
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2017

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/17/3168587

30 Lomond Drive, Linslade, Leighton Buzzard, Bedfordshire LU7 2XX

- 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 Gordon Browne against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref CB/16/03770/FULL was refused by notice dated 10 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character of the existing dwelling and the appearance of the surrounding streetscene.

Reasons

3. Policy H8 in the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review (2004) permits extensions to dwellings subject to a list of criteria including that an extension is well related to the building in terms of its design and that it takes full account of the character of the site and its surroundings. Local Plan Policy BE8, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that new development should complement and harmonise with the local surroundings and have no unacceptable adverse effect upon general or residential amenity.
 4. Guidance in the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) (2014) seeks to ensure that roof extensions relate to the design of the original building and are sympathetic within the streetscene.
 5. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling within a row of four dwellings of similar design with distinctive cat slide roofs. The surrounding area is characterised by residential properties of differing designs, but with distinct groupings of dwellings, including groupings of dwellings with cat slide roofs. I consider that these groupings make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
-

6. The proposed front extension would create a front gable over the first floor and a mono pitched roof over a front single-storey projection. As a result, the characteristic cat slide roof design would disappear.
7. From my observations, due to the scale and design of the proposal, I consider that it would unacceptably adversely affect the distinct character of the existing dwelling and unbalance the appearance of the row of dwellings of similar design. This would be to the detriment of the appearance of the row of dwellings within the streetscene. In such a prominent position, this would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the visual amenity of the streetscene and the visual amenity of nearby neighbours.
8. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised. For the reasons stated above, the proposal would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character of the existing dwelling and the appearance of the surrounding streetscene. This would be contrary to guidance in SPG and to Local Plan Policies H8 and BE8. I consider these policies are broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework as far as they meet the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be seeking to ensure high quality design and should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR