



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2022

by Hannah Guest BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/D/22/3297622

264 Henley Road, Caversham, Reading RG4 6LS

- 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 & Mrs Behar against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 220149, dated 2 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 264 Henley Road, Reading, RG4 6LS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 220149, dated 2 February 2022, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 005_P-020; 005_P-021; 005_P-023; 005_P-024.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the occupants of 262 Henley Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms one half of a semi-detached pair of 2-storey houses set in a row of detached and semi-detached 2-storey houses on the northern side of Henley Road. Plots along the road are generous with large front and rear gardens.
4. The rear gardens of the appeal property and its neighbours are particularly long, and while the gardens are narrow in comparison to their length, in real terms they appeared to me to be reasonably wide.
5. The existing boundary between the appeal property and No. 262, in the location of the proposed extension, consists of some fencing that varies in height with planting, made up mainly of mature tall trees, located closely

behind. At this time of year, there were very few visual gaps through the trees and plants, which gave the effect of a green wall. However, given the size of the rear gardens, this does not appear to be dominant, nor have an overbearing effect.

6. The proposed rear extension would be taller than the existing boundary fencing but shorter than most of the trees along this part of the boundary, and significantly shorter than some. It would be relatively deep at 6 metres, although it would appear fairly modest in the context of the large rear gardens. The blank elevation would be different in appearance to the existing landscaped boundary; however, given it is shorter than the existing boundary treatment, its degree of dominance would be less.
7. It is not clear from the application form and plans exactly which trees and plants along the boundary will be removed to deliver the proposed extension. However, the existing rear gardens contain many trees and plants so, although there could be quite a stark change in the boundary's appearance, the change in outlook would not result in harmful living conditions for the occupants of No. 262.
8. With regard to the above, I conclude that the proposed extension would not have an overbearing effect on the occupants of No 262. Accordingly, I find the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of 262 Henley Road. As such it would be in accordance with the aims of policies CC7, CC8 and H9 of the Reading Borough Local Plan that seek to achieve high-quality design that protects the living environment of existing residential properties.
9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have required the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the existing house, I have also imposed a condition requiring the external materials used in the construction of the extension to match.

Conclusion

10. With regard to the above, I find that the proposal would be in accordance with the development plan, read as a whole. It has not been demonstrated that there are any material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise in accordance with it.

Hannah Guest

INSPECTOR