



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2024

by Rebecca McAndrew, BA Hons, MSc, PG Dip Urban Design, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E0345/D/24/3343633
24 Ibstock Close, Reading RG30 2NU

- 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 Abdelhakim Boughriet against the decision of Reading Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 231572.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of an existing uPVC conservatory with a new gable-roofed single-storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner above from the Council's decision notice as it more accurately describes the proposed development than that included on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mid-20th century end of terrace dwelling which occupies a prominent corner plot and so is visible in the wider area. The proposed single storey extension would be a substantial structure which would wrap around the rear and side elevations of the existing dwelling. It would extend into a grass verge to the side of the appellant's home, bringing the property closer to the highway than the existing arrangement. As such, the proposed extension would be overly bulky, would dominate the host dwelling and would be unacceptably prominent within the streetscene.
5. The grass verge to the side of the appellant's home forms part of a wider network of landscaped areas which provide green buffers within this area of predominantly terraced housing. It would be substantially lost as part of the development, with only a sliver of it to be retained. I note that the appellant advises that he owns this green space. Nonetheless, as I have described, it's

loss would unacceptably erode the character and appearance of the site and area.

6. In view of the above, the proposed extension would appear incongruous and would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies H9 and CC7 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019) and the Design Guide to House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2021). Taken together, these seek to secure high quality development which respects the character and appearance of the dwelling and area.

Other Matters

7. I have considered a number of matters raised by the appellant in support of the proposals. I recognise it would provide valuable living space for the appellant's family. I note the appellant experiences problems with dog fouling on the grass verge adjacent to his home. Also, there is an issue with vehicles parking on the adjacent pavement. However, none of these matters, considered individually or cumulatively, would outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the site and area.
8. The appellant refers to an extension to No.12 Ibstock Close in support of his proposals. However, the circumstances of that development are significantly different to the appeal scheme as that is a two-storey side extension in a less prominent location. That aside, each proposal must be considered on its own merits. As such I attach limited weight to this in considering this appeal.
9. The appellant raises concerns regarding how the Council dealt with the planning application. However, this is not a matter for this appeal which I have determined on its planning merits.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR