



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/D/25/3365141

340 Hemdean Road, Caversham, Reading RG4 7QL

- 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 Mrs Kirsty Marr against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is PL/24/1696.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part double, part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Removal of existing lean to side porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part double, part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Removal of existing lean to side porch at 340 Hemdean Road, Caversham, Reading in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. PL/24/1696 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Series 2236: Plan Nos. 001 01; 002 01; 003 01; 006 00; 007 00; 008 00; 010 01; 011 02; 012 02;
 - 3) No development shall commence beyond foundation level until a schedule of materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene at the junction of Hemdean Road and Valley Close.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is located on the corner of Hemdean Road and Valley Close. Submitted Drawing 2236 003 Rev. 01 shows a wraparound extension and with the footprint extending tight to the property boundary with Valley Close. The part of the extension to the rear would be single storey.
4. The Council considers that the proposed extensions would be too large and would fail to integrate with the existing building. As such it is considered that the proposal

would conflict with Policies CC7 & H9 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and paragraph 7.2 of the Council's 'Design Guide to House Extensions SPD 2021.

5. However, the extension follows the design guidance by being 4m in width compared with the existing frontage of 6m. Further subservience would be achieved by a noticeable set back and set down from the existing front wall and ridge respectively.
6. In addition, the fact that this is a corner plot would mean that there is no necessity to set the side extension 1m away from the side boundary to avoid a terracing effect, as in this case the boundary is to the pavement of Valley Close. Finally, subject to external materials that harmonise with those of the existing dwelling, the submitted plans show design details that would be acceptable.
7. The grounds of appeal illustrate a number of similar extensions in Hemdean Road, with the main difference being that they are all of a less favourable appearance than the appeal scheme as regards their extension's relationship with the host dwelling. I note that these include the extension at No. 338 on the opposite side of Valley Close.
8. In respect of the Council's refusal of the appeal application because of a conflict with Local Plan Policies CC7 and H9, I therefore consider that there is no reasonable basis for this view, And as regards compliance with the Design SPD it is clear to me that the appeal scheme is also compliant with Section 7.2. Accordingly, on the main issue I find that no harm would be caused
9. I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of proper planning. A condition stipulating the Council's approval of external materials will supplement Drawing No. 012 03 and will safeguard visual amenity.
10. Finally, the Council's Questionnaire suggested a condition restricting further openings, but given the position adjacent to Valley Close on one side and with the rear garden of No. 342 already overlooked from the first floor windows of the host dwelling, I see no need for this.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR