

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Application No: 190487/HOU

Address: 235 Basingstoke Road, Reading

Proposal: Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension

Case officer: Connie Davis

Target Date: 27/05/19

EOT: 07/06/19

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the east side of Basingstoke Road. The dwelling benefits from a two storey rear gable with single storey projection. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, comprising dwellings of a similar style and design.

The property is not listed nor in a conservation area.

Proposal:

The proposal involves a part two storey and part single storey side and rear extension, which combined would have a depth of 15.3m. An existing car port and offshoot would be demolished to make way for the proposal. The two storey element would have a depth of 10m, overall width of 5m and an overall height of 8.6m. The single storey element would have depth of around 5.3m and width of 6.8m.

The materials would match those of the host dwelling.

Plans Considered:

PBC/2421 - Location Plan

PBC/2421/3 B - Block Plan

PBC/2421/1 - Plans and Elevations as Existing

PBC/2421/2 A - Proposed Two Storey Extension

Received 28th March 2019.

Relevant Planning History:

181735/HOU - Part two & part single storey side and rear extensions - Application Refused due to the proposal's impact on neighbours and contrived design.

Consultation Responses:

Transport:

Neighbour letters of notification were sent to No's 233 and 237 Basingstoke Road and No's 30 and 32 Tavistock Road on 01/04/19. Two letters of objection were received and raised concerns regarding:

- The proposed extension being too large and not in keeping with the properties within the road

Officer comment: See appraisal for discussion

- Issues with parking/ access

Officer comment: The proposal has been assessed as a householder application and as such, the transport consultation was satisfied with the proposed parking provision. See appraisal for transport officer's consultation response.

- Issues with privacy due to side facing windows

Officer comment: See appraisal for discussion

- The house is in multiple occupation with insufficient parking. This results in pedestrians being forced to walk into the busy bus lane outside the property.

Officer comment: Further evidence would be required to demonstrate whether the property is being used as a HMO. However the change of use to a single dwelling house (C3) to small HMO (C4) can be done under permitted development. If the property has been converted to a large HMO (Sui Generis) it should be reported to the planning enforcement team at Reading Borough Council. The concerns raised about parking provision have been addressed above and are further expanded in the appraisal of this report.

Summary of discussions with applicant/agent:

The agent was advised via email of concerns relating to the proposal, in terms of its scale and thus the impact to neighbouring properties, in particular no. 237 Basingstoke Road. The agent opted not to make amendments and for the proposal to be assessed as originally proposed.

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'. However the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making (NPPF paragraph 12).

In this regard, the NPPF states that due weight should be given to the adopted policies of the Local Development Framework (LDF) (Core Strategy and Sites and Detailed Policies Document) according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

Accordingly, the National Planning Policy Framework and the following development plan policies and supplementary planning guidance are relevant:

Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy, 2008 (altered 2015)
CS7: Design and the Public Realm

Sites and Detailed Policies Document, Oct 2012 (altered 2015)

DM4: Safeguarding Amenity

DM9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

DM12: Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters

Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003)

Supplementary Planning document - Revised Parking Standards and Design (2011)

Appraisal

The main issues are considered to be:

- Design, impact on the host dwelling, character of the area and street scene
- Impact on neighbouring amenity

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

Policy DM9 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 also states that all development must be of high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions states that 'two storey side extensions should normally be designed to be smaller in scale than the main house'.

It is recognised that the proposed extension has been set down from the main roof ridge, and set back from the main front elevation at first floor level and thus is considered adequately subservient to the main dwelling when viewed from the street. However, when viewed from the side and rear, the proposal, due to its excessive depth, fails to respect the character of the house in terms of being an overly dominant feature, when both the two storey and single storey elements are combined. It is acknowledged that the design of the proposal has somewhat been overcome since the refusal of the previous application 181735/HOU, in terms of redesigning the roof elements and positioning of the extensions to better sit in relation to the main house when viewed from the street, however the issue with the overall bulk of the extension still remains (as the dimensions have not been substantially reduced since the previous extension, just altered in terms of their position). As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM9 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012), Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003).

