



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/D/25/3372012

3 Fawcett Crescent, Woodley, Wokingham RG5 3HX

- 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 and Mrs Luke Carter against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 250150.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The Council have submitted drawing no RDO/2/2/A/3/D4ppC as part of the appeal documents. This appears to be a revised design which shows a hipped roof to the front extension. However, there is no clear indication before me that the Council considered the revised hipped roof design and it is not stated on the decision notice as a plan considered by the Council. Furthermore, the front extension's gable roof design contributed to the Council's concerns, as is referred to in the officer report. Therefore, it would be procedurally unfair if I were to consider the revised design as part of the appeal. Consequently, my recommendation is based on the plans considered by the Council.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached dwelling situated in a residential area. It has a hipped roof, a two-storey bay window to the front and a single storey side garage. These features are mostly replicated at the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, so much so that the pair appear well balanced. Similarly, while Fawcett Crescent has different housing types including two-storey dwellings and bungalows including varying roof styles, the street scene is still predominantly characterised by matching pairs. Furthermore, even where dwellings have been extended, the extensions tend to be subservient in scale and generally respect the original form of

the host dwellings. Overall, the matching pairs of dwellings, which includes the appeal property, gives the street scene a visual coherence which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

6. Although the two-storey front and side extension would have the same width and forward projection as the existing single storey side garage, due to its substantial height and mass above, it would form an unacceptably dominant and conspicuous addition to the host dwelling. Furthermore, the proposal's gable ended roof form and gable fronted design would be discordant features which would fail to respect the hipped roof form of the property. Consequently, the two-storey extension would be an incongruous addition to the host dwelling and would significantly unbalance the pair, to the detriment of the coherence of the street scene on Fawcett Crescent.
7. The photographs provided by the appellant generally serve to reinforce my own observations from my site visit, that although there is a variety of housing styles in the area, they still mostly form well balanced pairs. The appellant also refers to a bungalow which is now a two-storey house, however, I have limited details of this and the circumstances in which it was converted. I also saw the gable fronted houses on Roslyn Road on my site visit, but these seem to be an original and reoccurring design feature of those particular dwellings. For these reasons, none of the examples referred to by the appellant justify the proposal and the harmful effect it would have on the character and appearance of the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Wokingham Borough Council Adopted Core Strategy (2010), which amongst other matters, require that developments are appropriate in terms of their built form and the character to the area and maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment.

Other Matter

9. The appellant's concerns regarding the way the Council handled the application, in terms of its reasons for refusal, inconsistency in its decision making, as well as general delays and uncertainty, are not reasons to allow the appeal. Similarly, the lack of objections from neighbours is a neutral factor in the balance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations which would alter this conclusion. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR