
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 November 2016

by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/16/3158064

19 Saunders Place, Ampthill, Bedfordshire MK45 2QB

- 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 Matthew Gibson against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref CB/16/02576/FULL, dated 16 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is to raise the rear eaves to create full width second storey, new gable to end and roof lights to front elevation, to provide room in roofspace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is an end of terrace property located on the south side of Saunders Place. To the east of the site is a more modern detached property.
4. From the limited evidence before me, a similar proposal has been given planning permission by the Council¹ which included a narrower dormer window extension with different materials to the main body of the house. It is common ground between the main parties that the raising of the roof and the insertion of three rooflights on the front elevation do not raise any significant planning issues and I have no reason to disagree.
5. The Central Bedfordshire Design Guide 2014 (CBDG) at section 7 outlines the principles for householder alterations and extensions. This section indicates that extensions should have a roof design which matches the shape and pitch of the original building. Dormer windows will only be permitted where they can be inserted without damaging the character and appearance of the dwelling and that they should, generally, be no more than half the width of the house.
6. In this case, whilst the proposal could be more accurately described as a roof alteration, the principles outlined in the CBDG in relation to dormer windows equally apply.

¹ CB/16/01535/FULL

7. The proposed roof alterations would be a substantial addition to the property and would significantly increase the mass and bulk of the building when viewed from the rear.
8. Given the overall size and bulk of the roof alterations, it would not respect the character of the original dwelling and would have a detrimental impact on its external appearance principally as a result of its width and its alignment with the main rear wall.
9. I acknowledge that the roof alterations at the rear would not be readily visible in the streetscene owing to its location. However, it would nevertheless be visible from the rear gardens of a number of residential properties.
10. As I understand it, the permission granted by the Council incorporated different materials to the current proposal. I note that the Council considered that this helped that proposal be read as a subservient addition. Whilst the current proposal would utilise facing brickwork to match the existing, this would not overcome the harm I have identified above.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the roof alterations at the rear, by reason of its excessive width and resultant massing, would lead to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area contrary to Policy DM3 of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and the CBDG which amongst other things seek to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. Taking all matters into consideration, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR