



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by **Megan Thomas K.C.** Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 May 2025.

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/D/25/3361423

47 Marks Road, Wokingham RG41 1NR

- 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 Steve Veitch against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application ref. is 243077.
 - The development proposed is “householder planning application for a 1st floor side extension above existing garage, part two storey part single storey rear extension, and conversion of garage to habitable accommodation, with change of roof to front elevation to pitch tiled.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed,

Main Issues

2. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area, and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of 49 Marks Road in respect of outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located on the north-east side of Marks Road and is a two storey dwelling with an attached single storey garage to its north-western side. No.49 Marks Road is its two storey linked neighbour to the north-west and it has an attached single storey garage on its south eastern side meeting the appeal site’s garage. The dwellings are situated on a housing estate of dwellings with a broad uniformity in appearance. No.49 sits on slightly lower ground than the appeal site.
4. The proposal seeks approval for the erection of a first floor extension above the existing garage that would have a pitched roof form. The proposal would involve the removal of a rear conservatory and the erection of a part single storey and part two storey rear extension that would have a hipped roof form above the first storey and a flat roof with one roof lantern over the single storey element.
5. The first floor element of the rear extension would measure about 5.82m in width and about 4.15m in depth. The existing flat roofed front porch would be replaced by a mono-pitched tiled roof and the garage would be used for habitable space.
6. The new pitched roof over the first floor & garage area would be set down slightly from the main roof’s ridgeline and the new first floor element would step back about 0.5m from the main front

elevation. These elements would help to make the extension subservient to the main dwelling when viewed from the front. However, the new first floor element and roof over it would extend to the side boundary and remove about half of the visual gap between the appeal site and no.49 Marks Road. I consider that reducing that gap, as proposed, would be detrimental to the very pronounced rhythm of the streetscene. There is a pleasing uniformity which is a strong characteristic of this housing estate. However, given the numbers of examples of first floor side extensions above garages that have taken place in fairly close proximity to the appeal site, the harm to the front-facing character of the surrounding area is not sufficient on its own to warrant refusing permission on the basis of the loss of the gap.

7. Viewed from the rear, the first floor side extension would adjoin a two storey rear extension. The rear extension flank wall would be flush with side extension flank wall and on the common boundary with no.49. There would be a pitched and front receding hip roof on the two storey element and this, coupled with the two storey rear element would appear out of scale and excessive in bulk at the rear of the property. The eaves would partly overhang the airspace of no.49 Marks Road. From the rear, the host dwelling with the proposed development would look squeezed into the plot and overdeveloped, particularly as the remaining depth of the rear garden would be only about 16.1m and the width of the garden is not overgenerous. There would be some public views of the rear of the property from the footpath running to the south east of no.45 Marks Road and also private views of the rear of the appeal site from nearby properties. These views would be of an overdeveloped plot which would detract from the pleasing visual character of the area.
8. On this issue, I conclude that the proposed development would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. It would be contrary policies CP1 and CP3 of the Wokingham Adopted Core Strategy (adopted 2010) 'CS', policies CC01 and TB06 of the Adopted Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (adopted 2014) 'MDD' and parts of the Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) 'SPD'.

Living conditions of Neighbouring Occupants

9. The proposed first floor side extension and proposed two storey rear extension would be sited on the common boundary with no 49 Marks Road. The two storey flank wall would protrude beyond the rear building line of no. 49. Given the height, siting on the boundary, and extent of protrusion beyond the rear building line of no.49, there would be a tangible loss of outlook for the occupants of no.49 when using a part of their rear garden. The impact of the protruding two storey wall would be overbearing and unacceptable.
10. On this issue, I conclude that the proposed development would result in unacceptable living conditions for the occupants of no.49 Marks Road in respect of loss of outlook. It would be contrary to policies CP1 and CP3 of the CS, policies CC01 and TB06 of the MDD and parts of the Borough Design Guide SPD.

Conclusion

11. The benefits of the proposal are outweighed by the harm I have identified above. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

Inspector