

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Abbey

App Ref: 190062/HOU

Address: 30 Addison Road, Reading, RG1 8EN

Proposals: Retrospective application for a single storey rear extension to create a new bathroom and WC at the rear of existing building.

Case Officer: Nathalie Weekes

Applicant: Mrs Ringmaya Tamang

Date received (valid from): 14 January 2019 **Target Decision date:** 11 March 2019

Site Description and Surrounding Area

The application relates to a mid terraced house in Addison Road Reading. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with terraced dwellings of similar sizes and style. Addison Road is adjacent to an industrial area. It is not in a conservation area.

Proposal:

The application is for retrospective planning permission for a single storey rear extension to create a new bathroom and wc.

Plans considered referenced as:

180901-1A Proposed Site plan/block plan/location plan

180901-2A Existing floor plan & elevations

180901-3A Proposed floor plan & elevations

Application letter from agent dated 11th January

Received on 14th January 2019

Relevant Planning History:

181612 Retrospective single storey rear extension to create a new bathroom and wc plus a canopy at the rear for outdoor relaxation. Refused

Consultation Responses:

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

23 York Road, Maidenhead, SL6 1SQ

32 Addison Road, Reading, RG1 8EN

25 York Road, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 8DX

28 Addison Road, Reading, RG1 8EN

A Site notice was displayed at the site from 26/01/19 to 17/02/19.

No responses were 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 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 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)

SPG/SPD

- A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

Appraisal

In the assessment of this the following has been considered.

The main issues are:

- Design and impact on the character of the surrounding area
- Impact on neighbours

a) Design and impact on the character of the surrounding area

Policy DM9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012) 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 CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Core Strategy also states that all development must be of high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area.

This revised proposal that has been amended from planning application 181612 has omitted an additional canopy to the rear but it still results in harm due to the size and length of the proposed extension. The proposed extension extends beyond the original rear dining room to a total depth of 7.2m. The WC and bathroom extend 3m in depth from the rear of the kitchen but the development does not take into consideration the original kitchen side elevation and rear wall of the original dining room.

The height to eaves is 2.7m and width of 4m across the width of the plot. The proposed retrospective ground floor extension almost the same length of the existing ground floor of the original property.

The extension was originally the subject of an enforcement investigation for unauthorised development. The applicant submitted a planning application to seek to regularise the development. This development would not be permitted development under Class A, Class D or E. As such the application is being considered as a householder application and Permitted Development is not considered to be an overriding consideration.

The proposal is still considered an overdevelopment of the site due to its excessive depth and width which does not reflect the scale and proportions of the original property and does not

overcome the main issues relating to the previous application. It is not considered to be subservient to the existing house due to the impact of the extension sited to the rear of the house. Although some neighbouring properties have been extended to the rear, the existing extensions are not to similar scales in depth and do not extend across the entire width of the site.

Even without the addition of the canopy, the extension extends 7.2m along the boundary with 28 Addison Road due to L shaped design of the terraced houses and the alleyway to the rear of their dining rooms and kitchens.

The proposal is considered to be excessive in size. The scale and length is out of keeping with the original house. The proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings and would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the original building and does not respect the character of openness to the rear gardens and pattern of neighbouring properties.

A Design Guide to House extensions states, 'Proposals for side extensions that result in the loss of a gap to the detriment of local character will fail the relevant policy criteria and not normally be granted planning permission.'

The proposed development is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS7 (Design and the Public Realm), Policy DM9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions.

b) Impact on neighbouring properties

There is a detrimental overbearing impact on the amenity of 28 Addison Road that should be taken into account. Due to the terraced layout of the properties, the proposed retrospective application is considered to have a shadowing effect and unneighbourly impact on the amenity of 28 Addison Road.

The flank elevation of the rear extension would extend 7.2m along the shared boundary. Therefore the proposed development by virtue of its depth, forward projection of, and proximity along the boundary from 28 Addison Road is considered to cause a detrimental impact to the living environment of this neighbouring property in terms of visual dominance and an overbearing impact to the rear facing window of the dwelling and on the amenity space at No 28 in the immediate vicinity of the proposed extension.

DM4: Safeguarding Amenity states an extension to a house will be acceptable where it will not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties. This has been assessed and it is considered the proposal would cause a detrimental impact to the living environment of any existing or new occupiers or neighbours. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions states that for terraced housing, 'rear extensions (including single storey ones) can have a significant and detrimental impact on neighbouring properties'.

As such the proposal is contrary to Policy DM4: Safeguarding Amenity of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered to be excessive in size and does not integrate or relate well with the host property and is not considered to respect the scale and location of the original house.

The proposal is considered to cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of the neighbouring property at 28 Addison Road in terms of visual dominance and overbearing effects.

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

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE