

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 183 Upper Woodcote Road

Application No: 180181

Proposal: Single storey side extension with part single storey, part two storey rear extension

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Weldon

Date received (valid from): 07/02/2018

Target Decision date: 04/04/2018

Case officer: Tom French

1. Site description and Surrounding Area

The application site contains a two storey detached dwelling on the west side of Upper Woodcote Road. The site has a spacious driveway and garage to provide off-road parking and has a rear amenity space that is approximately 32m deep and 17m wide. The surrounding area is characterised by large detached dwellings of differing architectural style and design.

2. The Proposal

A householder application for planning permission is sought for a single storey side extension and a two storey rear extension.

The proposed side extension would be single storey and would protrude 2.7m from the existing side elevation. The extension would have a hipped roof with an eaves height of 3m. A parapet wall 3.3m high would form the boundary between the application site and no. 181 Upper Woodcote Road. A stainless steel flue to serve a gas fire is proposed.

The proposed rear extension would project 3m from the existing rear elevation with a maximum width of 9m. At ground floor the existing pitched roof would be extended to the proposal and at first floor the existing dormer would be extended to meet the proposal. The rear extension would have a hipped roof, set down 0.4m from the existing ridge line.

One window is proposed in the side elevation and this would be at first floor level, the plans note that it would be of obscure glaze. Two sets of french windows and one window are proposed at ground floor level in the rear elevation. At first floor in the rear elevation 3 windows are proposed.

3. Consultation

Neighbours consultation:

Nos. 181 and 185 Upper Woodcote Road have been notified of the application and a site notice has also been displayed at the site.

A letter of support for the application has been received. In addition an objection has been received in relation to the follow:

- The proposal represents overdevelopment and is not in keeping with other developments in the area.
- The flank wall is overly high and considering the minimal gap to the boundary would have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property.
- The maintenance of the flank wall would require access to the neighbouring property.

- The proximity to existing trees.
- The presence of the flue pipe close to the boundary.

4. Plans and Documents Considered

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

Drawing No.:

- 1203 / 1 / a - Plans and Elevations as Existing
- 1203 / 2 / a - Plans and Elevations as Proposed

As received: 12/02/2018

- 1203 / 3 - Block Plan

As received: 09/02/2018

- Location Plan

As received: 06/02/2018

5. Relevant Planning History

25/10/2004 - 040134 - FUL - First floor side extension and ground floor rear extension - Application Permitted

27/10/2005 - 050018 - FUL - Rear first floor dormer to existing bathroom to replace existing window and flat-roofed area - 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 area and street scene
- Amenity
- Impact on host dwelling

Impact on the character of the area and the street scene

This part of Upper Woodcote Road is characterised by large detached dwellings of varying styles and designs, many of which have been significantly extended. The impression of spaciousness is an important characteristic of the street scene. The proposal would retain the existing 1m gap to the boundary with no. 185 Upper Woodcote Road and would leave no gap to the boundary with no. 181 Upper Woodcote Road. Given the size of the application site the 1m gap is not considered significant as the proposal would read from the street scene as being full width, giving the impression of a cramped development resulting in the loss of spaciousness. As such the proposal does not integrate well into the distinctive and characterful street scene and therefore cannot be considered high quality design that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area of Reading in which it is located.

It is acknowledged that there are numerous examples of properties along Upper Woodcote Road extending all the way to a boundary. However, they generally have either a significant gap to the boundary on the other side or the extension is substantially set back from the front elevation (which offers the impression of gapping and spaciousness when viewed from the street scene). By extending to the boundary with no. 181 without a significant gap to the boundary with no. 185 and without a substantial set back from the existing front elevation, the extension does not respect the character and pattern of neighbouring properties or the street as a whole.

Due to the curve of the road the application property sits forwards of neighbouring no. 181 and as such the application property is in a prominent position in the street scene and the side elevation is visible for a great distance along Upper Woodcote Road. The side element of the proposal includes a parapet wall 3.3m high and 11m deep with no feature or relief along its length. As such it is considered that the proposal would present a large blank façade to a public area.

For the above reasons the proposal does not accord with policies CS7 or DM9.

Amenity

Given that no. 185 sits forward of the application property and that the proposed development would be to the south of the application site, the proposal would have no impact on the amenity of no. 185. With respect to no. 181 it is considered that the 3.3m high parapet wall, 11m deep and with no separation from the boundary would appear visually dominant and have an unacceptable overbearing impact.

Whilst a first floor side facing window is proposed, it would be of obscure glazing. It is considered that the proposal would have no adverse effects in terms of overlooking and would not result in loss of privacy.

As a result of the visual dominance and overbearing impact the proposal does not accord with policy DM4.

Impact on host dwelling

The large detached form of the host dwelling is complemented by it being set in a spacious and uncluttered plot, with a 2.7m gap to the boundary with no. 181. The proposed side element of the extension would produce a cramped relationship with the neighbouring no. 181. This would be to the detriment of the spacious and open character of the application property and as such the proposal is not considered to respect the character of the house in terms of design.

For this reason the proposal does not accord with policies CS7 or DM9.

10. Recommendation

Refuse