

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Application No: 200959/HOU

Address: 12 Ibstock Close

Applicant: Mr J Bilicki and Mrs K Bilicka

Proposal: Two storey side extension with single storey front and rear extensions (amended)

Agreed target date: 28/10/20

Case Officer: Connie Davis

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located on the northern side of Ibstock Close. The highway does not extend to in front of the site. The close is characterised by front protruding flat roofed garages. In terms of design, properties have side front doors and various fenestration sizes. White plastic and render panels can be found above and below windows.

The application site is not listed, nor in a conservation area.

Proposal:

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey side extension with front and rear protruding elements.

The two-storey side extension would be at the same ridge and eaves level as the main house and would also be flush with the front elevation at first floor level. At ground floor level, the front of the extension would protrude forwards of the front elevation by just over 2m. This is the same measurement at the rear.

The two-storey extension would have a gable roof to match the main property, with the rear extension having a mono-pitched roof and the front extension having a flat roof.

Materials are proposed to match the host dwelling.

Plans Considered:

01 Rev C - Existing & Proposed Plans & Elevations

Received 23rd October 2020

Relevant Planning History:

None.

Consultation Responses:

Internal Consultees

No internal consultees were consulted on this application.

External Consultation

A site notice was displayed at the site between 16/07/20 - 06/07/20 to advise members of the public about the application.

No responses have been received.

Discussions with applicant/ agent

Two sets of revised plans were received with the latter being considered acceptable. Officers had initial concerns over the side extension's lack of subservience to the main house. A marginal set down of the ridge was made, however it was considered that in this specific instance, it would lead to a jarring design given the character and form of the main house.

Fenestration and roof design alterations were made to the front extension, which were considered acceptable in this specific instance.

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**, in this specific case it is considered that the design is acceptable. The original property (and wider Close) have differing main roof and garage roof roofs (gable and flat), elements protruding forward of the main house, along with various fenestration arrangements. As such, having an extension that is set down and back from the main house was not considered essential in this specific case due to the additional jarring this may create. It was considered that continuity of the ridge and eaves height, along with introducing a flat roof front extension, would interlink with features already found on the property and in the Close rather than introducing new, additional components of design. Due to the property's location and its lack of prominence within the Ibstock Close street scene, the design is on balance considered acceptable in this specific case.
 - 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 property is an end of terrace. The rear extension would have a modest depth of 2m and would be set off the boundary with the adjoining neighbour (no. 11 Ibstock Close to the south-west) by 5.5m. To the north-east, the property is located next to a footpath which separates the site from the rear garden spaces of Colliers Way (specifically nos. 17, 18 and 19). It is considered that there would be sufficient distance between the side extension and the rear of these properties (6.5m to the end of rear gardens, 18.5m between the extension and rear windows of these properties) so as to not appear harmfully visually overbearing or result in a loss of light.
- Invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **NO**, no side windows are proposed. However a condition will be applied preventing the flat roof of the front extension being used as a balcony in the interests of residential amenity.
- Detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **NO**, materials are proposed to match the main property.

- Detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **NO, as mentioned above.**

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.**

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. No use of flat roof

Informatives

1. Building Control
2. Construction & Demolition

3. Terms
4. Encroachment
5. Positive and Proactive

1HA