
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2021

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W0340/D/20/3262352

20 Orchard Close, Tilehurst, Reading, Berkshire RG31 6YS

- 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 Mark Rixon against the decision of West Berkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00938/HOUSE, dated 23 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is 1.no proposed dormer window to side elevation in place of a velux style roof light.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant name above is taken from the appeal form as one was not given on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 18 Orchard Close, with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is set back from the dwelling of 18 Orchard Close (No 18) with the side elevation of the appeal property is angled towards No 18's rear garden. The elevated position and size of the window, along with its proximity to the boundary of the plot would allow direct views into the garden of, and towards the rear of the property at No 18, over the adjacent outbuilding.
5. There is an existing rooflight in the same side of the roof that would be replaced. However, the rooflight is at a high level with views from within the room directed over the adjacent plot. The appeal scheme would give views down into No 18's garden which at present is relatively secluded given the boundary treatments. The proposal would significantly reduce the level of privacy currently experienced at the rear of No 18.
6. A previous permission at the appeal site allowed a rooflight facing No 18. Notwithstanding this, the window served a dressing room and a condition required the window to be fitted with obscure glazing. The scheme before me is for a bedroom and the use of obscure glazing for the proposed window would create an unsatisfactory outlook from the room.

7. There are a number of side elevation dormer windows in the street. Nonetheless, these did not have the same relationship with the adjacent property as the appeal site where one is set back behind and at an angle to the other.
8. Therefore, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 18 Orchard Close with regard to privacy. It would fail to accord with Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy, the House Extensions SPG and the National Planning Policy Framework where they relate to quality of life, avoiding overlooking and that development should ensure a high standard of amenity for existing users.

Conclusion

9. For the reason given I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR