



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2024

by Rebecca McAndrew, BA Hons, MSc, PG Dip Urban Design, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/D/24/3342412

146 Kidmore End Road, Emmer Green, Reading RG4 8SP

- 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 and Mrs Darragh Buckley against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 230396.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side and rear extension at 146 Kidmore End Road, Emmer Green, Reading RG4 8SP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 230396 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 strict accordance with the following approved drawings: 146KER SP101, 146KER MP01 and 146KER MP02 R6
 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.
 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the side elevation of the extension hereby approved.

Procedural Matters

2. On my site visit I viewed the proposals from the neighbouring property, No.148 Kidmore End Road.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No.148 Kidmore End Road, with regards to loss of outlook.

Reasons

4. The proposed extension would be part single storey and part two storey. It would span the length of the appellants' home and would project beyond the existing rear elevation. However, given that No.148 has a deeper footprint, the extension would not extend beyond the rear elevation of this neighbouring property. As such, the proposals would not harm the outlook from the rear of the neighbours' home or their garden.
5. The proposed side elevation would be blank and at a slightly higher ground level than No.148. Whilst it would come close to the joint boundary with No.148, the proposed extension would include both two storey and single storey elements to break up the mass and bulk of the proposals. Also, a pathway to the side of the neighbours' property would retain a buffer between the two homes.
6. There would be clear views of the extension from the neighbour's side pathway. Nevertheless, it is not unusual for a residential side path to pass between two homes. The function of the path is to provide access between the front and rear gardens. Consequently, it is unlikely that the neighbours spend a significant amount of their time in this area. Therefore, whilst the pathway would be more enclosed than currently, the proposals would not unduly harm the outlook or living conditions of the neighbours.
7. There would also be views of the proposals from a secondary side window in the neighbours' kitchen. However, it is common for secondary windows to face walls. I accept that the proposed extension would come closer to the side kitchen window than the current arrangement, but an acceptable distance would be retained between the two. Also, I observed that a large primary window in the rear elevation of the neighbours' kitchen would continue to provide an attractive outlook from this room.
8. In conclusion, taking all the above into account, the proposed extension would not appear overbearing or unacceptably harm the outlook of the neighbouring occupiers at No.148. Consequently, I find no unacceptable harm to the outlook or living conditions of the neighbours. There is no conflict with Policy CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) and the Design Guide to House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2021) which seek to safeguard living conditions.

Other Matters

9. I have considered matters raised by neighbouring occupiers. I acknowledge that the appeal proposals would give rise to some loss of light to windows in the side elevation of their home. However, these are windows to non-habitable rooms and a degree of separation would be retained between the two properties. Therefore, this would not materially harm their living conditions.
10. I note comments requesting that the materials proposed for the side elevation of the extension be amended to add more interest to the neighbours' outlook. However, I must consider the appeal on the basis of the information before me, and I have found that the proposal would not unduly harm the neighbours'

living conditions. As such, I attach limited weight to this matter in considering the proposals.

Conditions

11. I impose conditions regarding timescales and setting out the approved plans to provide certainty. I attach a condition in relation to materials in the interests of the character and appearance of the property and area. I attach a condition removing permitted development rights for openings in the side elevation of the approved extension to safeguard the neighbours' living conditions.
12. Given the limited nature of the works proposed, I do not consider it necessary to include a condition requiring a landscaping scheme.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR