



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2025

by **Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/D/24/3358180

32 Wilmington Close, Woodley, Wokingham RG5 4LR

- 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 Dan Porter against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 242124.
 - The development proposed is for a ground floor wraparound extension, first floor side extension, internal alterations and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the planning application the subject of this appeal was determined, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') has been published (12 December 2024) and consequently amended on 7 February 2025. There has been no material change to National planning policy in respect of householder appeals and therefore I consider that it was not necessary to refer back to the parties. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached house in a residential estate in a slightly staggered arrangement to its immediate neighbours. 34 Wilmington Close has a subordinate two storey side extension with a single storey lean-to roof over a front porch and garage; the proposal would adjoin it, such that a terracing effect would occur.
5. Whilst in itself the proposed extension would appear subservient in its overall scale and relation to the host dwelling, it cannot be viewed in isolation. I acknowledge that the staggered building line of the properties would reduce the appearance of a terracing effect, but nonetheless, it would completely erode the current spacing between the appeal dwelling and no.34. Setting the extension away from the boundary as required by the Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document would make a meaningful difference in the gap between the buildings

when viewed from the street; however the end result would unlikely provide adequate internal living accommodation at such a resultant width.

6. I acknowledge the appellant's concern as to the reasonableness of allowing the extensions to no.34, however that proposal would have been assessed on its own merits and nonetheless it forms the built context to the site. Overall I consider that combined with the appeal proposal it would give rise to an incongruous form of development that would appear cramped, contrary to the prevailing pattern of development within the locality and therefore harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
7. I find the proposal is contrary to Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2010) which together require development proposals to maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment whilst ensuring that they are of an appropriate mass layout, built form height and character to the area, whilst ensuring that proposals have responded to design codes, such as the Wokingham Borough Design Guide SPD which seeks to ensure development integrates with the character of the area.

Conclusion

8. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR