

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Caversham

App Ref: 211919/HOU

Address: 18 Donkin Hill, Caversham, Reading, RG4 5DG

Proposals: Part one, part two storey side and rear extension

Case Officer: Tom Hughes

Applicant: Mr W Khan

Date received (valid from): 26 November 2021

Target Decision date: 21 January 2022

1. INTRODUCTION

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached property, located close to the junction with Anglefield Road. The site topography rises steeply in a northerly direction, such that the property is set comfortably above the highway. A wide plot frontage tapers to the rear. The surrounding area is residential in character.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for a part one, part two storey side and rear extension. The proposal would stagger to the side, following the tapered boundary, projecting to a maximum depth of 3.6m to the rear. The first floor element would be set back from the principal elevation, and set away from the boundary with 16 Donkin Hill.

The agent supplied the following, received on 26/11/21:

Site Location

Block Plan

Drawing No: DH-02 - Existing Floor and Roof Plans and Elevations

Drawing No: DH-03 - Proposed Floor and Roof Plans

Drawing No: DH-04 - Proposed Elevations

The original proposal included a deeper first floor element, projecting to the same depth as the ground floor. The agent was advised that due to the depth of this first floor element, the extension would have a bulky and over-scaled appearance, causing some visual dominance and overbearing effects to 16 Donkin Hill. The agent was invited to supply suitably amended plans to address this concern.

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received on 10/01/22:

Drawing No: DH-03 Rev. A - Proposed Floor and Roof Plans

Drawing No: DH-04 Rev. A - Proposed Elevations

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

210259/HOU - Two storey side and rear extension with front porch - Refused 26/06/21
Officer note: the application was refused as the extension was deemed bulky and out of proportion with the original property, with a detrimental impact in terms of its appearance. A second reason for refusal related to harm to the amenities of 16 Donkin Hill, due to the proximity of the first floor element to the shared boundary

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter:

1 Anglefield Road, Caversham, Reading, RG4 0HP

20 Donkin Hill, Caversham, Reading, Berkshire, RG4 5DG

16 Donkin Hill, Caversham, Reading, RG4 5DG

- 4.2 Letters of representation have been received as follows:
None.

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)

Design Guide to House Extensions SPD (2021)

6. APPRAISAL

H9 states: An extension to a house will be acceptable where it:

- A. Respects the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design;

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- detract from the appearance of the original building through the use of ill-matching materials and by not fitting in with the design, scale and proportions of the original building; **No, the amendment addresses the concerns raised, and overcomes the reason for refusal of application 210259/HOU. The set back, set down and step in of the first floor sideward element ensure that the proposal retains a subservient appearance. The reduction in depth of the first floor rearward element sufficiently reduces the overall bulk of the extension, such that no significant harm would be caused to the overall appearance of the property**
- reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree; **No, while the proposal represents a significant enlargement of the property, a sufficient amount of usable amenity space is retained to the rear**
- require the loss of trees in the garden or put significant trees at risk; **No**

- B. 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; Respects neighbour's amenities and does not present a large blank façade to public areas.

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- significantly reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight enjoyed by neighbouring properties; **No, the first floor rearward element would be set away from the boundary with 16 Donkin Hill by 2m, comfortably avoiding a 45 degree line. The depth and height of the ground floor element is not considered to cause any significant degree of light loss to the property. The impact of the extension on the adjacent property is mitigated by the sloping site topography and angled orientation of the properties**
- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **No, the proposed fenestration is not considered to cause a significantly greater degree of overlooking than the existing first floor windows**
- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **No, the amendment suitably addresses the concerns raised, with the resultant proposal achieving an appropriate degree of subservience to the original property, and no significant harm caused to the character of the area**
- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **No, materials have been selected to match those of the existing property**

CC8: Safeguarding Amenity 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.

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties in terms of:

- Privacy and overlooking; **No, see above**
- Access to sunlight and daylight; **No, see above**
- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development; **No, the first floor rearward element would be set away from the boundary with 16 Donkin Hill by 2m, comfortably avoiding a 45 degree line. The depth and height of the ground floor element is not considered to cause any significant degree of visual dominance or overbearing effects to this property. The impact of the extension on the adjacent property is mitigated by the sloping site topography and angled orientation of the properties**
- Noise and disturbance; **No**
- Artificial lighting; **No**
- Vibration; **No**
- Dust and fumes; **No**
- Smell; **No**
- Crime and safety. **No**

7. CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed and the proposed works are considered to be in accordance with the above relevant policies and planning permission can be granted.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

Application Permitted