

PLANNING REF : 241849
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Pitts Lane Earley
: Reading, South East
: RG6 1BT
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Ian Raine
DATE SUBMITTED : 06/08/2024

COMMENTS:

I object to this application.

This property is in a prominent corner location at the junction of Pitts Lane and Hilltop Road. The proposed extension will have a high visual impact on the surrounding area. The original property featured brickwork and rendering on the front elevation incorporating timber elements creating a Tudor style appearance. This mirrored a similar property on the opposite corner location. The two properties created symmetry and formed a distinctive entrance to Hilltop Road from Pitts Lane.

Section R8 of the Borough Design Guide requires that buildings on corner locations are designed to respond to their position in the layout. It notes that generally such properties have two front elevations. It also states that in prominent locations they may also be designed as high quality landmark buildings which fit within the character of the area.

Section R23 of the Borough Design Guide requires alterations and extensions to be well designed; to respond positively to the original building; contribute positively to the local character and relate well to neighbouring properties.

The proposed extension does not relate well to the original building. The brick structure does not complement the existing first floor appearance of rendering with timber elements. The proposals are of poor architectural design and do not integrate with the original building.

It is stated that the brickwork will match the existing. It is unclear whether this refers to the brickwork of the original building or that of the newly built ground floor extension. Application 232854 for the ground floor extension, which was approved in February 2024, also stated that brickwork would match the existing. As constructed, the brickwork for the ground floor extension does not match the brickwork for the original property and therefore fails to comply with conditions 2 and 3 of the decision notice for 232854. The proposed first floor extension is therefore likely to add to the current mismatch of materials.

The proposed elevation for side 2 fails to recognise that this is an elevation facing Hilltop Road. It is a continuous brick wall which presents a large, bland, unattractive facade to Hilltop Road.

The proposed extension will create a large structure dominating the surrounding properties and one that does not respond positively to the original building. It does not recognise the property's prominent corner location. It fails to comply with section R8 of the Borough Design Guide.

Further, it fails to comply with section R23 of the Borough Design Guide. It does not contribute positively to the local character and it does not respond positively to the original building. It is of a completely different appearance that does not contrast well with the original building.

It also fails to comply with Core Strategy CP1 and CP3. It does not maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment (CP1). It is not of an appropriate scale, mass, materials and character of the area. It is not a high quality design. (CP3).

There is an inconsistency between the elevations and the roof plan. The front, rear and side elevations show the proposed roof of the side extension at a lower level than that of the original building. However, the roof plan shows no change in level for the flat roof element. It is unclear how this change is to be achieved.

It is noted that previous applications 201041 and 203164 submitted in April and respectively in November 2020 both incorporated two storey side extensions in the same position. Both applications were refused. The decision notices included reasons as being the excessive scale and massing of the proposals and the failure to address the prominent location as a corner plot. The decision notices also stated that the property would appear excessively dominant within the street scene and would not relate well to properties in Hilltop Road or Pitts Lane. The current application does not address those earlier matters. It is still excessive in scale and fails to address the site's prominent location as a corner plot.