



Appeal Decision

- Site visit made on 25 June 2024

by Rebecca McAndrew, BA Hons, MSc, PG Dip Urban Design, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/D/24/3343854

44 Ratby Close, Earley, Wokingham RG6 4ER

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Tahir Jomaa against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 240445.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor front extension and 1 no. Dormer to the front elevation with changes to the fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner above from the Council's decision notice as it is more comprehensive than that included on the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms one half of a pair of semi-detached houses, which sit on a prominent corner location within Ratby Close. Both dwellings include a dominant and currently unaltered room form.
5. Due to its excessive width, height and depth, the proposed dormer extension would be disproportionately large and would appear excessively bulky. It's off-centre position within the roof plane, including a minimal set back from the edge of the roof, would contribute to its incongruous appearance.
6. The structure would appear obtrusive as it would dominate the appeal property and would unacceptably imbalance the pair of semi-detached houses. As such, it would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene.
7. I have considered a number of examples of front roof extensions in the vicinity, cited by the appellant in support of his scheme. Dormer roof extensions have been constructed within the roof planes of both adjoining semi-detached properties, Nos 38 and 40 Measham Way. However, unlike the appeal

- proposal, these structures are located centrally within the roof planes and set back further from the eaves. Therefore, they sit more comfortably within the context of both those properties and the streetscene than the appeal proposal would.
8. The roof extension to No 54 Measham Way is set well-below the main ridge line of that property and therefore appears less bulky than the appeal proposal would.
 9. No 68 Measham Way benefits from a staggered building line, so is set well back from the front elevation of the adjoining property. Therefore, the dormer extension within the roof of No 68 is significantly less prominent within the streetscene than the appeal proposal would be.
 10. All of these examples fundamentally differ in circumstances from the appeal proposal. In any event, each development must be considered on its own merits. As such, I offer them limited weight in support of allowing the appeal.
 11. In conclusion, the proposal would unduly harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy CP3 of the Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2010) and Section 4 of the Wokingham Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012). Taken together, these requires that extensions must be of an appropriate mass and built form and respond to local character.

Other Matters

12. I note that the appellant would be willing to include a hipped roof and increase the level of glazing within the proposed roof extension, in an attempt to overcome the Council's reasons for refusal. However, I must consider the appeal on the basis of the scheme and the plans which were before the Council when it made its decision.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR