

3 Fawcett Crescent,
Woodley,
Reading,
Berkshire,
RG5 3HX

29/08/2025

Planning Application Number 250150 Wokingham Borough Council

Re: Appeal Against Refusal of Planning Application for Two Storey Extension at 3
Fawcett Crescent, Woodley, Reading, RG5 3HX

I am writing to formally appeal the decision to refuse my planning application for a two storey front, side, and rear extension at the above property, as detailed in your refusal notice dated 8th July 2025. I respectfully submit this appeal based on the following points, which I believe demonstrate that the proposed extension is appropriate and consistent with local planning policies.

1. Excessive Width, Forward Projection, and Unsympathetic Design

The refusal states that the extension's width and projection are excessive. However, the property already has an existing ground floor extension that matches the same width and projection as the proposed extension. The current application does not extend beyond any existing building boundary; rather, it proposes building upwards on the existing footprint. Therefore, the concern regarding excessive width or forward projection is unfounded.

2. Impact on the Symmetrical Appearance of the Semi-Detached Pair

The assertion that the extension would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of the semi-detached pair does not take into account the diversity of architectural styles present on Fawcett Crescent. From my property, I can observe multiple different house types, including bungalows with varied roofs [Reference 2], houses with side gables and hip roofs [reference 1], properties with bay windows and normal windows [reference 1], and front gable roofs [reference 3]. This inconsistency in style and form clearly indicates that the street does not have a uniform character that would be disrupted by the

proposed extension. Consequently, the claim that the extension is “unsympathetic” is inaccurate.

3. Consistency in Decision-Making

I would like to draw attention to a nearby bungalow on the main road [Reference 4], which has been rebuilt into a house. If the council’s reasoning applies consistently, this significant change should also be deemed unsympathetic. This suggests inconsistency and a lack of clarity in the application of planning policies, leading to a perception of selective decision-making.

4. Process and Professionalism

The handling of this application has been protracted and marked by shifting reasons for refusal. Initially, concerns were raised about the extension not complementing the existing bay window, despite the presence of an existing ground floor extension adjacent to a bay window. This initial concern was then replaced by a new issue regarding the style of the proposed roof, specifically, the use of a gable roof. In response, we amended the design to incorporate a soft hip roof that follows the gradient of the existing roof, and this change was reflected in a second submission. Despite this accommodation and no objections from neighbours, the application was still refused. It is disappointing that this significant new issue was only formally raised after several months, contributing to unnecessary delays and uncertainty in the process.

5. Policy Compliance

I believe the proposal aligns with key planning policies and guidance, including:

Core Strategy Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development): The proposal builds upwards within the existing footprint, minimizing environmental impact and adhering to sustainable development principles.

Core Strategy Policy CP3 (General Principles for Development): The extension respects the varied character of the street, reflecting the existing diversity of styles and forms, thereby fitting within the local context.

Section 4 of the Borough Design Guide: The revised design, especially the adoption of a soft hip roof, demonstrates careful consideration of local design guidance and complements the existing building.

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework: The extension promotes good design, enhancing the dwelling's functionality without harming the character or appearance of the area.

Section B1 of the National Design Guide: The proposal responds positively to its context by respecting existing building lines and the architectural diversity of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

Given the above points, I respectfully request the council to reconsider the decision. The proposed extension aligns with local planning policies, respects the character of the area, and addresses all previously raised concerns through considered design amendments.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I remain willing to provide any additional information or clarification required.

Sincerely,

Luke Carter