

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2017

by Andrew Dawe BSc(Hons) MSc MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/D/16/3163024

24 Radical Ride, Finchampstead

- 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 J. White against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 162103, dated 20 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to front elevation, replace existing flat roof to garage on front elevation with pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council, in its decision notice, refers to its Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). I have applied some weight to that document due to it having been published following a consultation process and its role in supporting the relevant development plan policies.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the terrace relating to 24 Radical Ride and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No 24 is on the end of a terrace of four dwellings on a prominent corner plot within a residential estate. The existing terrace exhibits a distinctively strong degree of symmetry in its front elevation design and a consistency in the appearance of the dwellings in terms of their architectural features. The only forward projections relate to flat roof elements, encompassing garages, at ground floor level.
 5. That retained consistency is also largely exhibited in respect of the significant number of other similarly designed dwellings in the vicinity, albeit that some have had their garages converted to habitable accommodation. There are other house types in that same vicinity. However, they are limited to a fairly small number of different types and they too have generally retained a high degree of consistency in their front elevation design. There is therefore a pleasing and distinctive high degree of design continuity throughout the dwellings within each of the house types in the vicinity of the site.
-

6. The proposed development, both in respect of the two storey element and the pitched garage roof, would noticeably disrupt the pleasing symmetry of the terrace in a prominent location. It would also conflict with the distinctive retained degree of consistency and continuity in the design of those other similar dwellings in the vicinity. It would stand out all the more in the context of those other dwelling types in the vicinity that have also undergone little alteration to their original front elevations.
7. As such, the proposal would stand out as a jarring, dominant and incongruous feature within the terrace and surrounding area generally.
8. For the above reasons, the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the terrace relating to No 24 and the surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to policy CP3 of the Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the SPD which together, in respect of this issue, require development to be appropriate in terms of built form and character to the area.

Conclusion

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

Andrew Dawe

INSPECTOR