

## **DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT**

**Ward: Whitley**

**App Ref: 210941/HOU**

**Address: 3 Chagford Road, Reading, RG2 8AY**

**Proposals: Single storey side and rear extension**

**Case Officer: Tom Hughes**

**Applicant: Mr & Mrs Sadowska**

**Date received (valid from): 9 June 2021**

**Target Decision date: 4 August 2021**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling, adjoined at a L-shape to 100 Chagford Road. The eastward site boundary splays out to the rear. The dwelling has a single storey rear extension and an outbuilding to the sideward boundary. The surrounding area is residential in character, comprised of properties of a similar style and design.

### **2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

The proposal is for a single storey side and rear extension, adjoining and enlarging the existing rear extension. The proposal would have a flat roof, with a dummy pitch to the Chagford Road frontage. Roof lights would be located within the section of flat roof.

The agent supplied the following, received on 09/06/21:

Drawing No: 12821-09 - Site Location and Block Plan

Drawing No: 12821-01 - Existing Ground Floor Plan

Drawing No: 12821-02 - Existing First Floor Plan

Drawing No: 12821-03 - Existing Roof Plan

Drawing No: 12821-05 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Drawing No: 12821-06 - Proposed First Floor Plan

Drawing No: 12821-07 - Proposed Roof Plan

Drawing No: 12821-04 - Existing Elevations

Drawing No: 12821-08 - Proposed Elevations

The original proposal was for a larger single storey extension, including the reconstruction of the existing outbuilding to which it would be joined.

The agent was advised on 26/07/21 of concerns held with the proposal. The cumulative impact of the proposal and existing extension would represent a significant overdevelopment of the original dwelling, to the detriment of its character and appearance. The agent was advised of amendments that should be made in order to address these concerns.

Subsequently the agent supplied the following, received on 24/09/21:

Drawing No: 12821-05 Rev. A - Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Drawing No: 12821-06 Rev. A - Proposed First Floor Plan

Drawing No: 12821-08 Rev. A - Proposed Elevations

The agent was advised on 28/09/21 that the amendments had not sufficiently addressed the concerns raised, and that the application was subject for refusal.

### **3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

181220/HOU - Single storey rear extension (retrospective) - Refused 16/04/19

#### **4. CONSULTATIONS**

- 4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter:  
100 Chagford Road, Reading, Berkshire, RG2 8AZ  
20 Merton Road North, Reading, Berkshire, RG2 8BA  
1 Chagford Road, Reading, RG2 8AI  
98 Chagford Road, Reading, RG2 8AZ  
18 Merton Road North, Reading, RG2 8BA
- 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 EN12 - Biodiversity and the Green Network  
Policy EN14 - Trees, Hedges and Woodland  
Policy H9 - House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

##### **A 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.

The proposed extension would wraparound the existing dwelling, projecting to a depth in excess of 4m to the rear, with only minimal set back from the principal elevation. The proposal alone

represents a substantial enlargement of the original dwelling. Considered cumulatively with the existing extension and outbuilding, the built form would occupy almost the full width of the plot, creating a mass and bulk that is out of keeping with the general plot coverage in the area. The extension would unduly dominate the original dwelling, and its footprint would be more than doubled. On this basis, insufficient subservience is generated in the design for it to be a sympathetic addition to the original dwelling. By virtue of its depth, unrelenting width and large expanse of flat roof, the proposal significantly detracts from the character and appearance of the original dwelling. This is contrary to Policies CC7 and H9 of the Local Plan, and the Design Guide to House Extensions SPD.

It is accepted that the main bulk of the extension would be largely obscured from public view. Harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area would therefore be less than substantial. However, this lack of harm to the surroundings to not outweigh the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the original dwelling.

Due to the siting of the outbuilding, and the garage at 1 Chagford Road, the proposed development would not cause a significantly greater degree of harm to neighbouring residential amenities than currently occurs.

To conclude, for the reason of significant harm caused to the character and appearance of the original dwelling, the proposal is contrary to Policies CC7 and H9 and the Design Guide SPD, and is recommended for refusal on this basis.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **REFUSE**