

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Katesgrove

App Ref: 191789/HOU

Address: 26 Canterbury Road, Reading, RG2 7TB

Proposals: Proposed first floor extension

Case Officer: Nathalie Weekes

Applicant: Amir Iqbal

Date received (valid from): 7 November 2019 **Target Decision date:** 2 January 2020

INTRODUCTION

The application site is on the junction of Canterbury Road and Home Farm Close. This semi-detached property adjoins 45 Home Farm Close. The configuration and layout of the semi-detached houses are not typical of standard semi-detached houses, but are perpendicular to each other, forming a 'T-shaped' footprint. The main front entrance therefore faces onto Canterbury Road. The application site has a side garden, which accommodates a conservatory on the Western side of the host dwelling next to Home Farm Close, a single storey extension on the eastern side and a detached single storey dwelling on the boundary adjoining No. 24 Canterbury Road.

PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for a first floor extension above an existing single storey side extension to the house, measuring 5m in width, an additional 2.5m to eaves but with a total height to eaves of 5m and total height to ridge line of 7.2m. The end of the proposed roof is hipped. No box was ticked stating Council employee on the application form for the current application so the application will be considered under delegated decision.

Plans considered

Location plan & Proposed first floor extensions

As received on 7 November 2019

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

070918 Demolition of existing single storey building and erection of new single storey building

Permitted 24 May 2007 Committee decision as for a council employee.

CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

45 Home Farm Close, Reading, RG2 7TE

24 Canterbury Road, Reading, RG2 7TB

A site notice was also displayed at the site. One letter of representation has been received from 45 Home Farm Close with concerns regarding existing and additional increases in loss of light / sunlight as a result of the existing dwelling and proposed extension.

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.

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

APPRAISAL

The main issues are:

- a) **Impact on neighbours**
- b) **Design and impact of the house / streetscene and character of the surrounding area.**
- c) **Other - No Preapp**

a) Impact on neighbours

The proposed development by virtue of its depth, height, projection of, and proximity along the boundary with 45 Home Farm Close is considered to cause a detrimental impact to the living environment of this neighbouring property. It would significantly worsen the already constrained relationship between the two properties, in particular creating a visually dominant and overbearing presence (effectively a 5m long first floor extension on the boundary with the neighbouring property) which further reduces access to daylight and sunlight to the rear rooms of this property (failing the 45 degree line tests outlined within the SPD and paragraph 4.1.42 of the supporting text to Policy CC8) and for the amenity area to the rear of this neighbouring property too. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) and H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan 2019 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions.

b) Design and impact of the house / streetscene and character of the surrounding area.

Policy H9 states: An extension to a house will be acceptable where it respects the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design. The proposed materials would match the existing property and should not detract from its appearance. In addition, the Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions, more specifically states that two storey side extensions (which effectively this proposal would facilitate, as it involves a first floor side extension above an existing single storey side extension) should normally be designed to be smaller in scale than the main house. The SPD continues by outlining that this can be achieved by setting the extension down / back from the main house.

The design of the extension is not subservient to the host property as the proposed first floor extension is not set back at the front/back or set down from the roof ridge line. Instead it would simply continue the massing of the original house and represent an out of scale / character extension to a plot which has already been significantly extended (conservatory to the west and separate outbuilding to the east) - thereby representing overdevelopment of the plot. The property is in a prominent position and would be highly visible from Canterbury Road. The proposal would result in a property which would not reflect the scale and proportions of the original property is not considered to be subservient.

As such this would be contrary to policies CC7: Design and the Public Realm and H9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions.

c) Other -No preapp

This planning application was submitted without the benefit of first seeking pre-application advice from the Local Planning Authority, which can often result in the avoidance of refusal of planning permission. Please see the following link to the Council's pre-application service here: https://www.reading.gov.uk/media/1190/Pre-Application-Enquiry-Form/pdf/Pre-app_October_2018.pdf

CONCLUSION

The proposal would result in a detrimental impact on the neighbours at 45 Home Farm Close, with a detrimental impact on daylight and sunlight, as well as being visually dominant and overbearing. The design is not subservient to the host property either.

As such the proposed works are not considered to be in accordance with the above relevant policies and permission should be refused.

RECOMMENDATION

Application Refused