

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Address: 32 Anglefield Road

Application No: 180653

Proposal: Two storey side extension and rear first floor extension

Applicant: Mr P Turek

Date received (valid from): 18/04/2018

Target Decision date: 13/06/2018

Case officer: Tom French

1. Site description and Surrounding Area

The application property is a two storey end of terraced dwelling located on the south side of Anglefield Road, along the bend. The surrounding area is characterized by a mix of semi-detached houses and short rows of 4 terraces. No.32 was originally one part of a semi-detached property; however, No.30, the adjacent property was granted planning permission for a dwelling adjacent No.30, resulting in the pair of semis becoming a row of 3 terraces. The pairs of semi-detached dwellings have substantial gaps between them which provide a spacious quality to the area.

The land slopes significantly to the rear and the site is within an air quality management area.

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

2. The Proposal

A householder planning permission is sought for a two storey side extension and first floor rear extension. The side extension would project 3.7m from the existing side elevation at ground floor level and 2.7m at first floor level. The rear extension would project at first floor level above the existing kitchen.

The roof of the proposed extension would be set down 0.5m from the ridge of the existing roof. To the rear the proposal would have a hipped m-type roof form with a pitch to match the existing roof.

The proposed extension would be made with materials to match existing.

3. Consultation

Neighbours consultation:

No.s 30 & 34 Anglefield Road and 29, 31, 33 & 35 Lower Henley Road have been notified of the application and a site notice has also been displayed at the site from the 16th May 2018.

No responses have been received.

Transport consultation:

The RBC Transport Development Control Advisor has provided the following consultation response.

As a result of the submission of plans illustrating requested visibility splays, Transport do not have any objections to this application subject to the conditions and informatives stated below.

CONDITIONS:

DC1 Vehicle parking space provided in accordance with approved plans

The dwelling(s)/building(s) hereby permitted shall not be occupied until all vehicle parking space(s) have been provided in accordance with the approved plan. The space(s) shall be kept available for parking at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities to meet the needs of future occupiers and reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which could be a danger to other road users to accord with Policy CS24 & CS24 and Policy DM12.

DC2 Vehicle access provided in accordance with approved plans

No dwelling/building hereby permitted shall be occupied until the vehicle access serving it has been constructed in accordance with the approved drawing.

Reason: In the interests of road safety in accordance with Policy CS20 and Policy DM12.

INFORMATIVE:

IF3 Highways

i) The attention of the applicant is drawn to Section 59 of the Highways Act 1980, which enables the Highway Authority to recover expenses due to damage caused by extraordinary traffic.

ii) Any works affecting the Highway shall be in accordance with Reading Borough's Council's document "Guidance Notes for Activities on the Public Highway within the Borough of Reading". The applicant should note that compliance with this document is mandatory and licences to work on the Highway will only be issued if the requirements contained within it are met. A copy can be obtained from the Council's website.

ACCESS CONSTRUCTION

The Council's Highways section should be contacted at 19 Bennet Road, Reading, RG2 0QX, telephone: 0118 937 2138, to agree the access construction details and to grant a licence before any work is carried out within the highway. A formal application should be made allowing at least 4 week's notice to obtain details of underground services on the applicants' behalf.

4. Plans and Documents Considered

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

Drawing No.:

- 1 Rev. A - PLANNING

As received: 15/08/2018

5. Relevant Planning History

Application site

080091 - FUL - Two bedroom end terrace - Application Refused

091322 - FUL - Erection of two bedroom end terraced dwelling (Resubmission of 08/00507/FUL) - Application Refused

Appeal Ref APP/E0345/A/09/2113107 - Appeal Dismissed

170372 - HOU - Two storey side extension and rear first floor extension - Application Refused

No. 30 Anglefield Road

070098 - FUL - Erect a new 3 bed terrace dwelling - 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

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

Application 170372 was refused for the following reason:

‘The proposed development, owing to its bulk, scale, massing and detailed design, would create an overly dominant and incongruous form of development which would appear out of keeping with the host property and would be poorly integrated within the Anglefield Road street scene. As such, the proposed development would be harmful to and out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy DM9 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015), Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012’

Application 091322 (for an attached dwelling) was refused for the following reason:

‘The application fails to demonstrate how the location of the dwelling within the site, using virtually the entire width of the plot would result in a development that would respect the character of the streetscene and not appear cramped, given that the streetscene is defined largely through the relationship of the buildings and spaces between the buildings which contributes to the characteristic spaciousness of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with the requirements of saved policies HSG9 (Location of Residential Development) and CUD14 (Standards of Design in Development) of the Reading Borough Local Plan (1998) and policies CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) and CS15 (Location, Accessibility, Density and Housing Mix) of the adopted Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008).’

The planning Inspector dismissed the appeal (see relevant history section above) and considered the scheme to significantly reduce the gap to the adjacent pair of semi-detached dwellings and, due to its location adjacent to the bend in Anglefield Road, considered that the proposed dwelling would appear awkward and contrived in views from the street scene. It was considered that the scheme would appear out of context with the street scene, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the locality.

Whilst each planning application must be assessed on its own merits against all relevant planning policy, previous determinations are a material consideration. It is therefore a consideration the degrees to which previous reasons for refusal have been address.

Application 091322 was for a separate dwelling rather than an extension and was assessed against the HSG policies that have since been superseded by the Sited and Detailed Policies Document (2008, 2015). However, the crux of the policies remains the same and it is not considered that in design and street scene terms the current application sufficiently addresses the reasons that the previous application was dismissed at appeal.

Application 170372 was for an extension of a similar design and overall scale as the current proposal. The notable differences between the previous application (170372) and the current application are that this application would project 3.7m from the existing side elevation (rather than the 4.7m proposed in application 170372) and includes a raised decking area to the rear of the property. Given the similar design and modest reduction in width, it is not considered that the current application has sufficiently overcomes the issues surrounding bulk, scale, massing or design that formed the previous reason for refusal.

Further, when considering the proposals on their own merits, irrespective of the previous application, the proposals are considered unacceptable in design terms, as explained in greater detail below.

Due to the application site being located on a bend in Anglefield Road combined with the open and spacious character of the immediate surrounding area, the proposed side extension would be visible from the north east along Anglefield Road all the way to the junction with Henley Road (A4155). As such any side extension at this site will be prominent position in the street scene, emphasising the importance of high quality design that responds positively to the local context and increasing harmful the impact of poor design. Whilst there are examples of side extensions along Anglefield Road they are all single storey and relatively modest in scale, projecting less than half the width of the original dwellings to which they are attached. As such, the current application, being two storey and projecting from the side elevation a distance greater than half the width of the host dwelling, is not considered to respect the character and pattern of the neighbouring properties and street as a whole.

The proposed extension would be set down from the ridge of the main roof by 0.5m, set back from the existing front elevation by 0.7m and the first floor would be project 2.7m from the existing side elevation rather than the 3.7m of the proposed ground floor. These techniques should result in an extension that is subservient to the host property. However, it is considered that due to the overall scale of the proposal (the width is almost the same as the width of the existing house, albeit that part of this is single rather than two storey), the proposal would be out of proportion with the scale of the host dwelling and would not result in a subservient addition (as required by the adopted policies and guidance). Similarly, whilst the hipped roofs to the rear of the extension help - to a certain extent - to soften the impact slightly, it is still considered to appear overly bulky, with the roof profiles integrating poorly with the host property, exacerbating the overall scale. Although

it is acknowledged that the rearmost part of the dwelling may not be as readily visible from a public vantage point, due to the dwellings position in the bend of Anglefield Road and that the side elevation would be highly visible, this is not considered to justify allowing a development which would have a poor appearance within the area. As such it is considered that the proposals appear to integrate poorly with the host property, resulting in an overly dominant form of development that would appear out of keeping with the established street scene and characteristic spaciousness of the area.

The applicant's requirements for living space are noted. However, it is considered that the proposal does little to achieve an appearance in keeping with its plot and its wider setting. It is considered that the elevations, as a result of poor design, would result in a building being extended by much more than its 'natural' or logical limits. Consequently, due to the design, overall bulk, massing and scale the proposals would appear excessive and would not respect the character of the host property. Furthermore, due to its location adjacent to the bend in Anglefield Road, the extension would appear awkward and contrived in views from the north east and would be out of keeping with the established character of the street scene.

For the reasons stated above, the proposals would be contrary to Policy DM9 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015), Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015), the supplementary planning guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

The neighbouring properties potentially affected by the proposals are Nos. 30 and 34 Anglefield Road, located to the south west and north east of the site respectively. Application 091322 did not consider the proposals for an attached dwelling to result in any unacceptable harm to any neighbouring property in terms of loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact and the Planning Inspector agreed. This is also considered the case for application 170372.

Considering the current application on its own merits, it is considered that the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

In relation to No.34, no windows are proposed in the east side elevation of this property and as such there would be no material loss of privacy. Whilst the extension would be visible to the occupiers of No.34, given the distance to the dwelling itself and that the extension would be angled away from the boundary due to the tapering nature of the site, it is not considered to result in any material loss of light or overbearing impact.

With regards to No.30, no side facing windows are proposed on the first floor rear extension so there would be no material loss of privacy. Whilst the first floor rear extension would be visible to the occupiers of this property, it would not breach a 45 degree line to the nearest habitable room window. Given the distance to the common

boundary and that the roof would be hipped away to minimise the impact, it is not considered to result in any significant material loss of light or overbearing impact.

The site backs onto the rear gardens of Nos. 33 and 35 Lower Henley Road. Whilst the garden slopes to the rear, given the boundary treatment, which includes vegetation, it is considered that the back-to-back distance of approximately 20m between the properties would be sufficient enough so as not to result in any significant material loss of amenity in terms of loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact.

The proposal accords with Policy DM4.

Other Issues

Community Infrastructure Levy

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

Transport

Following the submission of revised plans showing the visibility splays and new dropped kerb there are no transport related objections to this application.

10. Recommendation

REFUSE

The proposed development, owing to its bulk, scale, massing and detailed design, would create an overly dominant and incongruous form of development which would appear out of keeping with the host property and would be poorly integrated within the Anglefield Road street scene. As such, the proposed development would be harmful to and out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy DM9 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (altered 2015), Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy 2008 (altered 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Informatives

1. The decision relates to the following drawing:

Drawing No.:

- 1 Rev. A - PLANNING

As received: 15/08/2018