

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Target Date: 12/09/2018

Application No: 181243/HOU

Address: 28 Eastern Avenue, Reading

Proposal: Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing utility room. Insertion of three roof lights

Case officer: Ethne Humphreys

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the western side of Eastern Avenue.

The surrounding area is residential in character with similar sized plots and dwellings of varying design, many of which have been extended.

It is within an air quality management area and is also located within the South Park Conservation Area.

Proposal:

This is an application for single storey rear extension following demolition of existing utility room. It is also proposed to insert three roof lights, one on the rear elevation and two on the front elevation.

The extension would be constructed out of brick to match the existing property, with a lead effect grp flat roof and contemporary steel framed doors.

The proposed roof lights would be in a conservation style.

Plans Considered:

The agent submitted the following drawings:

Drawing No: Existing Elevations 01 18-02/102

Drawing No: Existing Floor Plans 01 18-02/101

Drawing No: Proposed First and Loft Floor Plan 01 18-02/105

Received 17th July 2018

Drawing No: Proposed Ground Floor Plan 01 18-02/104

Drawing No: Proposed Elevations 01 18-02/103

Drawing No: Existing and Proposed Roof Plan 01 18-02/106

Received 17th August 2018

Design, Heritage and Planning Statement

Mondrian Door Specification

Photo Sheet

Received 17th August 2018

Relevant Planning History:

None.

Consultation Responses:

CAAC: None.

Civic Society: No objection to single storey extension. Objection to loft conversion, in that the works should be included in the description of works in the application form. Unconvinced about insertion of conservation style velux windows, considered to result in a negative effect on the general streetscape. Notes that neighbouring properties have a mix of skylights and larger dormers inserted on the roadside roofscale and therefore difficult to object on these grounds.

One neighbour letter of representation received, concerned with:

- Too small a gap for maintenance
- Some loss of light

Summary of discussions with applicant/agent:

The agent was advised of discrepancies within the plans, in that the proposed floor plan showed the rear extension in line with the neighbour's at No.26 but the proposed block plan indicated that it would project further. The agent was also asked to provide existing and proposed roof plans, a heritage statement and specification details of the finished appearance of the window/doors.

No formal pre-application advice was sought for this specific scheme prior to the submission of this application.

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'.

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the LPA to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy, 2008 (amended 2015)

CS7: Design and the Public Realm

CS33: Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment

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

DM4: Safeguarding Amenity

DM9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

DM10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space

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

South Park Conservation Area Appraisal (2008)

Appraisal

The main issues are considered to be:

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

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

The proposals would utilise the footprint of the existing rear addition to be demolished, and, whilst fairly large, the extension is not considered to be unduly excessive. There would be a distance of 2m to the common side boundary and, whilst there would be a reduction in the amount of amenity space, it would not be too dissimilar from the existing situation. It is considered that this specific plot can suitably accommodate the extension without giving a feeling of overdevelopment or crampedness.

In terms of its detailed design, flat roof additions generally fail to improve the appearance of a dwelling. Furthermore, the extension would be very contemporary in appearance. Its contemporary appearance, however, incorporating the full height steel framed doors, would help to break up the expanse of the extension. Whilst the design and mix of materials would not be consistent with the prevailing character of the area, subject to good quality materials, the extension could add visual interest to the property. In this respect, it is noted that the South Park Conservation Area Appraisal references 'a large variety of interesting and often unique design features to many of these buildings'. The extension would remain a subservient addition to the main dwelling and, given its position at the rear of the property it would not be readily visible from the public domain.

Given the above, and in this specific instance, the extension is not considered to be so incongruous so as to result in any significant adverse effect on the character of the host property, the visual amenities of the street scene or the character and appearance of the conservation area such to warrant a refusal.

Concern has been raised that proposed roof lights would have a negative effect on the street scene. The roof lights are proposed to be of a conservation style which is appropriate and there are examples of similar within Eastern Avenue and so would not be out of keeping with the character of the wider area.

In accordance with Policy DM9 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015) and Policies CS7 and CS33 of the Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015).

Impact on neighbouring amenity

The neighbouring properties potentially affected by the proposals are No's 26 and 30 Eastern Avenue located to the north west and south east of the site respectively.

In relation to the adjoining semi No.26, this property also has the benefit of a rear addition close to the common boundary. The proposed extension would just project past the rear elevation of No.26 and would not breach a 45 degree line to the nearest habitable room window. Whilst higher than the existing rear addition and that at No.26, the roof would be flat to minimise the impact and, whilst visible, given the above, the extension is not considered to result in any significant material loss of light or overbearing impact to the occupiers of this property.

In relation to No.30, the extension would clearly be visible to the occupiers of this property. However, the roof would be flat to minimise the impact and the extension would be no closer to the common boundary than the main dwelling at a distance of at least 2m. Given this, and its position to the north, it is not considered to result in any significant material loss of light or overbearing impact to the occupiers of this property.

The proposed rooflights are not considered to result in any material loss of privacy over and above the existing windows.

Owing to the flat roof nature of the rear extension proposed, it is considered necessary to include a condition stipulating that the flat roof area shall not be used as a roof terrace, and any access out onto this area shall be for maintenance/means of escape purposes only. This is in order to prevent any detrimental impacts of overlooking and/or noise and disturbance of the neighbouring premises, in accordance with the requirement of Policy DM4 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015).

Other Matters Raised In Representation

All material planning considerations covered in the above report.

The Party Wall Act is a separate matter and does not constitute a planning consideration. The developer would need to comply with the relevant requirements of other legislation such as the Party Wall Act.

CIL

The floorspace involved in the proposed works is below 100sqm and the proposals do not involve the creation of a new dwelling. Accordingly, the proposals are not CIL liable.

Conclusion

Having regard to the material considerations and all matters raised, the Local Planning Authority considers that the balance of considerations therefore weigh in favour of granting planning permission subject to conditions.

Recommendation:

GRANT subject to conditions