
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2013

by Elizabeth Jones BSc (Hons) MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 December 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/D/13/2207743

17 Peppard Road, Caversham, Reading RG4 8JP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr G Chandler against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 130757, dated 22 May 2013, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2013.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension and first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear extension and first floor side extension at 17 Peppard Road, Caversham, Reading RG4 8JP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 130757, dated 22 May 2013, 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: 0290-20, 0290-21, 0290-22 Rev A, 0290-23 Rev A, 0290-01, 0290-02, and 0290-03.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. This section of Peppard Road is characterised by a mix of large detached properties of varying architectural styles situated along a no through road. Many of the houses are separated from their neighbour, but there is variety in terms of the dimension and form of this separation. The host dwelling is detached with a single attached garage which extends to the neighbouring boundary with No.15.
4. The Council's concerns relate primarily to the closing of the space at the side of the house and the depth of the two storey side extension and unsympathetic form of the proposed rear extension.

5. Although the first floor extension would not be set back from the front elevation, it would be aligned with the existing garage. The proposed gable to the front elevation would be smaller than the existing gable feature on the front elevation. The proposed gable on the front elevation would also have a similar angle of pitch to the existing gable feature. As a result the proposed extension would complement the existing gable feature on the front elevation, a design detail common in the area. Therefore, it would sit comfortably within the street scene.
6. Whilst I have not been given full details, it would appear from information before me, that the Council has accepted the principle of a side and rear extension at this property having previously granted planning permission in 2010 (Ref 10-0478-FUL). The new extensions would be larger than those the Council previously considered acceptable and the bulk of the dwelling would inevitably increase as a result of their construction. However, the proposed roof height would be lower than that approved in 2010. The proposed roof height would also be a little lower than the host dwelling. The lower roof height and the juxtaposition of neighbouring properties would ensure that the resultant side elevation would not be overly prominent in the street scene.
7. The Council have expressed concerns regarding the 'unsympathetic form' of the rear extension. The proposed extension would project from the main rear elevation of the host dwelling by approximately 3.2m. Due to the generous size of both the host dwelling and the rear garden an extension of this size would not appear unduly bulky and therefore, the proposal would appear subservient to the host dwelling. In addition, the double pitch roof would complement the existing property and therefore, would not undermine the character of the host property or the surrounding area.
8. Whilst the proposal would erode the gap between the host dwelling and the neighbouring property at No 15, a significant gap between the properties would remain. The extended dwelling would sit comfortably within its plot and the extensions would not result in overdevelopment of the site.
9. Overall, I find that the extension would have an acceptable relationship with the appearance of the original building, which, when seen from the front, would largely retain its original form.
10. The proposal would not harmfully compromise the house or the value of the gap and therefore the character and appearance of the area would be maintained.
11. I therefore consider that the scale, siting and design of the proposed extensions would respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, there would be no conflict with the objectives of policies CS7 and CS24 of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework adopted in 2008 or Policy DM9 of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document adopted in 2012 in that the local context and character of the area would be respected. Furthermore, the proposal would comply with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance *A Design Guide to House Extensions* (SPG) which recommends that extensions should be proportionate with the original building.
12. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

13. Other than the standard time limit condition, the Council has suggested a condition requiring the external materials to be used in the construction of the extensions to match those of the existing building. In the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area this is an appropriate condition. In addition, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans is imposed. The withdrawal of permitted development rights for further windows is not necessary or reasonable, particularly given that the conditions attached to Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO¹ require windows in side elevations to be designed to prevent harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Elizabeth Jones

INSPECTOR

¹ The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 as amended.