
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 08 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/16/3159750
23 Priory Gate, Shefford SG17 5TX

- 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 T Lott & Mrs A Kerrel-Vaughn against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref CB/16/01468/FULL, dated 6 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is an extension at first floor above garage to create new gable end and infill at ground floor between house and garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension at first floor above garage to create new gable end and infill at ground floor between house and garage at 23 Priory Gate, Shefford SG17 5TX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CB/16/01468/FULL, dated 6 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans: Site Plan and Existing and Proposed Block Plan Drawing No 006, Existing & Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Scheme A) Drawing No 007, Existing & Proposed First Floor Plan (Scheme A) Drawing No 008, Existing & Proposed Roof Plan (Scheme A) Drawing No 009, Existing & Proposed Elevations (Scheme A) Drawing No 010, Existing & Proposed Side Elevations (Scheme A) Drawing No 011,
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the appellants details from the appeal form as I have been informed that these were incorrect on the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area;
-

- the living conditions of the occupants of No 22 Priory Gate with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a relatively large modern detached dwelling in a corner of a cul-de-sac in a residential area mainly comprising detached dwellings arranged in a relatively informal layout.
5. I have had regard to the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (2014). However, whilst I acknowledge the proposed extension would be a relatively large addition to the front of the appeal dwelling, it would not be overly prominent as the appeal property is tucked deep into the corner of the cul-de-sac. Furthermore, the ridge of the proposed roof would be set down from the ridge of the main dwelling, thus reducing its scale and the proposed extension would be constructed from materials which would match the original dwelling.
6. For these reasons, I find the proposed extension would not therefore harm the character and appearance of the area. Thus, it would accord with the good design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the development plan, specifically Policy CS14 and DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) which aim to ensure good design and that new development is responsive to its setting.

Living conditions

7. The proposed extension would have three first floor windows which would look out over the driveways of the appeal dwelling and No 22 Priory Gate (No 22). However, views from these windows towards the windows in the front elevation of No 22 would be from some distance, an oblique angle and would partially be restricted by the existing two storey gable end of the appeal dwelling.
8. Thus, for these reasons the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of No 22 with particular regard to privacy. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with the good design aims of the Framework and the development plan, specifically Policy CS14 and DM3 of the CSDMP which aims to ensure good design and that new development respects the amenity of surrounding properties.

Conditions

9. The conditions imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition which requires materials to match the existing dwelling in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR