

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 8 Hilltop Road

Application No: 180301

Proposal: Single storey front and side extension

Applicant: Mr John Ness

Date received (valid from): 15/02/2018

Target decision date: 12/04/2018

Agreed extension of time: 04/05/2018

Case officer: Tom French

1. Site description and Surrounding Area

The application site contains a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on the south side of Hilltop Road. There is an existing two storey rear extension and a rear amenity space that is approximately 27m deep and 9m wide.

The area is characterised by semi-detached residential properties of similar design, most of which have been extended and all with long rear gardens.

2. The Proposal

A householder application for planning permission is sought for a single storey front and side extension. The proposal would have a wraparound form and would project 1.5m from the existing front elevation and 1.5m from the existing side elevation. The total width of the front of the extension would be 4.5m and the proposal would have a total depth of 5m. One window is proposed in both the front and side elevations and the plans show that both would be obscure glazed.

A hipped roof is proposed that would join into the existing ground floor roof protrusion on the front elevation.

3. Consultation

Neighbours consultation:

No.s 6, 10 and 11 Hilltop Road, 76 Woodcote Way and 45 Geoffreyson Road have been notified of the application on the 20th February 2018.

No responses have been received.

Transport:

The RBC Transport Development Control officer advised that there are no transport objections to this application.

4. Plans and Documents Considered

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

Drawing No.:

- 01 - Existing and proposed ground floor plan
- 02 - Existing elevations
- 03 - Proposed elevations
- Location Plan

As received: 16/02/2018

Block Plan, as received 07/03/18.

5. Relevant Planning History

23/06/2004 - 040202 - FUL - Single storey side/rear extension - Application Permitted

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

Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015)

DM4 (Safeguarding Amenity)

DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

DM10 (Amenity Space)

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

9. Appraisal

The main issues to be considered are:

- Impact on the character of the surrounding area and street scene
- Impact on the host dwelling
- Amenity

Impact on the character of the surrounding area and street scene

The building line along Hilltop Road between Woodcote Way and Geoffreyson Road comprises two pairs of semi-detached properties - no.s 4, 6, 8 (the application property) and 10 Hilltop Road. Hilltop Road is characterised by semi-detached pairs, changing to linked semi-detached at the east end of the road, with significant gapping between pairs at first floor level. This character is achieved through consistency in the design and form of the properties, and by maintaining the clear and distinct building lines. As such the building line is considered to be an important feature of the street scene that contributes to the character and distinctiveness of the area. By projecting 1.5m forward of the front elevation, with a width of 4.5m, the proposal is not considered respectful of the character and pattern of the neighbouring properties or the important existing building line.

The wrap around form of the proposal means that the full width of the proposed extension would be forward of the existing building line. This results in a design less sympathetic to the local context than an extension of equivalent scale but of different design form. As such the proposal is not considered to be of high design quality that maintains and enhances the character of the area.

Being a semi-detached property the impact of the proposal on the pair as a whole must be considered. Whilst it is acknowledged that application property and adjoining no. 10 Hilltop Road are not symmetrical, with no. 10 being significantly extended to the side (planning permission 030834), there is an existing consistency of design. With its wrap around form and the scale of the forward projection, the proposal does not follow the pattern of the adjoining no. 10 and as a result would impact negatively upon the existing continuity of the pair. As such, the proposal relates poorly to the local context and fails to respect the character and pattern of the neighbouring properties.

For the above reasons the proposal does not accord with Policy CS7 or Policy DM9. Furthermore, the Design Guide to House Extensions SPD specifies that “the Council will normally not grant planning permission for front extensions that are excessive in size in terms of height and depth relative to the dwelling on the site and neighbouring buildings and which fail to demonstrate a balance of proportions” (p11). Reference to the SPD is therefore referenced in the reason for refusal.

Impact on the host dwelling

The application property has a simple and uncluttered style and is characterised by the ground floor bay windows and the protruding roof feature at ground floor level. These architectural features project just 0.5m from the existing front elevation and complement the simple style, form and proportions of the host dwelling. The proposed extension would project 1.5m from the existing front elevation and, considering the significant bulk of the proposal, would draw the eye and appear overly dominant. Due to the scale and design of the proposal, it would integrate poorly with the existing styling of the host dwelling and would be detrimental to the character of the house.

As such the proposal does not accord with Policy CS7 or Policy DM9.

Amenity

The proposal, in itself, is not considered to give rise to any significant detrimental loss of amenity to any neighbouring occupier, in terms of policy DM4.

For current and future occupiers of the host property, the proposed works would improve the standard of accommodation at the property. However, these benefits are not considered to outweigh the harm identified above, when applying a planning balance.

10. Recommendation

REFUSE

The proposed extension, owing to its forward projection from the front boundary line and wraparound nature, would be harmfully out of character with the host property and wider streetscene, contrary to Policy CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008, Altered 2015),, DM9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the Reading Borough Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015) and guidance within the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003).