The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/20/3244173
22, Maskell Drive, Bedford MK41 0GQ

- 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 Mrs J Jacob against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
- The application Ref 19/02021/FUL, dated 17 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2019.
- The development proposed is the erection of a front porch.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mrs J Jacob against Bedford Borough Council. This application is subject to a separate Decision.

Procedural Matter

3. I note since the submission of the appeal Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (LP) was adopted by the Council on 15 January 2020. The document supersedes the previous Development Plan policies cited in the reason for refusal. The Council has submitted copies of LP Policies 28S, 29 and 30 as the new relevant policies. These policies have also been provided to the appellant as part of the appeal documentation. Therefore, the appellant has not been prejudiced by the change. I have determined the appeal with regard to the current development plan.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. No.22 is a two-storey terraced dwelling situated within a recently built housing estate. The estate is characterised by houses of a simple and largely unadorned design with windows and doors arranged in a regular and uncomplicated pattern. Front doors within the immediate street scene are flat against the main elevation although some have a lightweight canopy above.

6. In contrast, the proposed porch would form a built projection beyond the existing front elevation which would be incongruous with the surrounding architectural style. The porch would be highly visible in the street scene due to its shallow front gardens and open plan nature of the estate.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to the presence of other enclosed porches in the wider area. However, these do not form part of the street-scene of the appeal property and therefore I give little weight to these examples.

8. I conclude that the proposed porch would harm the appearance and character of the host dwelling and would be visually harmful to the immediate street-scene contrary to Policies 28S, 29 and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030. In combination these policies seek to protect the character and appearance of the area. It would also conflict with Design Code E1 of Residential Extensions, New Dwellings and Small Infill Developments (January 2000) which seeks to promote high quality design and to protect as well as complement local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR