



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025 by S Indermaur

Decision by A Walker MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/D/25/3361278

94 Tilehurst Road, Reading RG30 2LU

- 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 Edward Day against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/24/1470.
 - The development proposed is raised parking area to provide 2x off road parking spaces and new front boundary wall.
-

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 Matter

3. I noted on the plans there was a retaining wall which was positioned in front and close the kitchen window; however, this had been removed prior to my visit.

Main Issue

4. The Council has raised no concern in respect of the front boundary wall and on the evidence before me I have no reason to find differently in this regard. Accordingly, the main issues are the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of the host dwelling, by way of outlook and loss of light; and, the neighbouring occupiers of 96 Tilehurst Road, with particular regard to noise and disturbance.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Existing and future occupants of the appeal property

5. The appeal property is three storey, detached dwelling, with only two storeys visible from the front elevation. There is a gap between the property and the site boundary to the east. This part of the site changes levels, stepping down towards the rear of the plot. There are windows on the side elevation that are located at basement level which accommodates a kitchen. The property has no on-site car parking and is located on a classified road.

6. The proposal involves partially raising this area, which would partly be constructed of grated metal. The positioning of the proposal would situate the parking area just above the kitchen window. Due to the proximity of the pre-existing retaining wall to the kitchen window, the pre-existing level of outlook would have been limited. Although the proposal involves removing that wall, it also incorporates a new retaining wall positioned towards to the front elevation of the property, close to the window. This wall in addition to the parked cars on the raised parking area above would create a sense of enclosure. Therefore, together these features would affect outlook from the above and from the side of the window instead of just below it, creating a more overbearing effect than the pre-existing situation.
7. I note from the floor plans that the kitchen and dining room are open plan, however the dining room window is some distance from the kitchen window and there is not a window to the front of the basement due to the internal arrangement. Furthermore, as the dwelling has a north facing garden and that the sun sets in the west this would mean that the rear window would not get sunlight at times that the kitchen window would. As such, light for this kitchen window is important for the living conditions of existing and future occupiers. Whilst the grated floor above the window would let light in, the addition of vehicle parked on this floor would impede this.
8. Consequently, the loss of outlook from and sunlight to the kitchen window would result in the kitchen representing an oppressively confined and gloomy room that would be unacceptably harmful to the well being of its occupants.
9. I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the living conditions of the existing and future occupiers of the host dwelling. As such the proposal would conflict with Policy CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 (LP) which states that development will not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties in terms of access to sunlight and daylight and harm to outlook causing overbearing effects of development.

Neighbouring Occupants

10. The host dwelling is a detached property with a moderate gap between it and the neighbouring property No.96. There is a change in floor level between these properties, which makes the appeal property appear taller than this neighbouring property.
11. The proposed parking area would be sited close to the shared boundary with the neighbouring property and would be positioned above its ground floor. There doesn't appear to be a window at ground floor level on the side elevation of No.96 and therefore light coming from vehicle headlights would not enter into that dwelling. Headlights from vehicles parking in the proposed area would mostly splay onto the appeal property garden. However, any light that could spill over into the neighbouring garden and noise from the vehicle would be fleeting as there would not be enough room to manoeuvre and therefore the appellant would either be exiting the vehicle or exiting the site. Furthermore, the vehicle may reverse into the space, meaning that light splay would not be visible from the rear.
12. For the reasons identified above, the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of No.96 in terms of noise and disturbance. In this regard, the proposal would not conflict with Policy CC8 of the LP which states that development will not cause a detrimental impact on the living

environment of existing residential properties in terms of noise and disturbance and artificial lighting.

Other Matters

13. The Council's Transport Development Control department has not objected to the proposal as it would remove vehicles from parking on the highway. Whilst the removal of parked vehicles may improve traffic movements and highway safety along this road, together these factors would not outweigh the harm identified.
14. The Revised Parking Standards and Design Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (SPD) outlines that a 3+ bed house within this area in Reading should have two car parking spaces. However, it cannot be reasonable to apply these standards to existing household parking provision. Furthermore, the document mentions developer requirements and as such the SPD is strategic in nature. Therefore, this has not been decisive in my findings.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. The proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of the appeal property. This would not be outweighed by the lack of harm identified to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupants. As such the proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole and there are no material considerations that justify granting permission. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A Walker

INSPECTOR