



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/D/19/3225351
268 Kingfisher Drive, Woodley RG5 3LH

- 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 Ryan Lovejoy against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 190056, dated 8 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is for a proposed two storey side with front and rear dormers, front porch plus internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area generally.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached chalet style dwelling located at the end of a residential cul-de-sac which has a separate rear service lane for cars, while pedestrian access is gained from the front of the property.
4. Kingfisher Drive is a large modern residential estate containing several cul-de-sac spurs off the principal estate road. Dwellings differ in design but are predominately semi-detached. The appeal property is the end dwelling in a line of six semi-detached pairs all built to the same specification. The pairs are built on a rigid building line, whilst there is an unwavering alignment of roof ridges and eaves, windows and dwelling widths when viewing the frontage. This uniformity is a distinctive feature of the street scene, and this appearance is accentuated by the pedestrian only street frontage that is devoid of cars as well as being attractively landscaped.
5. The proposed two storey side extension would tie into the ridge and eaves line of the existing dwelling, whilst the proposed front and rear dormer style roof extensions would match those on the main dwelling. However, despite this apparent consistency, at over 5m in width the proposed two storey side extension would appear unduly excessive in context with the host dwelling's existing proportions. Consequently, the proposal would appear to be a large and bulky addition that would not respect the proportions of the original

- dwelling. It would also significantly unbalance the appearance of the appeal property when seen in relation to the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, No 266 Kingfisher Drive (No 266).
6. Straddling the junction between the existing dwelling and proposed two storey side extension, would be the proposed front porch. It would have a modest projection from the front elevation but have a pitched roof that would break the existing eaves line and rise to a point that roughly aligns with the windows sills of the dormer style windows in the roof plane. The height and profile of the porch's pitched roof would appear jarring and visually incongruous against the distinctive horizontal rhythm of the eaves and roof lines of the pair of semi-detached dwellings. This harm would be accentuated when viewed with the proposed two storey extension.
 7. In relation to the row of semi-detached pairs that the appeal dwelling would relate to, the proposed extensions with their asymmetrical profiles would significantly unbalance and disrupt the uniform appearance of the frontage of this sequence of dwellings. The result of this would have an incongruous impact on the character and appearance of the area.
 8. In support of the appeal my attention has been drawn to other properties nearby, that have similar two storey extensions and sited at the end of a row of comparable dwellings, including Nos 112 and 162 Kingfisher Drive. I saw that these are very much in the minority and I do not know the full planning circumstances of those cases or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration. In any case, both examples appear not to have the same excessive projection as the appeal proposal making it difficult to draw similarities.
 9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed side extension, front and rear dormers and porch would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling. Therefore, this would be contrary to Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework – Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document, January 2010. Amongst other matters, these require development proposals to maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment, are of an appropriate mass, built form and character. The proposal is also contrary to the Wokingham Borough Council Borough Design Guide – Supplementary Planning Document, June 2012, that amongst other considerations requires proposals to respond positively to the original building and local context, including neighbouring properties, and any alteration and extension that is visible from the street should not unbalance the rhythm of the frontage.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons the appeal should be dismissed.

R. E. Jones

INSPECTOR