

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Application No: 200259/HOU

Address: 11 Holmes Road

Proposal: Proposed ground floor and first floor extension, floor plan redesign, installation of solar panels and all associated works

Case officer: Connie Davis

EOT: 04/02/21

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site is a two storey semi-detached property located on the southern side of Holmes Road. Surrounding properties are largely similar in their size and style (with the exception of the application site) and are greater in terms of height than no. 11. From the front, the property has a bungalow style appearance. The property is finished in brick with white render and has brown timber cladding on the front elevation.

The existing property is haphazard in its current design, having been extended in various non-sympathetic ways over the years. There are projections to different depths at first floor level, areas of flat roof and conservatory additions. It also has a high level boundary wall that faces on to neighbouring property 9 Holmes Road. It has a gable roof over the porch/entrance to the property and mono-pitched roof just on the eastern elevation and the rest of the property has a flat roof. A small dead-end track separates nos. 11 and 15, with no. 13, a commercial premise, at the rear of the application site.

The application site is not listed, nor in a Conservation Area. However, it is within an Air Quality Management Area.



Application site photographed from the rear. To the right is no. 9 Holmes Road

Proposal:

The proposal seeks to extend the property by way of a ground and first floor side/ rear extension. The site is unusual in its configuration with a variety of components extending to

different lengths. There is also a high brick wall on the eastern side elevation which measures a height of 4.4m and a length of 6m. The existing property has a predominately flat roof, other than on the eastern elevation (closest to no 15 where the roof has a pitched side).

At ground floor level, the extension would measure a depth of approx. 4.3m running adjacent to no. 9 Holmes Road. This would replace an existing conservatory. On the southern side of the site, the property is proposed to be extended by 2m and would replace an existing porch area beyond the kitchen/ dining room.

At first floor level, the property would be extended on portions of the building that currently have a flat roof. On the boundary with no. 9, the first-floor element would have a depth of approx. 9.5m (4m of which would be above the extension at ground floor level - labelled 'Sun Room'). On the boundary closest with no. 15, an additional bedroom would be provided by extending to a depth of 4m.

The extensions would result in the property having one consistent height (eaves of approx. 3.2m and maximum height of 5.3m). The existing high-level brick wall is to be retained and extended by 4m as described above, although not to the same height. The additional portion of the wall would have a height of 3.35m. The roof form of this elevation would, change, however, with the introduction of a pitch along the side elevation and would slightly go above the high level wall (where as existing, windows would face on to the neighbouring property).

The entirety of the property would have flat roof with roof lights. Three rear facing Juliette balconies are proposed.

Materials are proposed to generally match the existing property; brickwork with white painted render, clay tiles and fibreglass for the roof and matching windows/ doors.

Plans/ Documents Considered:

Location Plan

Received 19th February 2020

1379-PL01-401F - Block Plans
1379-PL 01-101C - Existing Floor Plans
1379-PL01-102C - Existing Roof Plan
1379-PL01-201C - Existing Elevations
1379-PL01-202C - Existing Elevations
1379-PL01-301C - Existing Section A-A
1379-PL01-103E - Proposed Floor Plans
1379-PL01-104F - Proposed Roof Plan
1379-PL01-203F - Proposed Elevations
1379-PL01-204F - Proposed Elevations
1379-PL01-302F - Proposed Section A-A

Received 4th January 2021

Relevant Planning History:

191206/HOU - Proposed ground floor and first floor extension, floor plan redesign, installation of solar panels and all associated works - Application Refused

081629/NMA - Minor amendment to planning consent 07/01674/FUL for alterations to the roofline along the eastern site boundary and an extension to the existing first floor boundary wall - Not Agree

071498/FUL - Part two storey and single storey rear extension and roof alterations (re-submission of 07/00977/FUL) - Application Permitted

071320/FUL - Part two storey and single storey rear extension and roof alterations - Application Withdrawn

Consultation Responses:

Internal Consultees

Ecology: No objections as the submitted bat survey has been carried out to an appropriate standard and concluded that the building is unlikely to host roosting bats.

Natural Environment: No objections

External Consultation

The following addresses were formally consulted via letter on 02/03/20:

9, 13 and 15 Holmes Road
129 and 149 Whiteknights Road

In addition a site notice was sent to the agent on 2nd March 2020.

One objection was received from no. 9 Holmes Road and the main points raised were:

- Boundary lines are incorrectly shown with elements of the proposal hanging over boundary lines
- Proposed first floor extension breaches 45 degrees from the living room ground floor window
- Proposed higher wall on the side elevation (closest to 9 Holmes road) would reduce natural light to living rooms and cast shadows
- No architectural detail is shown on the boundary wall to be extended
- Rear elevation drawing does not show sky lights which will protrude above the original roof line which will be visible from the street and out of character with the surrounding area
- Extension is beyond 4m in depth

Officer comment: *Throughout the course of the application sets of revised plans were received and a new survey of the site completed, to ensure that the boundaries of the site were correctly shown on the plans. It was also noted that the existing property (and the proposed development) would overhang the track between the application site and no. 15, although the applicant is not the owner of this track. Despite Certificate A having been signed on the application form, it came to light that this was incorrect and no. 13 (commercial premise) in fact own this track. The applicant engaged with this neighbour about the scheme and no. 13 has provided a letter stating that they are happy with the proposed plans, and Certificate B has now been signed to support the application. No comments were received from 15 Homes Road.*

An existing gutter is shown to slightly overhang the boundary with no. 9 Holmes Road. No new development is shown overhanging the boundary. The red line does not include land

owned by no. 9. If the application proposal and the red line included the part over the boundary then notice would have needed to have been served on the neighbour.

