
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2025 by F Bradford BA (Hons)

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/D/25/3364230

49 Recreation Road, Tilehurst, Reading, England, RG30 4UB

- 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 Tim Smart against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/25/0217.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

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. As noted from the appeal documentation and what I have observed on site, the development has been completed.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effects of the development on the living conditions of the occupants of No. 47 Recreation Road (No. 47) in terms of outlook; and
 - the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Context

5. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling, attached to No. 47. These dwellings are uniform in their appearance, though the wider streetscape encompasses an array of development in terms of its appearance.

Living Conditions

6. The development introduces a substantial mass along the boundary with No. 47. Whilst the development is set back from the boundary, its overall projection from the rear elevation combined with its vertical extension above the existing fence line

creates a dominant addition to the outlook experienced by the occupiers of No. 47. This results in conditions of overbearing, particularly when viewed from ground floor rear windows of No. 47 or through enjoyment of their garden, when close to the dwelling.

7. For these reasons I find that the development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 47 by way of overbearing. As such, I find conflict with the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) with particular regard to policies CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) which, among other things, aims to ensure that development will not cause detrimental impact on the living conditions of existing residential properties in terms of visual dominance and overbearing effects of development; and H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) which, among other things, aims to ensure extensions to houses do not present an overbearing impact on neighbours.
8. I acknowledge the appellant's engagement with the occupiers of No. 47. Although the current occupants may not object to the proposed development, the scheme is a permanent alteration to the appeal dwelling. For the reasons outlined above, the development would harm the living conditions of any future occupiers. I have therefore afforded the support offered by the neighbouring occupier limited weight within my recommendation.

Character and Appearance

9. The development introduces a single-storey rear extension attached to the existing outrigger. Whilst its footprint is somewhat large, the overall bulk of the extension, when considered in relation to the host dwelling, means it does not appear as a dominant addition. As such, the development is not commanding in terms of its relationship to the appeal dwelling. Despite its visibility from the street, afforded by its sideward projection from the existing outrigger, it does not detract from the character of the host dwelling or character and appearance of the wider area.
10. For these reasons, I do not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider area. As such I find no conflict with the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) with particular regard to policies CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) which, among other things, aims to ensure that development is of high quality design that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area in which it is located; and H9 (House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation) which, among other things, states the acceptability of extensions to houses where it respects the character and appearance of the house in terms of scale, location and design.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has drawn my attention to other factors in support of this appeal. Whilst reference is made to the depth being within permitted development rights the appellant does not present a fallback position or any further evidence to suggest that the extension would fall within all the criteria for permitted development. As such, I have afforded this limited weight within my considerations.
12. I acknowledge both the appellant's environmental and personal motivation for the proposed development. Moreover, whilst some public benefits may arise from the development, to include employment opportunities through the construction phase which would be temporary in nature, I attach only limited weight to the benefits of the scheme by reason of the scale of the development. Having given regard to the

public benefits of the development, I find that they would not outweigh the harm identified above to which I attach significant weight.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Finlay Bradford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR