



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2020

by JP Longmuir BA (Hons) DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/D/20/3247239
72 Cholmeley Road, Reading RG1 3NB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Shakeel Khan against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 191378, dated 20 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extensions (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extensions at 72 Cholmeley Road, Reading RG1 3NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 191378, dated 20 August 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1, Schedule 2, Article 3, of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development to the rear of the dwelling within Class A (enlargement, improvement or other alteration) or Class E (building or enclosure, swimming or other pool required for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse) shall be carried out within the rear curtilage of the dwelling without express planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Procedural Matters

2. The extensions have been built and appear to match the submitted drawings, on which basis I have considered the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupiers in respect of external private amenity space.

Reasons

4. Cholmeley Road is a predominantly residential street in a Reading suburb, which is characterised by its terraced Victorian houses. The front of the dwelling appears to retain much of its originality, however to the rear it is

considerably altered as are its neighbours. In particular a box dormer spreads across much of the roof of the appeal site and there is a ground floor extension which predates this proposal.

5. This proposal has extended the ground floor in two aspects. There is a side extension with a mono-pitch roof and a flat roof continuation extending the length of the original extension. Both are single storey. The remaining rear garden is fenced above low brick walls which provide good privacy assisted by a cherry tree on the neighbour's side. The garden was in full sunshine at mid-morning on my site visit. There is a shed at one side, but otherwise the garden is paved except for a small border. Several plant pots suggest some cultivation activity.
6. As a result of the development the rear garden has been reduced to some 40sqm from around 60sqm.
7. The garden narrows as the boundaries extend beyond the house but is otherwise a regular shape. I consider that there is space remaining for drying washing, sitting out and toddlers play, even at the same time. The shed contributes to the potential storage that many households require.
8. The garden has privacy from the surrounding boundary fence but above that there a sense of openness as the neighbouring houses are set back. Consequently, the garden does have an enclosed aspect. I therefore conclude that the garden is of an acceptable size.
9. In respect of character and appearance, the officer's report acknowledges that the extensions are not visible from public view and do not impact on the streetscene.
10. The rear of the terrace has an irregular building line and variable garden sizes. Consequently, the resulting space would not appear small in comparison with others in the vicinity.
11. The rear of the terrace has been significantly altered by offshoots and adaptations at all levels. Moreover, the appeal proposal is for single storey alterations which do not compete with the higher, more dominant line of the terrace. Therefore, in my view, these extensions do not look out of place, particularly as they are in matching brickwork.
12. I therefore conclude that the extensions do not harm the character and appearance of the area or the living conditions of the occupiers of the dwelling. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policy H10 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (LP), November 2019 which requires functional private space for sitting out, drying, composting and storage, or Policy H9 requires extensions to respect the character and appearance of the area. The Council's decision notice refers to its Supplementary Planning Guidance: A Design Guide to House Extensions. This is cautionary about the design constraints on terraced houses and only permits long extensions where they can be accommodated and for the above reason the extensions can be accommodated. Furthermore, I find no conflict with all the above policies as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which indicates the development should be visually attractive and provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

13. The Council have provided copies of the LP policies CC7 and CC8, which cover impacts on public realm and living conditions. These are not included in the Council's decision notice but in any event, they do not alter my findings.

Conditions

14. I have had regard to paragraph 55 of the Framework. The Council suggest a condition is required for the implementation of approved plans. However, given that the proposal is retrospective and appears completed this is unnecessary.
15. Both parties accept the need for a condition on the removal of Permitted Development Rights, which the Council has helpfully pin-pointed to Classes A and E. Given the size of the remaining garden and the relationship with the neighbouring dwellings I consider this is justified but limited to the rear curtilage which is pertinent to this proposal.

Conclusion

16. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR