

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 23 Highmoor Road

Application No: 180892 / HOU

Proposal: Single storey side and rear extension

Applicant: Mr Ian Hill

Date received (valid from): 16/07/2018

Target Decision date: 10/09/2018

Agreed Extension of Time: 12/10/2018

Case officer: Tom French

1. Site description and Surrounding Area

The application site contains a 1930s two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on the southern side of Highmoor Road. The property has a two storey bay window in the front elevation and an existing rear conservatory. The surrounding area is residential in nature with semi-detached and detached dwellings of a similar character.

The application building is not listed, nor is it located within a conservation area.

2. The Proposal

A householder planning permission is sought for a single storey side and rear extension. The proposed extension would project 2.9m from the existing side elevation of the application property and 2.5m from the existing rear elevation. It would protrude 1.5m from the existing front elevation (0.9m from the bay). A lean-to style roof is proposed and a garage style door would be placed in the front elevation.

Originally a two-storey side/rear extension with catslide roof was proposed; this was revised to make the proposal single storey during the course of the application (with the single storey extension being of a greater footprint to the front and to the rear - adjacent to the boundary with No. 21 - than the originally proposed scheme).

3. Consultation

Neighbours consultation:

No.s 21 & 25 Highmoor Road; 31, 33 & 35 Albert Road and 16 & 18 Darell Road have been notified of the application and a site notice has also been displayed at the site. Following the submission of amended plans a second consultation was undertaken and all the above properties were notified.

One response was received to the original proposal and one response was received to the amended proposal. The representations objected on the following basis (officer response in *italics*):

- No design statement has been submitted - *this is not a requirement for this type of application*

- No shadow calculations have been submitted - *this is not a requirement for this type of application*
- The submitted block plan does not display the location of the windows of the neighbouring properties - *this is not a requirement for this type of application*
- The applicant did not discuss the application (or amendments) with the neighbours before submitting the application - *the extent and detail of communication between neighbours is not a material planning consideration and therefore cannot have a bearing on the outcome of this application*
- The front elevation of the extension is not set back from the original house - see '9. Appraisal' below
- The roof is not significantly set down from the existing roof - *this has been addressed through the submission of amended plans*
- The proposed extension significantly reduces the gapping between the properties, to the detriment of the street scene and surrounding area - see '9. Appraisal' below
- The proposed extension does not comply with the 45 degree line rule - see '9. Appraisal' below
- The proposed extension would come within 0.5m of the boundary and would not provide access for maintenance - *there is no policy requirement to provide maintenance access along the side of a dwelling. For other comments regarding gapping and the impact on the character of the area see '9. Appraisal' below*
- The loss of gapping would appear overbearing and result in a loss of light to the occupiers of no.25 - see '9. Appraisal' below
- There may be party wall implications - *party wall obligations are a civil matter and not a material planning consideration, therefore cannot have a bearing on the outcome of this application*
- The extension would result in an overlooking impact and loss of privacy for the occupiers of no.25 - see '9. Appraisal' below
- It is not clear from the submitted plans if the side windows would be opening - *that the windows would remain obscure glazed and non-opening within 1.7m of the floor level would be secured by condition*
- It is not appropriate for a bathroom to be in such close proximity to the kitchen at no.25 - *alterations to the internal layout and location of bathrooms would not require planning permission and as such it is considered unreasonable for this to form a reason for refusal of this application.*
- It is not clear if the application includes extractor fans and if it does what the orientation of the fans would be - *no extractor fans have been indicated on the submitted plans and therefore are not a consideration of this application. It is noted that this permission does not permit the placement of any extractor fans or vents*
- The eaves of the proposed extension are significantly higher than the 3m permissible under permitted development rights - *whilst permitted development rights are not relevant to this application, this issue has also been address through the submission of amended plans*
- The applicant has also erected a shed that negatively impacts upon the amenity of no.25 - *this application does not make any reference to a shed and as such it is not*

a consideration to be assessed in this application. It is also noted that this application does not grant planning permission (either prospectively or retrospectively) for any outbuildings

