

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Park

App Ref: 211981/HOU

Address: 85 Hamilton Road, Reading, RG1 5RB

Proposals: Demolition of existing garage and replacement with new single garage. 3 storey rear extension with basement extension following demolition of rear outhouse extension. Removal of single pier to front boundary and insertion of new ironwork gate.

Case Officer: Tom Hughes

Applicant: Penchoukova

Date received (valid from): 9 December 2021 **Target Decision date:** 3 February 2022

PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Demolition of existing garage and replacement with new single garage. 3 storey rear extension with basement extension following demolition of rear outhouse extension. Removal of single pier to front boundary and insertion of new ironwork gate.

CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

87a Hamilton Road, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 5RB

90b Bulmershe Road, Reading, RG1 5RL

87a Hamilton Road, Reading, RG1 5RB

83 Hamilton Road, Reading, RG1 5RB

83a Hamilton Road, Reading, RG1 5RB

Flat 10, 83 Hamilton Road, Reading, RG1 5RB

Flat 9, 83 Hamilton Road, Reading, RG1 5RB

Flat 8, 83 Hamilton Road, Reading, RG1 5RB

Flat 7, 83 Hamilton Road, Reading, RG1 5RB

Flat 6, 83 Hamilton Road, Reading, RG1 5RB

Letters of representation have been received from 85 and 87A Hamilton Rd raising matters relating to the lack of measurement on the drawings, subsidence, loss of light to houses and garden areas, damage to property through bridging damp proof course, loss of privacy from new windows, encroachment, odd-shaped roof to garage, rainwater damage, views (outlook from neighbouring side windows), impact on sewerage

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.

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:

Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority in the exercise of its functions to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

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)

EN1 (Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment)

EN3 (Enhancement of Conservation Areas)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

APPRAISAL

The proposed extension would have an over-scaled appearance, lacking a sufficient degree of subservience to the original property. The extent of the proposed crown roof is a clear indicator of an overdevelopment and is not considered to be an acceptable design solution. While the property is set within a sizeable plot and is capable of accommodating a large extension, this should remain subordinate rather than consuming the entirety of the rear of the original property.

Further concerns relate to the internal arrangement of rooms, particularly at the first floor. The upper floor side-facing windows would be fitted with obscure-glazing, to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties. However, this would result in bedroom 4 being served with an obscure-glazed window only - this is not considered to afford a suitable outlook. It is reasonable to require a bedroom to be provided with a clear-glazed window. Given the requirement for upper floor sideward windows to be obscure-glazed, this arrangement of rooms is not considered to be acceptable.

The reconstruction of the garage is considered to be broadly acceptable, but confirmation that the entirety of it would be within the curtilage of the site, including guttering/rainwater goods.

The application is contrary to Policies CC7, CC8 and EN3 of the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Application Refused

Reasons:

1. By virtue of its excessive width and depth, the rear extension would have an over-scaled appearance disproportionate, and not subservient, to the original dwelling. The resultant extension would cause significant detrimental harm to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the wider Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore of poor design which is contrary to Policies CC7, EN1, EN3, EN6 and H9 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) and the Design Guide to House Extensions SPD (2021).
2. By virtue of their proximity to sideward boundaries, significant overlooking/perception of overlooking would occur to 83 and 87a Hamilton Road from the proposed first floor sideward windows. This would cause a significant detrimental impact to the residential amenities of the occupants of 83 and 87a Hamilton Road in terms of loss of privacy through overlooking. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) and the Design Guide to House Extensions SPD (2021).