

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2017

**by Beverley Doward BSc BTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 15 March 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/16/3164766**  
**24 Bedford Road, Wilstead, MK45 3HW**

- 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 Drummond against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 16/02004/FUL, dated 7 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2016.
  - The development proposed is described as extensions and alterations to garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Application for costs

2. Applications for costs were made by the appellant against the Council and the Council against the appellant. These applications are the subject of separate decisions.

### Procedural Matters

3. Both parties have referred to the planning history on the site relating to the garage. I have had regard to this in my consideration of the appeal.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a detached garage which forms part of 24 Bedford Road, a two storey detached house. The garage is sited forward of the dwelling house in a prominent position behind the existing hedge which forms the boundary to Bedford Road. It is clearly visible when approaching from both directions along Bedford Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and comprises dwellings of varying styles.
6. The original garage was allowed on appeal<sup>1</sup>. It measured about 5.39m wide, 5.7m deep with a ridge height of about 5.8m. Following a number of other planning applications and appeals planning permission was most recently granted in June 2016 for an extension to the garage which would result in it having a length of around 10.4m with a 1.3m mono-pitched addition to the

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/K0235/A/11/2144936

---

north-west elevation and a maximum width of 5.7m. The width of the permitted extension would be 5.4m and the height would be 4m, 1.8m lower than the ridge height of the original garage. At the time of my site visit the 1.3m mono-pitched addition to the north-west elevation of the garage as permitted in June 2016 had been constructed.

7. The appeal proposal seeks an amended scheme to that which was permitted in June 2016. It would result in the garage having the same length as that which has already been permitted. However, the width of the extension would match the existing garage width of 5.7m and the ridgeline of the roof would be at the same height as the existing garage, meaning that the garage would have a ridge height of 5.8m across its entire 10.4m length.
8. I note the appellant's concerns regarding the appearance of the roof form of the permitted extension. I also appreciate that the footprint of the garage as a result of the extension now proposed would be only marginally more than that which would result from the extension which has already been permitted. However, the height of the proposed extension would substantially increase the bulk and mass of the garage and would result in it appearing overly prominent and incongruous within the street scene. The proposal would result in an unsympathetic development, given the location of the garage forward of the dwelling within its front garden. Any screening provided by the boundary hedge along the frontage of the site would be limited, given the height of the proposed extension. Accordingly, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
9. To conclude therefore the appeal proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with policy CP21 of the Core Strategy and Rural Issues Plan 2008 which indicates that all new development should, amongst other things, be of the highest design quality, have regard to good practice in urban design and fully consider the context within which it will sit and the opportunities to enhance the character and quality of an area and local distinctiveness. It would also fail to accord with policies BE29, BE30, and BE37 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2002. Taken together these policies seek to promote good design, ensure that regard is had to the visual impact of a development and the relationship with the context within which it is placed and that development proposals relate to the character of the surrounding built fabric.
10. The Council has also referred to the aims of its Design Guidance: Residential Extensions, New Dwellings and Small Infill Developments in its reason for refusal. The Inspectors in two previous appeals at the site considered this document to be of limited relevance for a proposal for extensions and alterations to the garage and I concur with this view. However, this does not alter my findings in relation to the main issue and the conflict which the proposal would have with the relevant policies of the development plan as outlined above.
11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Beverley Doward*

INSPECTOR