



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 01 September 2026

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2026

Appeal Ref: 6013132

9 Tamworth Close, Earley, Wokingham RG6 4EQ

- 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 Haroon Qaiser against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 260569.
 - The development proposed is for a front/side ground floor extension and a two story rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. I have had regard to the revised Framework in reaching my decision.
3. I have taken the description of proposed development from the planning application form although I note it is expressed differently on other documents.

Main Issue

4. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the existing neighbouring occupiers at Nos 16 and 18 Cannock Way.

Reasons

5. There is overlooking from the existing first floor habitable accommodation toward No.16 Cannock Way however, the proposal would bring outlook from first floor accommodation closer to that neighbouring property. Given the limited separation between the development and this neighbouring property, overlooking from elevated outlook would take place of the private garden of No16, which hosts a conservatory, patio area and outbuilding just beyond the appeal site. This loss of privacy would be harmful to the living conditions the neighbouring occupiers should reasonably expect to enjoy.
6. The existing fence is not of sufficient height to obviate the harm from overlooking that I have identified. I acknowledge that this is a residential area where there is a degree of mutual overlooking of the rear private areas of neighbouring properties. Nonetheless, this does not obviate the harm that I have identified or justify the proposed development.

7. The rear garden of No.18 Cannock Way is adjacent the side elevation of the appeal property that is proposed to be extended over two-storeys. The proposal would be a large addition to the property and a significant feature clearly visible in the outlook from the rear of No.18 and substantially so when observed in conjunction with the existing side elevation. It would create a sense of being enclosed by built development. The visually dominant and overbearing impact of the flank elevation in such close proximity to the adjoining occupiers at No.18 would diminish the enjoyment of the residential living environment, and particularly that of the outdoor amenity space, for the neighbouring occupiers. The incorporation of a sloping roof would not significantly reduce the visual impact of the proposed development.
8. Further to the above, the garden of No.18 is south facing. Given the orientation of the proposed development directly to the south of No.18 and the overall size of the proposed development it would cast a shadow over No.18. As such, this would create overshadowing of No.18 reducing both sunlight and daylight to the garden area of this neighbouring property over a substantial part of the day. The proposal in such close proximity to the adjoining neighbouring occupiers would diminish the enjoyment of the residential living environment. This would be harmful to the enjoyment these occupiers should reasonably expect to enjoy.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the living conditions of the existing neighbouring occupiers of Nos 16 and 18 Cannock Way. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy and the provisions of the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other matters, development to maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment without causing detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users. This accords with the revised Framework that seeks to achieve well-designed places.
10. The Wokingham Borough Council Borough Design Guide advocates a minimum back to side separation distance of 12m. The separation distance between the rear of the proposed two storey extension and the neighbouring property at No.16 is less than that at said to be approximately 8m.

Other Matters

11. It is contended that Wokingham Borough Council has granted planning permission for extensions in other similar residential settings and some on more constrained plots with constrained garden depths and closer relationships to neighbouring boundaries. I have been provided with postcodes pertaining to examples of such development that includes an annotated image of a site at 41 Strand Way. I have not been provided the full details of these cases that might enable me to consider what similarity, if any, those examples have to that of the case that is before me and the policy context they were assessed against. In any event the proposal that is before me can and should be considered on its own merits against the current policies that are in place.
12. I note that the appellant wishes to create a larger bathroom as it is indicated the size of the existing family bathroom is constrained in size and impacts upon the circulation space and movement within the room. The proposal would address these shortfalls and provide a more appropriately sized family bathroom of improved layout. Whilst I sympathise with the personal circumstances of the appellant and his family in respect of the practicalities of the existing family

bathroom, I am mindful that the harm identified to the existing adjoining occupiers would be permanent and this is not outweighed by the appellant's particular personal circumstances.

Conclusion

13. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR