



Reading Conservation Area Advisory Committee
22 August 2024

2 ANSTEY ROAD – APPLICATION 240595

Dear Gary Miles

We hope that you are able to take account of our comments in your decision although we are aware that the deadline has passed. Reading CAAC object to this application to erect a rear roof dormer extension and two rooflights to the front roof slope.

Summary of objections:

- The applicant has not provided a heritage statement.
- The proposal will fail to respect the character and appearance of the property within the Russell Street/Castle Hill/Oxford Road Conservation Area (CA), which is included within Historic England's Heritage at risk list.
- The proposal does not take account of the Design Guide for House Extensions SPD.
- For the above reasons the proposal does not comply with policies EN3 or H9.

1. HERITAGE

1.1.1 The applicant has not prepared a heritage statement assessing the heritage impact of this proposal.

1.1 2 Anstey Road is a late nineteenth century terraced property within the Russell Street/Castle Hill/Oxford Road Conservation Area (CA). There are no listed buildings within the immediate area.



Extract from OS map surveyed 1875 published 1879 before Anstey Road was laid out. National Library of Scotland



Anstey Road Extract from OS map surveyed 1898 published 1900 after Anstey Road was laid out. National Library of Scotland

1.1.3 The street is comprised of terraced houses and although some, such as this property, have had the brickwork painted over they are of a consistent design on the west side of the street. From Google Earth (dated November 2022) almost all the chimney pots survive, there are currently no rear or front dormers and only a few rooflights.



2 Anstey Road from Google Earth November 2022

1.2 Impact of rear dormer

1.4.1 While the rear dormer would not be visible from the street frontage of Anstey Road, it certainly would be very obvious at the rear from Carey Street (see image) and approaching from the north and there would be a strong adverse visual impact on the conservation area.



Rear elevation today to the right of the tree from Carey Street (rear of The Oasis)



Rear elevation from proposal.

Front elevation from proposal

1.4.2 Section 7.3 of Reading's Design Guide to House Extensions (adopted March 2021) says that all dormers will be considered on a case by case basis. The SPD deals mainly with front dormers but the design principles that they should be 'set into the roof slope and proportionate to the scale of the rest of the house' and that the windows should line up vertically with the rest of the house should still apply.

1.4.3 These principles have been ignored in this proposal. The impact of the full width rear dormer would be to increase the height of the property at the rear by about a third. The dormer is overbearing and dominant at the rear of the house.

1.4.4 The style is not in keeping with the character and appearance of the house or the conservation area.

1.4.5 The dormer windows do not line up vertically with those of the rear elevation of the house.

1.5 Impact of front rooflights

1.5.1 The front rooflights although of less visual impact would disrupt the current uniformity of the front slope of the roofs of the terrace. If permission were granted for rooflights they should not project from the roof slope.

1.6 Heritage Summary

1.6.1 The proposed rear dormer would have a negative impact on and fail to enhance the character and appearance of the Russell Street/Castle Hill/Oxford Road CA. It would therefore fail to comply with policy EN3.

1.6.2 The proposals do not comply with the principles set out in Reading's Design Guide to House Extensions SPD (adopted March 2021) or policy H9.

2. DESIGN

2.1 The design of the dormer as described in more detail above is entirely out of keeping with a nineteenth century Reading terraced house.

2.2 In principle we would object to any dormer at the rear of this property but a less overbearing solution could be found using alternatives in the Design Guide to House Extensions SPD to comply with policy H9.

3. CONCLUSION

3.1 Please reject this application for the reasons stated.

Yours sincerely

Evelyn Williams
Chair Reading CAAC
On behalf of Reading Conservation Area Advisory Committee
43 Milman Road
Reading, RG2 0AZ