
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2021

by R Satheesan BSc PGCert MSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/C/20/3263785
12 Stanley Road, Wokingham RG40 1SX

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Louise Clark against an enforcement notice issued by Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The enforcement notice was issued on 26 October 2020.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission the erection of a single storey front extension.
 - The requirements of the notice are:
 - i) Demolish the single storey front extension as shown in the approximate location hatched in blue on the Plan.
 - ii) Permanently remove from the Land all materials resulting from compliance with step 1. above.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 6 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, and the enforcement notice is upheld. Planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Ground (a) appeal and the Deemed Planning Application

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end terrace dwelling and forms part of a small terrace characterised by consistent front building lines with a relatively shallow front gardens such that the properties on this side of cul de sac lies close to the highway. In this respect the character of the appeal property and terrace, differs from the opposite side of Stanley Road, which comprises predominantly larger detached properties, set back from the road behind generous front gardens.

4. Wokingham Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, 2012 states that porches and front extensions are generally only acceptable “where the building is set well back from the street frontage in a large plot of where the building is set further back from the street than the prevailing building line”. Contrary to the above guidance the building is not set well back from the street frontage and is not set within a large plot.
5. The front (porch) extension, owing to its size, design, and prominence, forms a large, obtrusive, and incongruous feature in the street scene which is at odds with the prevailing character of the terrace. Furthermore, the forward projection of the porch appears abrupt in the street and results in an even smaller set back from the highway. This is in stark contrast with the remainder of the appeal terrace where the front building line has largely been maintained. Whilst there are a small number of porches in the terrace, those that do exist are modest in size and scale.
6. Furthermore, the unpainted timber posts and window frames have a ‘chunky’ appearance and are not characteristic of the appeal property nor the adjoining terrace. I also note that the bricks used do not closely match those of the main building. As a result, the development appears prominent in relation to its setting, leading to a poor visual relationship.
7. I note the appellant’s reference to the pre-existing porch at this address. However, that porch was smaller in area and therefore does not lend support for the current unauthorised development before me, which is larger and more solid in appearance.
8. I therefore conclude that the development harms the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2010). Amongst other things these state that planning permission will be granted for proposals that are of an appropriate scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials, and character to the area; and maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment.
9. The development is also be in conflict with the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which requires development to be sympathetic to local character and history.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

R Satheesan

INSPECTOR