

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Southcote

App Ref: 191112/HOU

Address: 23 Hatford Road, Reading, RG30 3JA

Proposals: Single story rear, side and front extension plus internal alterations.

Case Officer: Tom French

Date received (valid from): 9 July 2019

Target Decision date: 3 September 2019

Agreed Extension of Time: 16/10/2019

PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Plans considered

Drawing Number:

- 19072BC-01 - Existing Floor Plans
- 19072BC-02 - Existing Elevations
- 19072BC-03 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan
- 19072BC-04 - Proposed Elevations
- 19072PP-06 - Block Plan
- Location Plan

As received: 09/07/2019

- 19072BC-03 Rev. A - Proposed Ground Floor Plan
- 19072BC-04 Rev. A - Proposed Elevations

As received: 16/09/2019

- 19072BC-06 Rev A - block plan

CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

107 Ashampstead Road, Reading, RG30 3LG

105 Ashampstead Road, Reading

25 Hatford Road, Reading, RG30 3JA

21 Hatford Road, Reading, RG30 3JA

No letters of representation have been received.

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 policies in 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'

Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008)

CS7 (Design and the Public Realm)

Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012)

DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity)

DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

DM10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space)

SPG/SPD

- A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

In addition, the New Reading Borough Local Plan is at an advanced stage. The Inspector's report into the Proposed Modifications has now been received and the new local plan is proposed to be adopted by the Council on 4 November 2019. Accordingly, it is taken into account as part of the determination of this application.

- Reading Borough Submission Draft Local Plan 2018
- CC7: Design and the Public Realm
- CC8: Safeguarding Amenity
- H9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation
- H10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space

Assessment

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

The proposed development includes a side extension and front porch extension. As such the proposal would be visible from the street. Considering the side extension element of the proposal, whilst it would extend all the way to the common boundary and would not be set back from the existing front elevation; it would be single storey with a hipped roof. As existing the garage/store is sited on the boundary between 23 & 25 Hatford, as such the principle of built form at ground floor level between the properties has been established and the proposal would not be significantly harmful to the character of the host dwelling or surrounding area in terms of scale, bulk or massing.

The front porch proposed would have a width of 1.9m and would project 3m from the existing front elevation. The porch would include a front facing window and would have a hipped roof. In the context of the proposed side extension, the scale of the existing house and what is achievable without planning permission through utilisation of permitted development rights; the proposed porch is considered to respect the host dwelling and surrounding area in terms of scale, design, materials and location. Amended block plan submitted 16/9/19.

The rear element of the proposed extension would project a relatively modest 3.2m from the existing rear elevation, less than the 4m recommended as normally permissible by the SPG - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003). The rear element would be the full width of the plot with a pitched tiled roof.

The extension would be single storey with a roof form and of a scale that respects the character of the host dwelling. With materials to match existing it is considered to integrate satisfactorily with the character of the host dwelling and visual amenity of the surrounding area.

The host dwelling would retain sufficient amenity space to the rear elevation, which is considered adequate for a dwelling of this size and relative to the character of amenity spaces to surrounding dwellings.

The proposal would accord with Policies CS7, DM9 and DM10.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

The neighbouring properties potentially affected by the proposed development are 21 Hatford Road and 25 Hatford Road, located to the west and east of the application site respectively.

With respect to the adjoining neighbour, no.23, the side element of the proposal would be to the east of the property and as such would not impact upon the living environment of no.21. Similarly, the front porch proposed would project a relatively modest 1.9m from the existing front extension and sited to the east side of the host dwelling. As such it would not unduly impact upon the occupiers of no.21. The rear element of the proposal would abut the common boundary, however it would project a relatively modest 3.2m, with a pitched roof. As such it is considered that the proposed development would not have any significant detrimental impacts on the amenity of no.21 in terms of loss of light or overbearing effects.

With regards to no.25, the proposal would also abut the common boundary. However given the scale of the proposal, that the proposed roof form would be hipped away from no.25 and the significant separation distance of the habitable rooms at no.25 and the common boundary; it is considered that the proposal would not have any significant adverse impacts in terms of loss of light or overbearing.

As the proposal would be single storey with no side facing windows, it would not have any adverse impacts upon neighbouring amenity in terms of privacy or overlooking.

Given the size of the extension it is reasonable to condition that it be used as ancillary to the main house only.

The proposal accords with Policy DM4.

Interaction with other nearby applications

There is a similar proposal presently under consideration at neighbouring no.25. It has been demonstrated above that on its own merits this application is suitable and could be implemented in isolation (irrespective of the proposal at the neighbouring property). It is also confirmed that, notwithstanding this, there are no issues should the neighbouring proposal be implemented either, as individually and cumulatively the proposals are considered appropriate. Furthermore, an informative shall be included on the decision notice to state that the works hereby approved in this application shall only relate to works within the red-line of the application site and not land outside the red-line of the application site (as some of the submitted plans show works outside the red-line boundary of the application site and these are not the subject of this permission).

It is noted from the red line plan that part of the extension proposed under this application would be built on land under the ownership of no.25. Similarly, part of the extension proposed at no.25 would be built on land under the ownership of no.23. Certificate A was signed for this application and as such the requisite notice has not been served on the owners of no.25. However as both applications were submitted in tandem and using the same agent it is considered that both parties are aware of the proposals (and have been since the submission of the applications). As such it is considered that neither occupier is prejudiced by either application and so each application can be determined based on the information provided. An informative is recommended to clarify that this permission does not confer any right of access onto land that is not under the developers control.

Other Issues

Community Infrastructure Levy

The proposal would not be liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

RECOMMENDATION:

Grant

The development is not harmful to the character or appearance of the site or its surroundings and does not have a detrimental impact on the original building or neighbouring properties. As such the proposal is considered to be in accordance with CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008), DM4 (Safeguarding amenity) and DM9: (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012) and the Councils Supplementary Planning Guidance "A Design Guide to House Extensions" (2003).