



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2020

**by James Taylor BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 17 November 2020**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/W/20/3252283**

### **57 Sibley Park Road, Earley RG6 5UB**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Neil Cooper against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 200047, dated 6 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 February 2020.
  - The development proposed is described as 'householder application for the proposed erection of a double storey front extension to dwelling'.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as 'householder application for the proposed erection of a double storey front extension to dwelling' at 57 Sibley Park Road, Earley RG6 5UB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 200047, dated 6 January 2020, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: S01A, S02A, S03B, S04A, S05A, and S06B.
  - 3) The side windows on the hereby approved plans shall be fitted with obscure glass prior to the first occupation of the development and maintained as such for the lifetime of the development.

### **Procedural matter**

2. During the course of the appeal the appellant has submitted revised plans. The Council and other interested parties have had opportunity to comment on the revisions. These are minor in nature and an assessment of the appeal based on these revisions would not prejudice the interests of the interested parties. Therefore, I have proceeded to determine the appeal on this basis.

### **Main Issue**

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

## Reasons

4. The host building is a 2-storey end of terrace dwelling located within a suburban residential housing estate. The terrace is typical of the Sibley Park Road/Beaconsfield Way character area which whilst including a number of different house types is unified by consistent scale, massing and design. For example, projecting 2-storey gables feature prominently within the street scene and contribute to the varied building lines.
5. The front elevations of 55-57 Sibley Park Road and the side elevation of No 51 are viewed together as a continuous built form within the street scene. They are set back from the road by an area of hard standing for parking and soft landscaping. This arrangement positively contributes to the spacious suburban form. The proposal would largely maintain the existing landscaping and preserve a generous space to the front of the site. As such, the extension would maintain the area's spaciousness.
6. Furthermore, whilst the proposal would project further forward than the existing gabled elements on this row, it would reflect the form and height of these and other front projections within the street scene. The proposal would appear as an evolution and interpretation of the original design principles that underpin the wider area, including the varied building lines and projecting front gables. As such, the proposal would satisfactorily assimilate with the context and not appear prominent or incongruous.
7. The Council have drawn attention to how few changes have occurred within the street scene. However, there is no policy requirement to prevent change, only to ensure that it is sympathetic to the area's context or would enhance the quality of the area. They have provided details of a recent refusal of planning permission<sup>1</sup>. However, this was on a different house type and not in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. As such, it is of little relevance. Furthermore, an Inspector's decision<sup>2</sup> within the borough has also been provided. However, based on the evidence it appears to be in a different character area and as such I afford this very limited weight.
8. Therefore, in conclusion on the main issue the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would not conflict with Policies CP1 and CP3 of the Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework, Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document, January 2010, Section 4.11 of the Wokingham Borough Council Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, June 2012 or Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies and guidance seek to achieve high quality design that protects the street scene and local character.

## Conditions and Conclusion

9. I have noted the suggested conditions from the Council. In the interests of completeness, certainty, and the character and appearance of the area I have imposed the standard implementation and approved plans conditions. The approved plans state the use of matching materials and so a specific condition to require this is not necessary. Additionally, in the interests of the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, I have imposed a

---

<sup>1</sup> LPA ref: 190517

<sup>2</sup> PINS ref: APP/X0360/D/18/3214407

condition to require the fitting of obscure glazing as set out on the appellant's plans and required this provision to remain as such.

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*James Taylor*

INSPECTOR