

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Norcot

App Ref: 231572/HOU

Address: 24 Ibstock Close, Reading, RG30 2NU

Proposals: Proposed replacement of existing uPVC conservatory with new gable-roofed single-storey side and rear extension.

Case Officer: James Schofield

Applicant: Abdelhakim Boughriet

Date received (valid from): 3 November 2023 **Target Decision date:** Originally 29 December; Extension of time agreed until 1 March 2024

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is an end of terrace dwelling on Ibstock Close. The wider residential estate was part of the re-development of former industrial land during the 1970s. As such, the dwellings within this development are relatively uniform in terms of their design. The attached garages and driveways dominate much of the front elevations of each close within this estate. However, the end sites on Ibstock Close and Windrush Way include landscape strips. These landscape strips were purposefully planned into the estate layout to provide relief. 24 Ibstock Close, along with 1 Ibstock Close, 1 Appleby End, and 27 Appleby End are some of the most prominent sites within the estate; being visible from Water Road and acting as gateway sites to their respective roads and the wider estate.

Site visit date: 26/01/2024

Site visit photos:



2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposal is for the replacement of an existing uPVC conservatory with a single-storey wraparound side and rear extension with a gable-ended roof. Plans considered:

Dwg No. PL01 - Plans & elevations floor plan as existing

~~Dwg No. PL02 - Floor plans & block plan as proposed (superseded)~~

~~Dwg No. PL03 - Elevations as proposed and location plan (superseded)~~

As received on the 6th of November 2023

Dwg No. PL02 Rev A - Floor plans & block plan as proposed

Dwg No. PL03 Rev A - Elevations as proposed and location plan

As received on the 22nd of February 2024

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The following addresses were consulted by letter.

23 Ibstock Close, Reading, RG30 2NU

No letters of representation have been received.

Ecology

The Ecology officer indicated that any impact on protected species, including bats, was unlikely.

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.

5. LEGAL AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

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. Material considerations include relevant policies in the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) - among them the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

National Planning Practice Guidance 2024 onwards

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

CC7 (Design and the Public Realm)

CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity)

H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation)

SPG/SPD

A Design Guide to House Extensions SPG

6. APPRAISAL

Character and Appearance

Policy H9 states that an extension to a house will be acceptable where it respects the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials, and design and respects the character and pattern of neighbouring properties and the street as a whole in terms of scale, location, materials and design, and any important existing building line. Policy CC7 also sets out relevant considerations for design.

There is no objection to the loss of the existing conservatory. However, the proposed extension, due to its scale, design and siting, would appear unduly bulky and intrusive. The relationship between the roof of the proposed side extension and the existing first-floor bay window would be close, and result in a cluttered visually awkward relationship, with the bay overhanging the side of the gable-ended roof. Due to its size and wrap-around nature, the extension would be out of scale with the original house, and given the corner site location, this development would be particularly prominent and harmful to the character of the dwelling and the wider streetscene.

Part of the extension would be sited on land to the south west of 24 Ibstock Road. Although within the same ownership as the remainder of the property, it is considered that the land falls outside of the domestic curtilage and instead forms part of the landscaping of the estate. It is considered that the land, in its grassed unenclosed state, forms an important part of the

landscaping of the estate, (in combination with other grassed areas in the surrounding area) and contributes positively to the character of the area and the appearance of the street scene. These landscape strips offer much needed visual relief, and its loss, combined with the visual intrusion caused by the extension would impact Ibstock Close and adjacent Windrush Way and Water Road.



View of 24 Ibstock Close from the intersection of Windrush Way and Water Road; the large tree in the middle of the image is next to the proposal site, which is the house with the first-floor bay window on its side elevation [left- hand side].

In conclusion on this point, due to the design, scale and wraparound nature, the proposed extension would draw the eye, appearing jarring and unbalanced in the street scene. It would encroach onto a landscape strip serving a clear and important design function for the area. This would be exacerbated by the site's prominent corner plot location. The resultant extension would detract from the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the surrounding area, and as such, does not accord with the aims of Policies CC7 and H9 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019) or the Design Guide to House Extensions SPD 2021.

Residential Amenity

Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not result in an overbearing impact on neighbours. Policy H10 seeks to ensure that the amenity of gardens and other outdoor areas are not compromised. Policy CC8 states an extension to a house will be acceptable where it will not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties.

The proposal includes the removal of an existing conservatory, and would replace it with a rear extension. The eaves would be relatively low and the roof would be hipped away to minimise the impact. Whilst clearly visible, it is not considered to result in any significant material overbearing effects over and above the current situation to warrant a refusal on this basis.

7. CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed as set out above and is considered to be unacceptable for the reasons set out below.

The proposed extension, due to its prominent siting, excessive scale, and encroachment onto land which forms part of the landscaping of the wider estate would appear overly dominant in relation to the existing dwelling and streetscene with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CC7 and H9 of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan (2019) and the Design Guide to House Extensions SPD 2021.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE.