



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2020 by S Watson BA(Hons) MSc

Decision by V Lucas LLB (Hons) MCD MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/19/3237573

93 Whitworth Way, Wilstead, MK45 3EF

- 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 Dan Cox against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01322/FUL, dated 16 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: existing 4 hip roof to be removed in its entirety. New block work gable ends to be erected. Steel beams to be used to support new roof and floor for loft conversion. 1no extra bedroom with added ensuite. 2no small dormers with windows to be added at front of house. 1no full length dormer to be added at rear. New roof tiles to be fitted to main roof and front dormers. New dormers to be finished in monocouche chalk white render. New gable ends to be finished in monocouche chalk white render. New staircase added to 1st floor to access loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. During the course of the appeal, the *Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030* has been adopted by the Council and has therefore superseded the *Bedford Borough Local Plan* and the *Bedford Borough Council Development Plan Document: Core Strategy and Rural Issues Plan*. Both Parties have been given the opportunity to comment on the adopted plan. I am therefore satisfied that the interests of the parties will not be prejudiced by determining this appeal in accordance with the up to date Development Plan, as I am required to do.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is on the south side of Whitworth Way and contains a two-storey dwelling with a hipped roof. It forms the middle of a row of five similar properties with hipped roofs, with the surrounding area primarily made up of gabled roofs, running either perpendicular or parallel to the road. The proposal includes the replacement of the existing roof with a gabled roof running parallel to the road with two pitched roof dormers to the front and a flat roof dormer to the rear.
6. Although the proposal would be a conspicuous addition between the hipped roofs either side, its central position would result in the gabled roof taking on the appearance of a feature rather than an incongruous addition. Moreover, as gabled roofs are typical within the street it would not appear out of keeping with the general street scene. Although the extension would increase the size of the roof it would not be a significant addition, disproportionate to the host dwelling. Moreover, while the use of render is not common within the street, I note that there is a variety of claddings styles, including timber effect and tile, in use. I find therefore that rendering the gabled ends would not be unacceptable in this instance.
7. However, dormer windows are not present within the street scene and the proposed front dormer windows would, by way of their prominence, be an intrusive feature within the street scene. Although the rear dormer would not likely be seen from Whitworth Way, it would be visible from the new residential development to the south. By way of its form, the flat roofed dormer would jar with the surrounding pitched roofs, harming the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. In all I find that the proposed alterations to the roof would be out of keeping with the street scene and surrounding area by way of the proposed dormer windows. The proposal would therefore cause an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policies 28S, 29 and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (Adopted January 2020) which collectively seek development to contribute to good place-making and high-quality design.
9. In coming to this decision, I acknowledged that the height of the roof serving the property immediately to the west of the appeal site has been increased. However, given that it still retains its hipped roof design this matter carries little weight in the determination of this appeal. Moreover, all proposals must be considered on their own merit.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has raised possible alternatives to the appeal scheme such as using rooflights and removing the proposed render. I cannot consider these alternatives as they were not part of the scheme on which the Council made their decision.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

V Lucas

INSPECTOR