



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 5 October 2020

by S Edwards BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/D/20/3252944

360 Gosbrook Road, Reading, RG4 8EG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr P Maydeo against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 200288, dated 21 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is 'Proposed single storey rear extension, following demolition of part of the existing extensions'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for proposed single storey rear extension, following demolition of part of the existing extensions, at 360 Gosbrook Road, Reading, RG4 8EG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 200288, dated 21 February 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Block Plan (06 Rev C), Proposed Elevations (05 Rev C), Proposed Floor Plans (04 Rev C).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on (1) the character and appearance of the host property, and (2) the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of no 358 Gosbrook Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Located within an area of predominant residential character, the appeal site comprises a mid-terrace property set within a narrow but deep plot. The property has been subject to a number of single storey rear extensions, which are characterised by their staggered eaves heights and extend significantly beyond the rear wall of the original house. The existing structures, by reason of

their detailed design and condition, presently detract from the character and appearance of the host property. Whilst they do not benefit from planning permission, I understand that the extensions were constructed before the appellant purchased the property, that is more than 10 years ago. This is not disputed by the Council.

4. The proposed extension would be approximately 0.3 m deeper than the existing structures and thus increase the overall scale of the additions to the original property. That said, the design approach for the development, having particular regard to the shallow pitched roof and use of matching materials, would ensure that the new addition appears far more sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host property than the existing extensions. Despite its significant footprint, the proposed development would, by reason of its single storey scale, roof form and modest height, retain a subservient relationship to the original dwelling. Additionally, the size of the extended property would remain proportionate to the overall size of the plot, and would not lead to an overdevelopment of the appeal site.
5. Overall, the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the host property and would not lead to an overdevelopment of the appeal site. I find therefore no conflict with Policies H9 and CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan¹ (LP) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that householder extensions respect the character and appearance of the house. For the same reasons, the development would broadly accord with the advice contained within the Council's Design Guide to House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG).

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

6. The Council is concerned with the effect that the proposed extension would have on the living conditions of the occupiers of no 358 Gosbrook Road (no 358). There is a door within the recess of this neighbouring property's original rear elevation, which is immediately adjacent to the boundary shared with the appeal site. Additionally, the ground floor openings situated to the side elevation of no 358 already look directly towards the wall of the existing single storey additions, which extends out from the main rear elevation of the terrace by approximately 8.5 m.
7. The proposed addition would be approximately 0.3 m deeper than the existing extension and 2.2 m high to the eaves. It would therefore be noticeably smaller than the first 4 m of the existing extension. The eaves height of the new addition would therefore be 0.2 m taller than the wall or fence which could be erected on the boundary using permitted development rights. The shallow and largely glazed pitched roof, which would slope away from the boundary shared with no 358, would ensure that the new addition does not adversely affect the outlook and light levels from this neighbouring property, especially when compared with the existing arrangement.
8. For these reasons, I find that the proposed extension would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of no 358. It would therefore accord with LP Policies H9 and CC8, or the Council's Design Guide to House Extensions SPG, which notably seek to ensure that development

¹ Adopted November 2019.

proposals do not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties.

Conditions

9. I shall impose conditions regarding the standard time limit and specifying the relevant drawings, as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the extension to be constructed using materials matching the host property is considered necessary to preserve the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons detailed above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR