

## **DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT**

**Application No:** 220415/HOU

**Address:** 6 The Horse Close

**Proposal:** Single storey side extension

**Extended Target date:** 01/06/22

**Case officer:** Connie Davis

### **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application site is a chalet bungalow located on the northern side of The Horse Close. There is a detached garage located at the side of the property which has a plastic car port attached to the front of the garage.

The surrounding area is residential, comprising of bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey dwellings. The site is not listed, nor in a conservation area.

### **Proposal:**

Planning permission is sought for a single storey side extension. It would have a width of 5.7m and a depth of 8.4m. It would be set back from the front elevation by 2.6m and would be level with the existing rear elevation. The eaves height would be 2.2m and maximum height of 4.1m. It would be set off the boundary with no. 7 The Horse Close by 0.5m.

The extension would have a hipped/flat roof with roof lights.

Materials have been selected to be in keeping with the existing property.

### **Plans Considered:**

B127561 - 1000 A - Existing Block Plan

B127561 - 3000 A - Proposed Block Plan

### **Received 26<sup>th</sup> May 2022**

B127561 - 1100 C - Existing Drawings

B127561 - 3100 D - Proposed Drawings

### **Received 25<sup>th</sup> May 2022**

Location Plan

Site Photographs

Application Form

CIL Form

### **Received 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2022**

### **Relevant Planning History:**

None.

### **Consultation Responses:**

### **Internal Consultees**

**Transport** - No objection subject to condition

### **External Consultation**

The following addresses were formally consulted via letter on 06/04/22:

5, 7, 8, 9 The Horse Close  
108 Peppard Road

In addition, a site notice was displayed.

No responses have been received.

### **Discussions with applicant/ agent**

The agent was contacted to reduce the width of the extension by approx. 1m to allow greater gapping with no. 7 and so the width is more in line with the width of the main dwelling. This change was not made by the applicant, rather, a reduction in the eaves height of the extension was made.

### **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.

### **Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance**

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**

National Planning Policy Framework;  
National Planning Policy Guidance;

#### **Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)**

CC7 Design and the Public Realm  
CC8 Safeguarding Amenity  
H9 House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation  
H10 Private and Communal Outdoor Space  
TR3 Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters

Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2021)

### **Appraisal Checklist**

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 proposal is considered of an acceptable scale and siting in relation to the main property. It would be set back from the existing front elevation and set down from the ridge of the main house. The proposed roof form is considered to suitably integrate and the development has been set off the shared boundary by an acceptable degree given the varied gapping along the Close. The existing garage is already in close proximity to the boundary and therefore in visual terms, the side extension would not be considered overly dissimilar to the existing situation.
  - Reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree; **NO**
  - 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 appearance of the street as a whole in terms of scale, location, materials and design, the arrangement of doors, windows and other principal architectural features and any important existing building line;
- & C. Does not present an overbearing impact on neighbours or 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 extension would not project past the rear elevation of no. 5 The Horse Close (to the north-west) and therefore would not result in a loss of light to this neighbour.

The extension would project 3m beyond the staggered rear elevation of no. 7 (to the south east). This neighbour has a ground floor level window in proximity to the boundary and is on a lower ground level than the application site.

Officers raised initial concern that the extension due to the proximity to the boundary and the change in ground levels, would be considered overbearing from the rear amenity space of this neighbour. However on balance, due to the combination of the modest depth of the extension past the neighbouring rear elevation, the window in question serving a bathroom (non-habitable room) and the majority of amenity space being located away from the boundary, the extension would not be considered to result in a substantially harmful loss of light or overbearing impacts. During the course of the application, the eaves height of the extension was reduced from 3.3m to 2.2m on the boundary which is also comparable to the height of the neighbouring boundary treatment. As such, its prominence from the neighbouring site has been reduced.

A boundary fence is also proposed to be erected on the boundary with no. 7 to further screen the development.

- Invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **NO**, no side windows are proposed. Rear and front facing windows would not result in a more harmful loss of privacy than the existing front and rear window configuration.
- Detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **NO**, The Horse Close is varied with a variety of style and size of dwellings and so would not detract from the wider street scene.
- Detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **NO**, materials are proposed to match the host dwelling, with the exception of rear fenestration which is considered acceptable given their limited visibility within the street scene.

D. Does not result in a loss of biodiversity within garden - **NO**

E. Ancillary accommodation, such as granny annexes, will be acceptable where it would not be capable of operating as a separate dwelling which could be let or sold separately - **NO**

**CC8: 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:

- Privacy and overlooking; **No**
- Access to sunlight and daylight; **No**
- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development; **No**
- Harm to outlook; **No**
- Noise and disturbance; **No**
- Artificial lighting; **No**
- Vibration; **No**
- Dust and fumes; **No**
- Smell; **No**
- Crime and safety; **No** or
- Wind, where the proposals involve new development of more than 8 storeys - **N/A**.

### **Other Matters**

#### **Transport**

The proposal will result in the loss of the detached garage. However, 2 parking spaces can be satisfactorily provided on site. No changes are proposed to the existing access with no extension to the existing dropped kerb. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in relation to Policy TR3 subject to condition that the vehicle parking spaces are provided in accordance with the approved plans.

#### **Conclusion**

The proposed development would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the site or its surroundings and would not have a detrimental impact on the original building or neighbouring properties. As such the proposed works are considered to be in accordance with CC7 (Design and the Public Realm), CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) and H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) along with the Councils Supplementary Planning Guidance A Design Guide to House Extensions 2021).

## **RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION**

### **Conditions**

1. Time Limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials as specified
4. Parking as specified

### **Informatives**

1. Building Control
2. Construction & Demolition
3. Terms
4. Encroachment
5. Highways
6. Do not damage the verge
7. Positive and Proactive