Other matters are discussed within the appraisal below.

Summary of discussions with applicant/agent:

A series of revised plans were provided to address the boundary issues and the relocation/ repositioning of solar panels and roof lights (solar panels have been removed). The agent was also contacted to discuss reducing the scale of the proposal, particularly that on the boundary with no. 9 Holmes Road, however, no reduction 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'. However the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making (NPPF paragraph 12).

In this regard, the NPPF states that due weight should be given to the adopted policies of the Local Development Framework (LDF) (Core Strategy and Sites and Detailed Policies Document) according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

Accordingly, the National Planning Policy Framework and the following development plan policies and supplementary planning guidance are relevant:

At the time of the application's submission/validation, the former LDF documents were in place. These were superseded by the new local plan, which was adopted on 4th November 2019.

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction

CC7: Design and the Public Realm

CC8: Safeguarding Amenity

H9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

H10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space

Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003)

Appraisal

The main issues are considered to be:

- Design, impact on the host dwelling, character of the area and street scene

- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Impact on amenity space

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**, due to the configuration of the existing site, the proposal is considered to increase the actual footprint of the property by an acceptable degree. The proposal seeks to infill various parts at first floor level, rather than extending substantially at ground floor level. The new elements at (ground and first floor level) are considered of general policy depths (approx. 4m). Whilst it was noted in the objection that the proposed extension is to measure 4.38m deep along the boundary with no. 9, it is considered that this additional 0.38m would not result in a proposal that is harmfully out of keeping with the main property or would result in an excessive scheme. The proposed works are seeking to harmonise a convoluted property and create levelled elevations which in this particular instance, is considered to be somewhat of an improvement. The constraints of the site are also acknowledged, and this has resulted in a somewhat unbalanced rear elevation at roof level. However, the design is not considered to cause such harm that the application is refusable in this instance.
 - Reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree; **NO**, the proposed development at ground floor level would replace existing structures and so the amount of useable amenity space would largely remain unaltered.
 - 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**, light angles were taken from neighbouring windows at no. 9 Holmes. At ground floor level, this neighbour has an open canopy which extends so is in close proximity to the application site. It is assumed that the property's original side windows are still located beyond the canopy. Nevertheless, the outlook of these windows is limited as they would face onto the high-level boundary wall. As such, it is considered that any side windows at ground floor

level beyond the open canopy are already compromised and this proposal would not result in a substantial level of additional harm being created.

In terms of the first floor side windows, these would face onto the existing boundary wall which is to remain as existing. Alterations are proposed behind the boundary wall which would not result in an overall height that is higher than the existing situation. Light angles have also been shown on the proposed plan, with a 45 degree light angle being from the approximate location of the first floor side window. It shows the roof of the proposed extension breaching this line by a small degree, however as the proposed roof is to be slanted it is not considered that the window's access to natural light would be compromised to a substantially harmful degree owing to the existing arrangement of the sites in relation to one another.

The second floor window of no. 9 would not face onto the application site as it is located higher than the maximum height of the main house.

The proposal is considered acceptable in relation to the windows at no. 15 as the property is set off the application site by approx. 4m due to being separated by an access track. The neighbouring property has a number of side windows at ground, first and second floor. However, no. 15 is located closer to the highway than the application site and therefore will not face directly onto part of the property that is to be extended (at the rear), it is not considered that these would be affected to a greater degree than the existing situation.

Invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; NO, no side windows are proposed, other than a rooflight facing no 15 which would not be considered to invade privacy due to its position in the roof. A condition will be included on the permission preventing the installation of windows on either side elevation in the interests of residential amenity for nos 9 and 15 Holmes Road.

Three rear Juliet balconies are included in the design. Whilst the application site is at a slight angle, the Juliet balconies would not be considered to result in a harmful level of overlooking to the rear amenity space of no. 15 due to an adequate separation distance being retained.

Beyond no. 11 is a commercial premise (no. 13) and there would not be considered any loss of privacy to this neighbour.

- Detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; NO, from the street, two of the proposed rooflights would be marginally visible and in any case could be implemented under permitted development rights.
- Detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; NO, materials are proposed to be of similar appearance to the main dwelling. As part of the objection, it was noted that no architectural detailing is shown on the boundary wall to be extended. It is not considered that the existing boundary wall is of noticeable architectural detail and so it is considered that extending the wall with bricks to match is sufficient.

- 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, given the context of no.9 Holmes Road (which has been extended at ground floor level along the boundary with the application site - and protrudes further than the proposal), it is not considered the proposal extending beyond the high level boundary wall (in terms of depth) would result in substantial bulkiness for this neighbour or result in substantial shadowing. Development is also to take place *behind* the existing high level boundary wall and so this aspect is not considered to result in a harmful level of additional visual dominance.**
- 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.**

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 (2003).

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION

Conditions

1. TL1 - 3 year time limit.
2. Approved plans
3. Materials as specified
4. Removal of PD rights for windows on side elevation

Informatives

1. Building Control

2. Construction & Demolition
3. Terms
4. Encroachment
5. Positive and Proactive