



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 January 2025 by N Manley BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/D/24/3352853

74 Donnington Road, Reading, Berkshire RG1 5ND

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Imran Tufail against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 240727.
 - The development proposed is Rear extension measuring 6.0m in depth, with a maximum height of 3.0m, and 2.7m in height to eaves level. Notification of the construction of an extension under class A Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development included in the banner heading is taken from the Council's decision notice, as it accurately and concisely reflects the appeal proposal. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse, subject to limitations and conditions.
4. Where an application is made for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for development which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) but is allowed by paragraph A.1(g) to Part 1, paragraph A.4(3) provides that the local planning authority may refuse the application where it considers that the proposed development does not comply with, or the development has provided insufficient information to enable the authority to establish whether the proposed development complies with the conditions, limitations or restrictions that are applicable to such permitted development.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposed development would be permitted development under Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site consists of a two-storey mid-terraced property. At the rear, there is a two-storey gabled-ended outrigger which, as detailed within the Case Officer report, forms part of the original dwellinghouse. Having regard to the available evidence, I have no reasons to disagree with this view. Extending directly in line from this outrigger is a later single-storey flat-roofed extension, currently used as a bathroom, which matches the outrigger's width.
7. As set out in paragraph A.1.(j) of the GPDO, development is not permitted under Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A if the extension would project beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwelling and have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.
8. Based on the drawings listed on the Council's decision notice (specifically drawing no.1355-2b – Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations (amended)), the proposed extension would extend beyond the side wall of the outrigger, which forms part of the original dwellinghouse. Furthermore, from the plans before me, the width of the proposed extension would be greater than half the width of the original house (measured at the widest point).
9. Consequently, the proposal would therefore fail to meet the specific requirements outlined in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph A.1.(j) of the GPDO and would not constitute permitted development.

Other Matters

10. Paragraph A.4(7) to Part 1 requires the local planning authority to assess the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of all adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received. Although one letter of objection was received by the local planning authority, there is no need to consider the impact on the amenity of the adjoining premises in this instance, as the proposal does not constitute permitted development. I note the appellant's reference to other extensions nearby. However, their existence is of little relevance for the consideration of this appeal, which has to be determined with regard to the GPDO as in force at the date of the appeal decision.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Manley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR