



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2020

by A Blicq BSc (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/D/20/3252966

11 Meadow Road, Wokingham, Berkshire RG41 2TE

- 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 Richard Leonard against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 200050, dated 6 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is householder application for the proposed conversion of existing garage and front porch to create habitable accommodation, first floor side extension, modifications to roof at the rear of the property, plus internal modifications and changes to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of existing garage and front porch to create habitable accommodation, first floor side extension, modifications to roof at the rear of the property, plus internal modifications and changes to fenestration at 11 Meadow Road, Wokingham, Berkshire RG14 2TE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 200050, dated 6 January 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan Licence No. 100047474; Drawing No. 02447:2 Rev A; Drawing No. 02447:3 Rev A; Drawing No. 02447:4 Rev A; Drawing No. 02447:5 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall be of a similar appearance to those used in the existing building unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
 - 4) Before occupation of the aforementioned extension the vehicle parking space identified on Drawing No. 02447:4 Rev A must be provided in accordance with the approved plans and surfaced in accordance with condition 5, below. The vehicle parking space shall be permanently maintained and remain available for the parking of vehicles at all times.
 - 5) Before occupation of the aforementioned extension, the vehicular parking area shall be surfaced for a distance of 5 metres measured from the carriageway edge and across the entire width of the vehicle parking space identified on Drawing No. 02447:4 Rev A, with a permeable

surface. Details of permeable surfacing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before construction of the surfacing proceeds.

- 6) Before occupation of the aforementioned extension the vehicular access from the highway, comprising dropped kerbs, shall be increased to a width of 7.5 metres.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Number 11 Meadow Road (No 11) is a two storey dwelling of an unremarkable but pleasing style prevalent in the mid to late 20th century. There is a high degree of architectural consistency in the locality with a large proportion of dwellings presenting with similar or slightly varied designs.
4. The building of a two storey extension in place of the garage would undoubtedly intrude into the separation between No 11 and 9 Meadow Road (No 9). However, No 11 is situated within a short and distinct run of four dwellings separated by their garages. Although there is a repeating pattern of separation between these four dwellings, the loss of separation between Nos 9 and 11 would have a very localised effect.
5. Moreover, although there is a high degree of architectural coherence in the area, individual dwellings are varied and there is an underlying informality in their layout. This is reinforced by topography and the shifting screening effects of mature vegetation. All these factors contribute to and are characteristic of the cohesive street scene. I am satisfied that the repeating pattern of separation between 9, 11, 13 and 15 Meadow Road is not a defining feature of the street scene as a whole. Minor disruption to the building pattern from this development would be very localised and would not therefore be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
6. Number 9 was granted permission for an identical extension as recently as August 2019. Although No 9 does not have the same spatial relationship with 7 Meadow Road as No 11 has with No 9, this reinforces my reasoning that the building pattern is not consistent. There are other dwellings with identical and similar extensions nearby. These variations to the original dwelling design have not had a detrimental impact on the street scene, even where lateral separation between dwellings has been lost.
7. I appreciate that the SPD¹ requires side extensions to be set back from the building line by at least one metre. However, the front porch and garage are slightly forward of the main front elevation and this situation would remain. Moreover, this guidance has not been upheld at No 9.
8. The Council argues that a similar extension was refused in 2013. However, that is some years ago and each appeal is considered on its merits.
9. Accordingly, I find that the development would not have an adverse effect on the character of the area. It would not be contrary to the design aims of Policy

¹ Borough Design Guide, June 2012

CP3 of the Core Strategy. The Council has also cited the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) but has not highlighted specific paragraphs. There is nothing before me to suggest that the development would be contrary to the design guidance given in the Framework.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council. As well as the standard time condition I have imposed a condition requiring adherence to the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt. I have also imposed a condition requiring materials to be consistent with the existing dwelling to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
11. The plans show parking for three cars and the Council argues that the development would result in the loss of a garage parking space. Although there is nothing before me to indicate that the Council requires residential developments of this size to have three parking spaces, it remains that additional parking is shown on the drawing. As such I have also imposed conditions requiring that the parking area and crossovers be set out and available for use before occupation of the extension, and that the area hard against the footway has appropriate surfacing. This is to ensure highway safety and to safeguard the construction of the highway estate.
12. Where appropriate I have amended the wording of conditions to reflect current best practice.

Conclusion

13. I conclude that the development would not be contrary to relevant policies in the Local Plan and that the appeal should be allowed.

A Blīc

INSPECTOR