

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Ward:

App Ref: PL/24/1410 Householder planning permission

Address: 26 MILMAN ROAD, READING, RG2 0AY

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension

Applicant: Andrew Freitas

Received date: 22/10/2024

Target Decision date: Originally 24/12/2024; EOT agreed until 17/1/2025

Case Officer: James Schofield

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is a mid-terrace dwelling which shares a single-storey outrigger with its neighbour at number 24 Milman Road.

Site visit date: 12/12/2024

Site visit photos:



2. PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

The proposed development is for a single-storey L-shaped rear extension off the back of the dwelling and replacing the existing single-storey outrigger. The depth of the rear extension would be 2.15 metres while the replacement outrigger would be approximately 2 metres longer than the existing one and level with the rear extension at number 28 Milman Road. Plans considered;

Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.100-Existing Site Plan and 3D Views-Rev A

Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.200-Existing Floor Plans-Rev A

Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.300-Existing Front and Side 1 Elevations-Rev A

Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.301-Existing Rear and Side 2 Elevations-Rev A

~~Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.400-Proposed Site Plan and 3D Views-Rev C (superseded)~~

~~Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.500-Proposed Floor Plans-Rev C (superseded)~~

~~Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.600-Proposed Front and Side 1 Elevations-Rev B (superseded)~~

~~Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.601-Proposed Rear and Side 2 Elevations-Rev C (superseded)~~

As received on the 22nd of October 2024

Dwg No 2264.000-P.M Location Plan Rev A

Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.100-Existing Site Plan and 3D Views-Rev A

Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.200-Existing Floor Plans-Rev A

Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.300-Existing Front and Side 1 Elevations-Rev A

Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.301-Existing Rear and Side 2 Elevations-Rev A

Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.400-Proposed Site Plan and 3D Views-Rev F

Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.500-Proposed Floor Plans-Rev F

Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.600-Proposed Front and Side 1 Elevations-Rev E
Dwg No 2264.01-P.M.601-Proposed Rear and Side 2 Elevations-Rev F
As received on the 16th of January 2025

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The site notice was sent to the agent and was duly posted. The following addresses were consulted by letter:

- 24 Milman Road, READING, RG2 0AY
- Prospect Cottage, Whitley Street, READING, RG2 0EJ
- 28 Milman Road, READING, RG2 0AY
- 26 Milman Road, READING, RG2 0AY

No letters of representation have been received.

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 2024
National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 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 SPD 2021

6. APPRAISAL

Character and Appearance

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

The proposed replacement outrigger and rear extension would not be readily visible from the wider public domain. Its design is modern and a positive contrasting contribution to a well preserved non-protected Victorian terrace dwelling. It replaces an awkward and less harmonious original part of the dwelling in a way which improves the character of the dwelling.

The appearance of the proposed rear extension improves the character of the rear of the host dwelling without altering the very positive established character of the more important front elevation. Its single storey nature allows it to remain subservient to the host property. Further to the above analysis, the proposal satisfies the character considerations of local policies H9 and CC7.

Residential Amenity

Policy H9 states that an extension will be acceptable where it does not harm the privacy amenity of neighbouring sites. Policy CC8 states alterations to a house will be acceptable where they will not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties.

The plans as originally submitted were considered to result in harm to the neighbouring property No.28 Milman Road, due to the depth immediately adjacent common boundary and impact on neighbouring window (loss of light, overbearing).

Revised plans proposed an L shape extension, which has a limited depth of 2.5m closest to the boundary. This results in a better relationship with No.28 at this point. The proposal carefully avoids falling within the 60-degree line discussed in 7.1.1 of the Design Guide to House Extensions. Furthermore, the design of the sloping roof will help to minimize any potential for the eaves of the roof to create a sense of overbearingness or marked reduction in light for number 28 Milman Road.

The extension would not project past the rear of No.24 Milman Road and no harm would arise.

Further to the above analysis, the design and siting of the proposed single-storey rear extension would ensure the avoidance of any loss of privacy, light, or overbearingness. Further to this analysis, the proposal is considered to meet the aims of local policies H9, H10, and CC8.

7. CONCLUSION

The proposed development has been assessed as set out above and is considered to be acceptable on that basis, subject to the following conditions.

8. RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Conditions:

1. TL1 Standard time limit
2. AP1 Approved plans
3. M1 Materials to match