

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Application No: 200971/HOU

Address: "Little Adding" 2 Addington Road

Applicant: Dr Afif Hanif

Proposal: First floor side extension over existing garage and existing single storey extension to create a self-contained annex (amended)

Target date: 16/10/20

Case officer: Connie Davis

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site is a two-storey extended detached dwelling located on the southern side of Addington Road. To the east lies residential flats, and a detached house to the rear of the site (built in the former rear garden of the application site).

The surrounding area is residential, although the Royal Berkshire Hospital is in close proximity. The site is not listed, nor in a conservation area, although a TPO is in the vicinity.

Proposal:

Planning permission is sought to for a first-floor 'L shape' side extension above the existing garage which would be used as a self-contained annex for a carer to serve a family member of the applicant. The extension would measure 2.23m to eaves height, with a maximum height of 4m and a set down from the ridge of the main house by 1.9m.

Materials are proposed to match the main property.

Plans Considered:

2795 001 P6 - Location Plan

2795 003 P6 - Existing Plans and Elevations

2795 002 P6 - Block Plan

2795 004 P6 - Proposed Plans and Elevations

2795 005 P3 - Design and Access Statement

Received 9th July 2020

Relevant Planning History:

111228/FUL - Single storey rear extension, first floor level side extension, loft conversion and new front porch - Application Withdrawn

110525/FUL - Single storey rear and front extensions (Resubmission of 11/00813/FUL) - Application Permitted

Consultation Responses:

Internal Consultees

No internal consultees were consulted on this application.

External Consultation

The following addresses were formally consulted via letter on 16/07/20:

“Hamlet” 2b Addington Road

In addition, a site notice was displayed between 17th July - 7th August 2020.

No responses have been received.

Discussions with applicant/ agent

The agent was advised that the scheme was considered acceptable, subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement preventing the annex being let or sold separately. This was considered necessary due to the degree of separation the annex could have from the main house with internal re-arrangements, in combination with its size.

The agent advised that the applicant was willing to enter into a S106 legal agreement.

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

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

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 proposed extension would be set a considerable distance from the ridge of the main house (by 1.9m) and set back from the front of the garage by 0.5m to aid subservience in line with the Design Guide SPG. It would also have a hipped roof which would be in keeping with the main dwelling.

It is acknowledged that the width of the extension is fairly substantial (6.7m, and the width of the original house is 8.7m), so represents an increase in more than half of the original house. However, in this specific instance, due to the size and scale of the original plot, that the proposal would not be considered overbearing or of detriment to the design of the main house.

- 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**, two side windows of flats at no. 33 Cadogan Place would face onto the extension. These windows have been noted in the D&A as kitchen windows for the flats, despite their small size. However, a line of 45 degrees would not be breached as a result of the extension and so an acceptable level of light would still be maintained. Outlook from these windows would notice an increase bulk, however a separation distance of in excess of 3m would remain, with sufficient light, as mentioned, and as a result it is not considered to result in a level of harm so substantial to warrant refusal of the application.

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of light in relation to 2b Addington Road at the rear of the site due to a respectable separation distance.

- Invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **NO**, no side windows are proposed. A condition would also be attached preventing any side windows being inserted without separate planning permission from the LPA.

The proposal is also set off 2b Addington Road by 8m. It is not considered that the proposed first floor rear window would result in any newly substantial

overlooking to the rear amenity space when compared to the existing situation as rear windows already face onto the neighbouring site.

- Detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **NO**, although a condition would be attached removing Class B Permitted Development rights due to the scale of the proposal and additional roof form in addition to the existing large property. The removal of the automatic right will mean that any further addition to the roof will have to be assessed under the Council's adopted planning policies.
- 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.

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**, Given the size of the proposed annex, it is considered that a S106 agreement is required in order for planning permission to be granted. This is to ensure that the annex is not sold or let for independent use. It is considered that the proposal would not be acceptable without a S106 legal agreement. The agent advised via email that the applicant would enter into a S106 agreement.

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**, as discussed
- Access to sunlight and daylight; **No**, as discussed
- 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**.

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 SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT

Conditions

1. TL1 - 3 year time limit.
2. Approved plans
3. Matching materials
4. No additional windows on the western side elevation
5. Removal of Class B Permitted Development rights

Informatives

1. Building Control
2. Construction & Demolition
3. Terms
4. Encroachment
5. S106
6. Positive and Proactive

1HA