
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by Matthew Woodward BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/19/3242601

56 Ridge Road, Kempston, Bedford MK43 9BS

- 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 Woodland against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01960/FUL, dated 9 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as '2-storey side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the Council refused planning permission the Council has adopted the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (January 2020) (the adopted Local Plan). The Council have provided me with a copy of the relevant adopted Local Plan policies which replace those in the decision notice relating to a previous Local Plan and Core Strategy¹. Both main parties have had an opportunity to comment on the implications of the adopted Local Plan on the proposal as part of this appeal. I have determined this appeal on the basis of the adopted Local Plan.
3. The submitted plans include details of a porch. Whilst this element is not included in the description of development on the application form, it is referenced by the Council and the appellant in their evidence. Like the Council, I find that the porch would not harm the character and appearance of the area and therefore, I have confined my considerations in this appeal to the proposed two-storey side extension.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a dwelling which lies amidst a run of properties with a similar height and semi-detached form. It lies in a street with a generally

¹ Policies BE29, BE30, BE37 and H29 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2002 and Policy CP21 of the Core Strategy and Rural Issues Plan 2008 as referred to in the Council's decision notice replaced by Policies 28S, 29 and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030

- consistent building line, with houses set back from the road behind small front gardens/hardstanding areas.
6. I saw on my site visit that a number of side extensions on the street have closed gaps that once existed between properties. Therefore, I find nothing objectionable about the extent to which the proposal would reduce the gap between the appeal property and 58 Ridge Road given that large gaps between dwellings are not prevailing characteristics of the wider street. Furthermore, No 58 is set in from the boundary and angled away slightly from the appeal dwelling thus the proposed extension would not significantly infill the existing gap between the two houses, nor would it lead to a terracing effect.
 7. However, the proposed extension, with its gable-end roof design and front projecting dormer, would introduce an incongruous element into the street which would fail to harmonise with the hipped roof design of the appeal dwelling. The presence of well-balanced semi's on either side of the appeal site would only serve to exacerbate the discordant appearance of the side extension.
 8. Whilst I noted on my site visit several pairs of semi's in the street where the roof design of each adjoining dwelling varies, I could not see any examples of extensions where the roof form was so divergent in comparison with its respective host dwelling. Moreover, despite the reduced height of the proposed extension in relation to the height of the appeal dwelling, the proposed front facing dormer would add bulk to the roof and an element which is not characteristic of the street. When combined with the gable-end roof design, it would result in an extension which would lack subservience and simplicity in relation to the appeal dwelling.
 9. Other dwellings with different designs also form part of the street but they lie outside of the cluster of semi's within which the appeal site sits. In any event, for the aforementioned reasons, I find that the proposed design and form of the side extension would compete with, rather than complement, the architectural form and appearance of the appeal dwelling, to the detriment of the street scene.
 10. I do not dispute the appellant's assertion that permitted development rights exist² which would allow the hipped roof form of the appeal dwelling to be changed to a gable. Be that as it may, the proposal before me is for a side extension with a roof form which would differ from the existing dwelling such that the dwelling as extended would appear visually discordant and disharmonious in the street to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
 11. Consequently, the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with Policies 28S, 29 and 30 of the adopted Local Plan which seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that the relationship of the development in context is considered having regard to the character of the area and the need for development to be of the highest design quality so as to positively contribute to the area's character and identity.

² Under the provision of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015

Conclusion

12. I therefore conclude that, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Matthew Woodward

INSPECTOR