
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2020

by S. Rennie BSc (Hons), BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/D/20/3256349

26 Canterbury Road, Reading RG2 7TB

- 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 Amir Iqbal against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 200465, dated 13 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a proposed first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbours to the site, specifically those at No 45 Home Farm Close.

Reasons

3. The proposed extension at first floor level for No 26 Canterbury Road would be adjacent to the boundary with the neighbouring property of No 45 Home Farm Close. No 45 is to the north of the site of the proposed extension. Currently, the rear of this neighbouring property receives some sunlight over the single storey section to the rear of No 26 which reaches their rear garden and rear windows. However, the introduction of a first floor extension over the existing ground floor section would obscure a significant amount of this sunlight from the rear garden of No 45 (including what appears to be the more well used and sensitive area near the rear of the house) and its rear windows.
4. This level of overshadowing would have a significant impact to the occupiers of No 45 as it would affect this property for much of the day, being that No 45 is immediately to the north of the proposed extension which is to be located adjacent to the boundary. I recognise that there have been some amendments to the proposal such as the lowering of the roof ridge, though the scheme before me now does not adequately address this issue of overshadowing and loss of sunlight and general daylight to this neighbouring property. The result of the proposed extension is that some of the rooms served by the rear elevation windows in No 45, together with a substantial part of the rear garden, would be gloomy for much of the day, which in turn would have a potential overbearing and oppressive impact.

5. I have noted the comments raised by the appellant in terms of the process of the planning application and the advice received, but this does not affect my consideration of the merits of the proposal.
6. Furthermore, the appellant's comments with regards the design and appearance of the proposed extension and how it compares to another nearby built extension are all taken into consideration, but this does not overcome the issue of the impact to the neighbour.
7. Overall, the proposed extension would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of No 45 Home Farm Close primarily due to overshadowing impact. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) and H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) of the Reading Borough Council Local Plan 2019. These policies require development to not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties, including from access to sunlight and daylight, amongst other things.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above and with regards to all other matters raised the appeal should be dismissed.

Steven Rennie

INSPECTOR