighbouring boundary, with this mirrored at the neighbouring property. This creates a pattern of gaps between properties at the rear. The proposal seeks to close this gap at the application site and extend to the boundary of neighbouring property, 84 Kings Road. Considering no. 84's gap between the boundary and property exists, this would have an overbearing effect on the neighbour and cause a tunnelling effect for current and future residents.

As elaborated on in the previous sub-section, the PassivHaus Approach included in the proposal is considered to be beneficial to the host dwelling, local area and has separate merit. However, these sustainability efforts do not mitigate officer concerns in regards to the proposal as a whole, thus the potential for detrimental harm to residential amenity remains.

Whilst it is acknowledged that certain aspects of the proposal, such as the height of the single storey rear extension, are compliant with certain conditions of Class A, Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 and would therefore be permitted development, the application type the proposal has been submitted under necessitates the proposal to be assessed under the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019). Therefore, as policy CC8 of said local plan states: *'Development will not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties or unacceptable living conditions for new residential properties, in terms of:... Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development... Harm to outlook...'*, alongside policy H9 stating: *'An extension to a house or other householder development will be acceptable where it:... Does not present an overbearing impact on neighbours or a large blank façade to public areas...'*, the proposal is contrary to policies CC8 & H9 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019).

Flood Risk

As the proposal site is within flood zone 2, it is required that a flood risk assessment report be carried out and produced to support this application. The submitted report highlights that the proposed ground floor level will be set at the same level as existing.

It is considered that the proposals will not increase the risk of flooding or compromise the safety of the occupants or neighbours should a 1 in 100 year (FZ2) / 1 in 1000 year (FZ3) flood occur. A compliance condition is recommended to ensure that the measures stated are carried out [*USE Standard Condition SU9*]. This is in accordance with EA Standing Advice and Policy EN18 of the Reading Borough Local Plan.

7. CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed as set out above and is considered to be unacceptable for the reasons set out below.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL

Reasons for Refusal

1. Due to the form, size, bulk, and new roof forms of the proposed rear dormer, the overall development fails to respect the character of the existing house and results in overly dominant features that would be out of proportion with the host dwelling, and would create a discordant and contrived appearance, particularly when viewed from the rear. The extensions would not integrate well with the host property and would fail to constitute subservient additions to the property. Overall, therefore, the proposal would not represent a high quality design, which would be contrary to policies CC7 & H9 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Design Guide to House Extensions (2021).
2. The proposed development by virtue of its proximity to the boundary with 86 Kings Road and excessive scale would cause a detrimental impact to the living environment of the neighbouring property at 86 Kings Road in terms of visual dominance and overbearing effects. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies CC8 & H9 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Design Guide to House Extensions (2021).