- *The applicant did not display the site notice until 29th July 2018 - as the adjoining neighbours were also notified of the application by letter all necessary statutory consultations have been carried out irrespective of whether a site notice was displayed or not.*
- *The proposal would be detrimental to the living environment of the occupiers of nearby properties in terms of privacy and overlooking; access to daylight and sunlight and noise and disturbance - see '9. Appraisal' below*
- *The proposal does not respect the character or pattern of neighbouring properties or of the street as a whole - see '9. Appraisal' below*
- *The gapping between properties that is characteristic of the street scene would not be retained - see '9. Appraisal' below*
- *The overall length of the extension appear to have been increased by approximately 1m from the previous application - each application must be assessed on its own merits against all relevant planning policy. Please refer to '9. Appraisal' below for the assessment of this application*
- *The size of the proposed store would allow for the formation of a forth bedroom that could be let as a separate unit - Policy DM9 states that 'ancillary accommodation such as granny annexes will be acceptable where not capable of operating as a separate dwelling which could be let or sold separately'. The policy goes on to state that 'ancillary accommodation could be considered a separate dwelling where is:*
 - *Is self-sufficient in terms of facilities e.g. kitchens or bathrooms*
 - *Has its own front door without internal links to the main house and/or*
 - *Has its own external facilities e.g. access, drive, garden or has scope for these to be created easily.'*

Whilst the bathroom could be re-orientated without planning permission to exclusively serve the store room, it is not considered that the part of the proposed extension could be considered a separate dwelling as defined by the criteria stated in Policy DM9 (ie. the proposed extension, or relevant part(s) of the proposed extension, is not self-sufficient in terms of facilities; does have internal links to the main house and does not have its own external facilities)

- *The rear element of the proposed extension would negatively impact upon the views, light and amenity currently enjoyed by the neighbouring properties - it is noted that views (and the loss of) are not a material planning consideration and as such cannot impact upon the determination of this application. With reference to the other points raised please see '9. Appraisal' below*
- *No site notice was displayed with relation to the amended plans - as the adjoining neighbours were notified of the amended plans by letter, all necessary statutory consultations have been carried out*
- *The proximity to the boundary, coupled with the lack of access give rise to concerns regarding the constructability, quality and appearance of the side elevation - any permission issued would be in relation to the approved plans and assessed against relevant planning policy in terms of design quality. Any material deviation from those plans would represent a breach of planning control. The*

quality of workmanship and construction fall within the remit of Building Control and as such are not material planning considerations. An informative is recommended advising the applicant of the need for a building control application

4. Plans and Documents Considered

The Council, in reaching its recommendation, has taken into consideration the following plans & documents:

Drawing No.:

- 01 - Existing ground and first floor plan
- 02 - Existing elevations
- Block Plan 1 : 500
- Location Plan 1 : 1250

As received: 30/05/2018

- Site Plan
- 01 Rev. B - Proposed ground floor plan
- 03 Rev. B - Proposed elevations

As received: 08/10/2018

5. Relevant Planning History

None

6. 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.

7. Relevant Planning 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. The Development Plan for Reading relevant to the application site comprises the Reading Local Development Framework 'Core Strategy' 2008 (Altered 2015) and 'Sites and Detailed Policies Document' 2012 (Altered 2015).

The 'National Planning Policy framework' ('NPPF') 2012 states clearly that its content is to be a material consideration in the determination of applications. 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 'NPPF' and the following development plan policies and supplementary planning guidance are relevant:

8. Relevant Policies

The application has been assessed against the following policies:

National

National Planning Policy Framework;
National Planning Policy Guidance;

RBC Local Development Framework

Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015)

CS7 Design and the Public Realm
CS24 Car / Cycle Parking

Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015)

DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity)
DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)
DM10 (Amenity Space)
DM12 (Access, Traffic and Highway Related Matters)

Supplementary Planning Guidance -

A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003)
Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD (2011)

9. Appraisal

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

Being to the side of the application property the proposed extension would be visible from the street scene along Highmoor Road. The proposal would be single storey and have a width equal to half that of the original house. As such it is considered that the scale of the proposed extension would not be significantly out of character with the host dwelling or surrounding area. Given the existing side and rear extension at the attached neighbouring property (21 Highmoor Road) and the variation in scale, design and gapping between properties along this part of Highmoor Road; the proposal is not considered to be significantly harmful to the character or pattern of development of the surrounding area.

