

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Kentwood

App Ref: 200388/HOU

Address: 12 Lower Armour Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HH

Proposals: First floor rear extension

Case Officer: Tom Hughes

Applicant: Mrs Sofie Cooper

Date received (valid from): 9 March 2020

Target Decision date: 4 May 2020

1. INTRODUCTION

The application site comprises a characterful three storey semi-detached dwelling. 12 Lower Armour Road, and its adjoining neighbour at no. 14, previously comprised the Bird in Hand public house. Both 12 and 14 Lower Armour Road have been variously extended to the rear. 12 Lower Armour Road benefits from a full width single storey rear extension and a loft conversion with the provision of rearward roof lights. A chimney is located within the rearward roof slope. The surrounding area is predominantly residential. The Butchers Arms public house is located opposite the application site. The adjacent dwelling at 8 Lower Armour Road is a Grade II Listed Building. Two detached dwellings, approved under application 111477/FUL, are located to the rear of the application site. 1 Andover Close, located immediately to the south of the site, is oriented at 90 degrees to the application property. 1 Andover Close only benefits from a short rear garden, such that its rear elevation is located in very close proximity to the southward side boundary of the application site.

2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for a full-width first floor rear extension. The existing chimney would be demolished to facilitate the proposal. The proposal would extend above the existing single storey rear extension, projecting to a maximum depth of 2.25m. The proposal would have a hipped, part-catslide, roof with a maximum height of 7.6m and a height to eaves of 3.6m. The proposal would be set down from the existing ridgeline by 0.6m. A window would be located to the rear elevation. Materials have been selected to match those of the existing dwelling.

The applicant supplied the following, received 11/03/20:

Drawing No: GP/1719/A-6 - Site Location, Block Plan, Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

890313/FUL - Single storey rear extension - Permitted 04/08/89

990192/FUL - Single storey rear extension and conservatory - Permitted 28/03/00

110779/FUL - Construction of private drive and erection of four terraced dwellings with associated parking at rear - Refused 26/09/11

111477/FUL - Construction of private drive and erection of two detached dwellings with associated parking at rear - Permitted 26/09/11

121253/FUL - Conversion of public house and two bedroom flat to 1x three bedroom and 1x two bedroom dwellings, with two storey rear extension and external alterations - Permitted 10/12/12 *Officer note: a first floor extension to the southeast corner of the building was originally proposed. This extension was very similar in design to the extension currently proposed. On the advice of the case officer of this application, the first floor extension was removed from the proposal. This was to prevent a loss of*

privacy through overlooking into the rear of 1 Andover Close, and to mitigate against the overbearing effect of the extension on this neighbour

180057/HOU - First floor rear extension - Refused 01/03/18 *Officer note: the application was refused on the grounds of design and impact on neighbouring residential amenity. The proposal was not considered to be a subservient addition, detracting from the original buildings appearance. The proposal was also considered to cause significant harm to the living environment of 1 Andover Close in terms of loss of privacy through overlooking, visual dominance and overbearing effects*

Appeal ref: APP/E0345/D/18/3202378 - appeal dismissed 26/07/18 *Officer note: the Inspector disagreed with the first reason for refusal but agreed with the second reason, sufficient to dismiss the appeal. The Inspector noted the clear views from the existing landing window into the rear of 1 Andover Close and its garden - "the rear of 1 Andover Close would be completely exposed to view from the proposed bedroom windows at very close quarters, thus significantly impairing that property's privacy. Moreover, because of the extensions height, bulk and closeness to no.1, it would be perceived as dominating and oppressive when viewed from the rear of that property". The Inspector went on to note that "even if the issue of fenestration were acceptably addressed, there remains the issue of adverse visual impact"*

182022/HOU - Single storey side extension - Permitted 21/12/18

190212/HOU - First floor rear extension - Refused 09/04/19 *Officer note: the application was refused due to the detrimental impact on the living environment of 1 Andover Close, in terms of loss of privacy through overlooking, visual dominance and overbearing effects. This application was identical to the current proposal, but for the provision of a high-level window*

4. CONSULTATIONS

4.1 The following addresses were consulted by letter:

8 Lower Armour Road, Tilehurst, Reading

The Bird In Hand Ph, 14 Lower Armour Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HH

1 Andover Close, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HU

14b Lower Armour Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HH

14a Lower Armour Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6HH

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)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)
CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)
H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

6. APPRAISAL

Design and impact on the character of the surrounding area

Policy H9 states that an extension to a house should respect the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design and respect the character and pattern of neighbouring properties and the street as a whole in terms of scale, location, materials and design and any important existing building line. Policy CC7 also states that all development must be of a high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area.

The proposed extension is approximately 0.8m shorter in depth than that refused under application 180057/HOU. The amended roof design is considered to be an improvement, better reflecting the dwelling's scale and proportion. The extension is therefore generally sufficient in its design and proportion that it does not detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling, in accordance with Policies CC7 and H9.

Impact on neighbours

The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions states that rear extensions should be located as far away from side boundaries as possible. A basic way to protect light reaching main rooms in adjacent houses, and to safeguard their outlook, is to avoid extensions that would infringe on an area measured at 45 degrees from the midpoint of the closest window in a neighbouring dwelling. This is of particular importance for two storey extensions. Policy CC8 also states that development "will not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties in terms of privacy and overlooking, access to sunlight and daylight and visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development".

At appeal, the Inspector agreed with the reason for refusal of application 180057/HOU on the grounds of the impact on the residential amenity of 1 Andover Close. The Inspector noted the clear views from the existing landing window into the rear of 1 Andover Close and its garden - *"the rear of 1 Andover Close would be completely exposed to view from the proposed bedroom windows at very close quarters, thus significantly impairing that property's privacy. Moreover, because of the extensions height, bulk and closeness to no.1, it would be perceived as dominating and oppressive when viewed from the rear of that property"*. The Inspector went on to note that *"even if the issue of fenestration were acceptably addressed, there remains the issue of adverse visual impact"*.

The proposed extension is approximately 0.8m shorter in depth than that proposed under application 180057/HOU, and has a different arrangement of fenestration to the rear elevation. Notwithstanding this, the proposed extension would still encroach on a line taken at 45 degrees from the midpoint of the first floor windows serving habitable rooms at 1 Andover Close. The proposed fenestration would also be comfortably within the 20m back-to-back distance with 1 Andover Close, recommended by Policy CC8. Due to the proximity to 1 Andover Close, the

proposal would have a visual dominance and overbearing effect on this neighbour. The proximity of the first floor window is also considered to cause an unacceptable loss of privacy through overlooking, for both the residents of 12 Lower Armour Road and 1 Andover Close. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy CC8 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

Informatives relating to:

1. Refused plans