

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Target Date: 25/02/2019

Application No: 182260/HOU

Address: 9 Kintbury Walk, Reading

Proposal: Part one, part two storey rear extension

Case officer: Ethne Humphreys

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application property is a two storey mid-terraced dwelling located on the south side of Kintbury Walk. Whilst the front of the site faces Kintbury Walk, the rear of the property faces Silchester Road and the rear garden has been replaced with hardstanding, used for parking. There is a walkway from the front of the site through to the rear. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, however, the Grange United Reformed Church is located to the north of the site and Southcote Primary School to the south east of the site.

Proposal:

This is an application for a proposed part one, part two storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear outbuilding. The proposed single storey element would measure approximately 4m in width and 6m in depth. The proposed two storey element would measure approximately 3.6 m in width and 3m in depth and would measure approximately 6m at its highest point.

Decking is also proposed. The materials would match those of the host property.

Plans Considered:

Drawing No: Existing Plans and Elevations P1816 - 02

Received 7th January 2018

Drawing No: Proposed Plans and Elevations P18016 - 03 B

Received 5th February

Drawing No: Location Plan and Block Plan

Received 10th February 2018

Relevant Planning History:

None.

Consultation Responses:

None.

Neighbour letters were sent to No's 8 and 10 Kintbury Walk.

Two letters of representation received, concerned with:

- Loss of light

Summary of discussions with applicant/agent:

The agent was advised that the proposals, as originally submitted would, due to the scale, bulk and detailed design (flat roof, differing eaves heights) relate poorly to the host property and terrace, resulting in a contrived and incongruous appearance. The agent submitted revised plans reducing the depth of the single storey rear element and replacing the flat roof with a pitched hipped roof. The proposals were still not considered acceptable (as discussed below) and the agent opted to receive the decision notice on the basis of the revised plans with a view to appealing any such refusal.

No formal pre-application advice was sought 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

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

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

DM4: Safeguarding Amenity

DM9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

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

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

Albeit the proposals would be located at the rear of the property, given the layout of this terraced row, the rear elevation is highly visible from the Silchester Road street scene, to the south of the site, immediately adjacent the rear gardens.

The terrace has a simple linear form and whilst it is recognised that the majority of the properties in this terraced row feature single storey rear extensions, they are of a scale which is subservient to the host building - and the remainder of the terrace.

Due to the scale, siting and detailed design (including differing roof forms), it is considered that the cumulative impact of the proposed development would not relate sympathetically with the host property, with the proposals resulting in a contrived appearance and somewhat disharmonious architectural composition. Both the single storey and two storey elements would have an awkward visual relationship in respect of the host dwelling and adjoining properties either side; Indeed, it would be harmful to the property's original character and the remainder of the terrace, particularly when viewed from the rear and neighbouring gardens, due to the sites prominent location. The proposals would result in a visually prominent addition which would appear overly dominant to the host property and a discordant feature which jars with the terrace as a whole, harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

As above, given the sites prominent location in respect of the Silchester Road street scene, from this public vantage point, the proposals would stand out as being visually incongruous and of poor design.

The proposal incorporates decking which, in isolation, is considered acceptable.

In respect of the above, the agent has commented that a two storey rear extension could be constructed under permitted development rights, and considers that its effect would have virtually the same effect as the proposal. The proposal is for a part one, part two storey rear extension, which is not permitted development, and as such little weight is given to this argument. The proposal has been assessed on its merits.

Contrary to Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015), Policy DM9 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015) and the Council's Supplementary Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

The neighbouring properties potentially affected by the proposals are No's 8 and 10 Kintbury Walk, located to the east and west of the site respectively. Concern has been raised that the proposals would result in a loss of light to both properties. In this respect, the first floor element as originally proposed was, due to its position and depth considered to be overbearing to both properties. However, the below appraisal is made in light of the revised plans.

Both No's 8 and 10 feature single storey offshoot additions and the proposed single storey element would not project past these additions. As such, albeit slightly higher, the extension would not result in any material loss of light or overbearing impact.

In respect of the first floor element, it would not breach a 45 degree line to the nearest habitable room window to either neighbouring property. The roof would be hipped away to minimise the impact and, whilst visible, it is not considered to result in any significant material loss of light or overbearing impact to the occupiers of either property. No first floor windows are proposed on the flank elevations facing either property and as such there would be no material loss of privacy.

Given the small scale nature of the proposed decking, it is not considered to result in any material loss of amenity to either neighbouring property.

As such in overall terms, considering all nearby residential occupiers, no significantly harmful amenity impacts would occur, subject to conditions and in compliance with policy DM4.

Conclusion

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE

Due to the scale, siting and detailed design, the proposals would result in a visually prominent addition which would appear contrived in appearance and overly dominant to the host property and in relation to the remainder of the terraced row. As such, the proposals would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and contrary to Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015), Policy DM9 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015), the Council's Supplementary Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions and the National Planning Policy Framework (2018).

Informatives

The decision relates to the following drawings and documents:

Drawing No: Existing Plans and Elevations P1816 - 02

Received 7th January 2018

Drawing No: Proposed Plans and Elevations P18016 - 03 B

Received 5th February

Drawing No: Location Plan and Block Plan

Received 10th February 2018

The local planning authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way by clearly setting out concerns relating to the proposal and providing an opportunity for the applicant to withdraw the application. However, the agent opted to receive the decision notice, hence the issuing of this decision within the statutory time period. Use of the Council's pre-application advice service can avoid the need to refuse planning permission. This scheme was not subject to pre-application planning advice.