Further, to be made with external materials to match the existing and a tiled mono-pitched roof, the extension is considered to integrate satisfactorily with the character of the host dwelling and visual amenity of the surrounding area.

The proposal would project a relatively modest 2.5m from the existing rear elevation and would retain a 0.6m gap to the common boundary with no.25. It is considered that the proposal would retain the high level gapping that is characteristic of the area and not

appear unduly cramped. The proposed side element would project 1.5m forward of the existing front elevation (0.9m from the front of the bay). Whilst this is contrary to the advice provided in the Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide To House Extensions (2003), given the relatively modest scale of the extension and distance it would project from the existing front elevation (and the context in the area); it is not considered sufficiently harmful to the character of the host dwelling or surrounding area to warrant the refusal of this application.

The host dwelling would retain sufficient amenity space to the rear elevation, which is considered adequate for a dwelling of this size and relative to the character of amenity spaces to surrounding dwellings.

The proposal would accord with Policies CS7, DM9 and DM10.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

The neighbouring properties potentially affected by the proposed development are 21 Highmoor Road and 25 Highmoor Road, located to the east and west of the application site respectively.

With regards to the adjoining neighbour, no.21, the proposed rear extension would abut the common boundary. As the extension would be single storey and project a modest 2.5m from the existing rear elevation, it is considered that it would not have any significant detrimental impacts in terms of loss of light or overbearing. The side element of the proposal would be to the west of the application site and therefore would not significantly affect the amenity of no.21.

With relation to no.25, the proposed extension would be set off the common boundary by 0.6m. Combining this with no.25 being set off the boundary by 2m and that the proposed extension would be single storey; it is considered that, whilst the proposed development would just breach the 45 degree line taken from the window of the nearest habitable window, it would only do so at single storey and the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact upon the occupiers of neighbouring no.25 in terms of loss of light or overbearing.

Whilst two side facing windows are proposed, these would be at ground floor levels and are marked on the plans as being obscured glazed. Subject to a condition stating that the side facing windows must be (and remain) non-opening below 1.7m and obscure glazed, it is considered that there would not be any significant detrimental impact in terms of privacy or overlooking. Further, the proposal would result in the removal of the existing side facing kitchen window and hallway window, which are not obscure glazed. As such the proposed extension is considered to represent an improvement to the existing situation in terms of privacy and overlooking.

The proposal accords with Policy DM4.

Other Issues

Community Infrastructure Levy

The proposal would not be liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

10. Recommendation

Grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission was granted.

Reason: to prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions, and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of this development shall match those of the existing building.

Reason: To ensure that the new development appears in keeping with the existing building, in the interests of the character of the area, in accordance Policy DM9 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015).

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Site Plan

01 Rev. B - Proposed ground floor plan

03 Rev. B - Proposed elevations

As received: 08/10/2018

Reason: because permission is granted in respect of the development as detailed in the approved plans only.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order) the proposed west side windows shall be *non-opening and glazed with obscure glass* on parts below 1.7m as a minimum when measured from the floor level of the respective rooms, before occupation of that room, and shall be permanently maintained thereafter as non-opening and obscure glazed.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises from overlooking and loss of privacy in accordance with Policy DM4 and DM11.

Informatives

1. Your attention is drawn to the terms and conditions of this permission. Any development which is carried out but which differs materially from the approved plans and details, or does not comply with any condition(s) or planning obligation(s) attached to the permission may result in the Council taking action to remedy the breach of planning control. If you are in any doubt please contact the Council.
2. The applicant's attention is drawn to Building Regulations requirements. Please contact Building Control on 0118 937 2449 for advice.
3. The construction (and demolition) of the development will be subject to environmental health law and the applicant is referred to:
<http://beta.reading.gov.uk/environmentalprotection>
4. The decision to grant planning permission follows the positive and proactive consideration of the issues raised by this planning application and issuing the decision within the agreed time period.