

APPEAL DECISION REPORT

Appeal No: APP/E0345/D/21/3278656

Application Ref: 210328/HOU

Address: 11 Whiteknights Road, Reading

Proposal: Single storey rear extension

Case officer: Beatrice Malama

Decision level: Delegated. Refused 20 April 2021

Method: Written Representations. Decision: Appeal allowed

Date Determined: 31 October 2022

Inspector: Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

1. Background

1.1 The application site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling, located to the north of Whiteknights Road. The University of Reading Whiteknights Campus is located to the south of the site. The existing house has been extended on both sides without permission. The proposal for a single storey rear extension, projecting to a depth of 6m and extending across the full width of the plot was refused for the following reason:

- The proposal in terms of design and scale and cumulatively with existing enlargements would cause significant detrimental harm to the character and appearance of the original dwelling.

2 Summary of the decision

2.1 The Inspector considered the main issue to be:

- The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property

2.2 On character and appearance, the Inspector found that the extension's *"bulk would be significantly tempered by its low single storey, flat roofed form, which would respect the style and height of the existing side sections, to which it would be attached. It would also be much lower than, and subordinate to, the host's principal two storey section"*. Further, the Inspector pointed out the presence of a much deeper single storey rear annexe adjacent to the boundary at 9 Whiteknights Road and considered that the scheme would not be prominent viewed from that property. The Inspector highlighted that *"As the rear face of 13 Whiteknights Road ('No 13') is stepped back compared to the host, and given the presence of a boundary fence, the scheme at this modest height, would not be unduly dominant viewed from that property"*

2.3 The Inspector stated that although the proposal would be deeper than four meters and would be contrary to the advice of the Council's Design Guide to House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2021, for the reasons above, *"it would not appear disproportionate, unduly bulky or incongruous, and it would not conflict with the broad thrust of that advice"* and thus *"would not harm the character and appearance of the host house"*.

2.4 The Inspector concluded that the Council's reason for refusal were not supported and allowed the appeal. Necessary conditions were imposed.

2.5 On conditions the Inspector shared the Council's concerns that the use of the flat roof could result in overlooking of adjoining premises to the significant detriment of those occupiers' living conditions and a condition restricting the use of flat roof was

necessary. However, the Inspector did not agree with the Council's suggested condition removing permitted development rights as it was considered that there was no clear justification for that as required under paragraph 54 of the NPPF. The Inspector also regarded the Council's suggested requiring that the proposal be used only for purposes ancillary to the main dwelling as unnecessary.

3 OFFICER COMMENTS

3.1 It is unfortunate that the Inspector did not agree with the Council, given the harm identified. The findings are noted.

LOCATION PLAN



Case Officer: Beatrice Malama