

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT**Target Date:** 28/11/2018**Application No:** 181735/HOU**Address:** 235 Basingstoke Road, Reading**Proposal:** Part two and part single storey side and rear extensions**Case officer:** Ethne Humphreys**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 off shoot. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, comprised of dwellings of a similar style and design.

Proposal:

The proposal involves a part two storey and part single storey side and rear extension. The two storey element would have a depth of 6.5m and overall width of 5.5m. The single storey element would have depth of 3.5m and width of 7m. The two storey extension would have an overall height of 8m, and 6m to the eaves.

The materials would match those of the host dwelling.

Plans Considered:

Drawing No: Location Plan

Drawing No: Block Plan PBC/2421/3

Drawing No: Plans and Elevations as Existing PBC/2421/2

Drawing No: Proposed Two Storey Extension PBC/2421/2

Received 3rd October 2018

Relevant Planning History:

None.

Consultation Responses:

Transport: Revised plans required to confirm and condition parking spaces.

Neighbour letters of notification were sent to No's 233 and 237 Basingstoke Road and No's 30 and 32 Tavistock Road. No neighbour letters of representation were received.

Summary of discussions with applicant/agent:

The agent was advised via email 12th November of concerns relating to the proposal, in terms of its unsympathetic design and the impact on the neighbouring property No.237 Basingstoke Road. The agent opted to receive the refusal, hence the issuing of the decision notice.

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
- Impact on parking/highways

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. On the face of this, these techniques should result in a subservient addition. However, it is considered that the proposed development, due to its form, size and bulk, and its separate roof form fails to respect the character of the house and results in an overly dominant feature that would be out of scale and proportion with the host dwelling. Combined with the somewhat convoluted junctions between the roof elements, the proposals would result in a discordant and contrived appearance (particularly when viewed from the rear and neighbouring gardens) that would not integrate well with the host property and would fail to constitute a subservient addition to the property. 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 or 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 the common boundary and at a depth of 3.5m, would have some impact on the ground floor window close to this boundary. However, the roof would be flat to minimise the impact and the depth complies with the recommendation in RBC's Design Guide to House Extensions. 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.

Given that no first floor windows are proposed on the flank elevation of this property, there would be no material loss of privacy in relation to No.237 Basingstoke Road. However, the proposals would project approximately 9m past No.237 - this would comprise 5m at two storey and 4m at single storey. Albeit reduced to single storey towards the rear, the depth, in close proximity to the common boundary, presenting a high blank facade, 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

Revised plans were originally requested to show parking for a minimum of 2 vehicles at the front of the site. This was requested of the applicant but no response was received.

Notwithstanding, the proposed extension does not technically impact on the existing parking arrangements and the Council's Highways Officer has confirmed that there is no objection to the proposals on parking/highways grounds.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE

Due to its detailed design and scale, the proposed development is considered to be overly dominant with respect to the existing property, resulting in a contrived appearance that would be out of proportion with the host property, rather than a subservient feature.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS7 (Design and Public Realm) of the Reading Borough LDF Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015) and Policy DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity) and DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) 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, the proposal is considered to 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:

Drawing No: Location Plan

Drawing No: Block Plan PBC/2421/3

Drawing No: Plans and Elevations as Existing PBC/2421/2

Drawing No: Proposed Two Storey Extension PBC/2421/2

Received 3rd October 2018

2. The Local Planning Authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. The applicant was made aware of the issues relating to the refusal of this application and given the opportunity to withdraw. The applicant opted to receive the decision notice; hence the issuing of this notice of refusal of permission.
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