Impact on Neighbour Amenity

DM4: Safeguarding Amenity of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document, Oct 2012 (altered 2015), states that development should not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties in terms of visual dominance and overbearing effects of the development.

The neighbouring properties potentially affected by the proposals are No's 233 and 237 Basingstoke Road, located to the north and south of the site respectively. In relation to No.233, given the position and distance of the proposed two storey element, it would not result in any material loss of light nor overbearing impact to the occupiers of this property. No windows are proposed on the flank elevation of this property and as such there would be no material loss of privacy. The proposed single storey element would be positioned immediately adjacent to the common boundary and at a depth of over 5m. This does not comply with the Council's SPG 'A Design Guide to House Extensions' which states that the maximum depth of a single storey rear extension should be 4m. Although not compliant with the SPG,

the flat roof is considered to minimise the impact to this neighbour. A 45 degree light angle was also taken from the rear facing neighbour window and the line was not breached. In addition, no representations were received from this neighbour regarding this issue. As such, whilst visible, it is not considered to result in any significant material loss of light or overbearing impact to the occupiers of this property.

Four windows are proposed on the flank elevation; three at ground floor level and one at first floor level. During the consultation period, the occupiers of no. 237 raised concern that these windows would invade the privacy of their property. However from the site visit made by the case officer, it appears that this neighbouring property has one first floor side window. However, it was not made clear in the representation if this was a window of a habitable room. Nevertheless, the proposed first floor side window at the application site will serve a bathroom and thus is not considered a habitable room which would result in the neighbouring property being overlooked. However, the proposals would project approximately 7.3 m past No.237 - this would comprise 2m at two storey and 5.3m at single storey. Albeit reduced to single storey towards the rear, the depth, in close proximity to the common boundary, presenting a high elevation, is considered to result in an unneighbourly overbearing impact to the occupiers of this property.

As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM4 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document (2012) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003).

Impact on Parking/Highways

The Council's transport officer assessed the application and provided the following response:

According to the Councils Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD, the site falls into Zone 3, Secondary Core Area where the parking requirement for a 3+ bedroom dwelling is 2 parking spaces.

The property currently benefits from a carport and off road parking to the front of the house with direct access across from B3031 Basingstoke Road. The proposed plans demonstrate that 3 parking spaces can be provided to the front of the house in a revised parking layout to ensure that the development retains the required level of parking for a single dwelling.

However, the new parking areas should be constructed in permeable materials so not to increase the surface water run-off from the site.

In view of the above, there are no transport objections to the application subject to the conditions below.

Conditions

DC1 Vehicle parking space provided in accordance with approved plans

The dwelling(s)/building(s) hereby permitted shall not be occupied until all vehicle parking space(s) have been provided in accordance with the approved plan. The space(s) shall be kept available for parking at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities to meet the needs of future occupiers and reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which could be a danger to other road users to accord with Policy CS24 & CS24 and Policy DM12.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Due to its overall scale, it is considered that the proposed development would be overly dominant with respect to the existing property, and would be out of proportion with the host dwelling. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the Reading Borough LDF Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions.

Due to the depth of the proposed two storey element, combined with the single storey element and its proximity to the common boundary, it is considered that the proposal would cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of the occupiers of No.237 Basingstoke Road in terms of being visually dominant and overbearing. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity) of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions.

Informatives

1. The plans considered in this planning application are as follows:

PBC/2421 - Location Plan

PBC/2421/3 B - Block Plan

PBC/2421/1 - Plans and Elevations as Existing

PBC/2421/2 A - Proposed Two Storey Extension

Received 28th March 2019.

2. The Local Planning Authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. The agent was made aware of the issues relating to this proposal but opted to keep the proposal as it stands despite this.
3. This planning application was submitted without first having sought pre-application advice, which can often avoid the need to refuse planning permission. The council's pre-application advice service is here:

http://www.reading.gov.uk/media/1190/Pre-Application-Enquiry-Form/pdf/Pre-app_1_Revised_Nov_2015.pdf