

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2017

by Megan Thomas Barrister-at-Law

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

Decision date: 7 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/D/17/3176455

192 Victoria Road, Wargrave, Berkshire RG10 8AJ

- 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 Gavin Lock against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref.170074, dated 9 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant's name is entered on the application form as Mr Gavin Lock but it is entered as Gavin Locke on the appeal form. I have used the application form entry.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the terrace of dwellinghouses and streetscene.

Reasons

4. Victoria Road is an attractive and long residential road in Wargrave with a mixture of dwelling types along it. It is located in the 'Modest Development Location' of Wargrave where the principle of residential extensions and alterations are acceptable subject to there being no adverse impact upon the character of the area or on residential amenity. The appeal site is a two storey dwelling with a front bay window, which sits on the end of a row of ten terraced dwellings on the southern side of the road. Each dwelling in the terrace is similar but not identical in appearance. Nos 188 and 186 have a shared front ground floor canopy, and not all windows and doors in the terrace look the same, however, overall there is a strong uniformity to the row of dwellings. The terrace is distinctive even though it is not made up of listed buildings and is not within a conservation area.
-

5. The proposed development would involve the removal of the front ground floor bay window and the erection of a single storey front extension across the whole width of the dwelling. It would have a mono-pitched roof and a door and window in the front elevation. It would have a depth of about 1.5m and a width of about 2.7m.
6. Whilst its depth would not be significantly deeper than the existing bay window which it would replace, it would nevertheless be prominent in the streetscene owing to its different design. The rhythm of the terrace is strongly defined by the bay windows. The loss of the bay window and its replacement with an extension across the width of the property would be detrimental to the pleasing uniformity of the terrace. The loss of the characteristic patterned brick detailing and arch would also be detrimental to the appearance of the host dwelling and the terrace.
7. On my site visit, I viewed no.104 Victoria Road which has a front extension similar to the one proposed in the appeal. However, it sits in a higher position in relation to Victoria Road and the papers before me do not reveal whether or not it obtained express planning permission from the Council. In any event, I am obliged to judge each application on its own individual merits and the existence of the extension at no.104 does not alter the harm that I judge would result to the row of terraces in which the appeal site is situated.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would unduly harm the character and appearance of the terrace of dwellings and streetscene and would be contrary to policies CP1 and CP3 of the Wokingham Borough LDF Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted 2010) and the Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

Conclusion

9. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas

INSPECTOR