

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Whitley

App Ref: 211308/HOU

Address: 4 Wincanton Road, Reading, RG2 8PB

Proposals: Rear and side double-storey extension.

Case Officer: James Schofield

Applicant: Yasin Marouf

Date received (valid from): 11 August 2021

Target Decision date: 1 December 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

4 Wincanton Road is a two storey semi-detached dwelling, located close to the junction with Blandford Road. The dwelling is set within a splayed plot, which tapers to the rear. A large flat roof outbuilding is located to the end of the rear garden, noted on the submitted plans as used for storage. A further small outbuilding is located to the side of the dwelling. The surrounding area has a residential character, comprised of properties of similar styles and design.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for a part one, part two storey front, side and rear extension. The existing outbuilding to the side of the dwelling would be demolished to facilitate the proposal. At the ground floor the extension would project forward of the principal elevation by 1.8m and to the rear by 3.5m, tapering to follow the splay of the sideward boundary. At the first floor the extension would be set back slightly from the principal elevation, wrapping around the dwelling and projecting to the same depth at the rear. Additionally, the existing outbuilding at the end of the rear garden would be converted to habitable accommodation.

The agent supplied the following, received on 10/08/21:

Site Location

Existing Site Plan

Drawing No: A 03 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Drawing No: A 04 - Proposed First Floor Plan

Drawing No: A 02 - Existing Elevations

Drawing No: A 05 - Proposed Elevations

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received on 11/08/21:

Drawing No: A 06 - Proposed Site Plan

Drawing No: A 01 - Existing Floor Plans

The original proposal was for a larger extension, without set back from the principal elevation and extending out to the sideward boundary. The agent was advised on 11/10/21 of concerns held with the proposal relating to its scale and lack of subservice.

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received on 30/11/21:

Drawing No: A 06 - Proposed Site Plan

Drawing No: A 03 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Drawing No: A 04 - Proposed First Floor Plan

Drawing No: A 05 - Proposed Elevations

The amendments proposed minimal changes to the original scheme. The agent was advised on 18/01/22 that the amendments had not addressed the original concerns.

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received on 22/02/22:

Drawing No: A 06 - Proposed Site Plan

Drawing No: A 03 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Drawing No: A 04 - Proposed First Floor Plan

Drawing No: A 05 - Proposed Elevations

These amended plans are described above, and are the basis for the determination of the application.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

040177/FUL - Single storey front and rear extension, two storey side extension - Refused 06/05/04

051177/FUL - Two storey side and rear extension, front porch and internal alterations - Permitted 30/01/06

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter and a site notice was displayed:

6 Wincanton Road, Reading, RG2 8PB

131 Blandford Road, Reading, RG2 8RU

2 Wincanton Road, Reading, RG2 8PB

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)

Policy CC7 - Design and the Public Realm

Policy CC8 - Safeguarding Amenity

Policy H9 - House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

Design Guide to House Extensions SPD (2021)

6. APPRAISAL

Policy H9 states that an extension to a house will be acceptable where it respects the character and appearance of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design. The Design Guide to House Extensions SPD describes the design principles against which proposals will be judged. The SPD states '*proposals that appear bulky and sizeable in relation to the existing dwelling will not be considered favourably*'. There is a requirement that extensions complement the design of, and do not appear overbearing to, the existing dwelling.

It is acknowledged that the dwelling is set within a comfortable plot, and could accommodate extensions to the side and rear. However, such an extension must be sensitively designed to ensure compliance with the policy objectives outlined above. The proposed extension would approximately double the footprint of the original dwelling. While some attempt has been made to reduce the size of the extension, through two sets of amendments, the proposal still has an over-scaled appearance disproportionate and not subservient to the original dwelling. Given the splayed plot, the extension would be clearly visible from public areas. The largely blank sideward elevations do not aid the appearance of the extension. By virtue of its width and projection forward, the extension would unbalance not only the original dwelling but also the semi-detached pair. This would be to the detriment of the overall character and appearance of the area.

The extension appears to have been designed to maximise the space available, originally extending up to the boundary and following its splay. Though now set away slightly from the sideward boundary, the extension has a contrived and awkward appearance, with the roofscape being particularly jarring. For these reasons, the proposed extension is of poor design and would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the surrounding area.

4 Wincanton Road has a regular orientation, facing onto the highway. A common feature of the surrounding residential area is for semi-detached pairs of dwellings at road junctions to be oriented at 45 degrees to the highway. This is the case for the adjacent semi-detached pair, and results in the splayed boundary as described above. Due to the splayed boundary, the rear of the adjacent property at 2 Wincanton Road is angled towards the application site. This relationship exacerbates the impact of any extension to no. 4. Though the proposed extension has now been set slightly off the sideward boundary, it would still project at great height and depth in close proximity to it. Due to this relationship, the proposed extension would cause significant harm to the residential amenities of no. 2 in terms of visual dominance and overbearing effects.

Though not listed in the description of development, the Proposed Ground Floor Plan shows the existing outbuilding to the rear of the site to be converted to habitable accommodation. Policy H9 states that ancillary accommodation will be acceptable where it would not be capable of operating as a separate dwelling which could be let or sold separately. Ancillary accommodation could be considered a separate dwelling where it is self-sufficient in terms of facilities; has its own front door without internal links to the main house; or has its own external facilities or has scope for these to be easily created. The outbuilding is large and proposes the installation of bathroom facilities. It is considered that there is scope to include kitchen facilities too, given its size. The outbuilding has its own front door and would have direct access to the front of the property. On this basis, and without evidence to the contrary, it is considered that the outbuilding would be capable of operating as a self-contained dwelling which could be let or sold separately.

7. CONCLUSION

Due to its scale and bulk and awkwardly contrived design, the extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and surrounding area, and harm to

neighbouring residential amenities. There is also a very reasonable prospect of the outbuilding operating as a self-contained dwelling. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to the identified policy and is recommended for refusal on this basis.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

Application Refused