
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October by Scott Britnell MSc FdA

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/D/19/3234634

7 Russell Way, Winnersh, RG41 5SN

- 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 Giles Cranidge and Ceilia Gresswell against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 191172, dated 25 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 June 2019.
 - The development is proposed two storey front and side extension, new pitched roof to the existing store and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the front and side extensions on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a detached dwellinghouse located on the south side of Russell Way in a prominent location opposite the junction with Delane Drive. The property benefits from front and rear gardens with a single storey flat roofed car port and garage to the side. The appeal dwelling is a simply designed and well-proportioned property, featuring a gabled roof that runs parallel to the road.
5. There is a mix of housing types within Russell Way and the adjoining streets, so that there is no one dominant style. However, there are generally spacious gaps between the dwellings along Russell Way, including at first floor level between the appeal site and No 9, which provide views through the plots and which contribute to a pleasant sense of spaciousness.
6. The proposed front extension would project significantly beyond the front elevation of the host building introducing prominent gable features which would not reflect its character and appearance. The front extensions would visually

dominate the building and appear as a disproportionate addition and harm to the character and appearance of the host property would result.

7. Although the new side extension would be of a design to reflect the host dwelling, it would result in the current visual gap at first floor level between the host property and No 9 being significantly eroded. This, taken with the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host property would result in harm to the pleasant and attractive character and appearance of the area. In reaching this view I am mindful that there are gable fronted dwellings close to the appeal site, however from my observations, there are no dwellings with 2 gable features fronting the road, such as that proposed.
8. The appellant has directed me to a number of properties within the area where extensions and other alterations have been undertaken. However, I do not have the full details of these developments before me, although I note that both parties refer to the examples provided with the planning application as dating from before the current Local Plan. Moreover, each case must be considered on its own merits. Consequently, I do not consider that the presence of other extensions in the area justifies unacceptable development as proposed.
9. Although not explicitly referred to within the refusal reasons, the Council object to the proposed roofing material of the extensions and existing roof. In the event that the appeal was successful the materials to be used could be controlled by a suitably worded planning condition. Accordingly, this is not a determining factor in this case.
10. To conclude, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area in conflict with Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document (January 2010), the Wokingham Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (June 2012) (BDG) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These policies and guidance seek, among other things, to ensure that development is of an appropriate scale, layout and built form which maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment and contribute to a sense of place, with alterations and extensions to buildings being well designed which respond positively to the original building and contribute positively to the local character. Moreover, the Framework makes it clear at paragraph 130 that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Other Matters

11. I note the concerns raised about the way that the Council considered the planning application. However, I have considered the proposal on its merits. It is clearly open for the appellants to raise these concerns directly with the Council.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Scott Britnell

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR