



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2020

by Phillip J G Ware BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/19/3243394 65 Grange Close, Linslade LU7 2PP

- 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 Lee Tracucchi against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref CB/19/03147/FULL, dated 17 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension to link with the existing garage, the erection of a 1.8m fence and the extension of the existing drop kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension to link with the existing garage, the erection of a 1.8m fence and the extension of the existing drop kerb at 65 Grange Close, Linslade LU7 2PP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CB/19/03147/FULL, dated 17 September 2019, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule to this decision.

Main issue

2. No objection has been raised to the elements of the proposal other than the two storey side extension. On that basis the main issue in this case is the effect of the two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal premises are a two storey end of terraced house on the corner of Grange Close. The surrounding area is entirely residential and comprises semi-detached and terraced properties. The house features a garage at the front of the building.
4. The proposal includes a two storey extension to the side of the property facing the return leg of Grange Close. This would be in line with the main frontage of the property and with the rear elevation - although obviously set back behind the garage to the front.
5. The area around the appeal site does not exhibit any particularly uniform character and there are certain elements of built form projecting which break

- up what might otherwise have been a building line. It is hard to discern any particular pattern to the dwellings.
6. The relevant part of the development plan is the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review (2004) (LP). In the LP policy H 8 provides that extensions to dwellings will be permitted if they are well related to the existing buildings in terms of design and the character of the site and its surroundings. Policy BE 8 is a more general design policy which reflects the same approach. I have also been referred to the Central Bedfordshire submission Local Plan although, as advised by the Council, I give this limited weight. It was not referred to in the reasons for refusal and does not add to my consideration of this appeal.
 7. The Central Bedfordshire Design Guide: Design Supplement 7: householder alterations and extensions (2014) is a relevant material consideration. It recommends that extensions should appear as subservient additions to existing dwellings and that the width of side extensions should be significantly less than the existing dwelling house.
 8. I can appreciate the Council's concern regarding side extensions on corner plots such as this. However in this case sufficient space would be retained between the proposal and the adjacent street and this would have a very limited effect on the openness of the area around the junction. A good size garden would be retained.
 9. The authority has made the point that the proposal would extend sideways in front of the building line of the houses to the south, and notes that the topography of the area means that the extension would be higher than these properties. However there is no homogeneous character to the streetscene and the effect on the building line would be of limited consequence.
 10. The advice in the Design Guidance is that extensions should appear subservient and should be significantly less than the existing dwelling house. The proposal in this case would be appreciable less than the width of the existing dwelling and would, in my view, remain subservient.
 11. Reference has been made to other developments in the area. It is a given that each application and appeal must be treated on their own merits, and similar developments are often of little assistance. That said, my attention has been drawn to an approved scheme which has been built opposite the appeal site at no.28. Although differing in detail from the appeal scheme it has a similar effect on the openness of the streetscene at that point and was judged to be acceptable by the Council.
 12. Of greater significance is the fact that the Council has approved a two storey side extension at the appeal site. This permission, which is still capable of implementation, includes a two storey side extension only 0.52 metres narrower than the appeal scheme. Nothing has been put before me to suggest that this development would not go ahead if the current appeal is dismissed. I appreciate that at some point it may be appropriate to draw a line and refuse a further extension – but nothing has been put before me to suggest that the appeal scheme has crossed this threshold. This extant permission is an important material consideration.
 13. Overall, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not conflict with the policies and guidance summarised above.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

15. I have considered the conditions put forward (without prejudice) by the Council. I have made minor alterations in the interests of clarity and in line with national guidance.
16. It is necessary to identify the approved plan, in the interests of precision. For highway safety reasons, the new access needs to be constructed before the extension is occupied. In the interests of the appearance of the development, the materials to be used on the extension should match those on the existing building.

P. J. G. Ware

Inspector

Schedule of conditions 65 Grange Close, Linslade LU7 2PP

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in accordance with the details shown on the approved plan, number DD 18/235.1C.
3. Development shall not begin until details of the junction of the proposed vehicular access with the highway have been approved by the Local Planning Authority and the extension shall not be occupied until the junction has been constructed in accordance with the approved details.
4. The proposed vehicular access shall be surfaced in bituminous or other similar durable material (not loose aggregate) before the extension is occupied. Arrangements shall be made for surface water drainage from the site to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge into the highway.
5. The extension hereby permitted shall be carried out in materials to match as closely as possible in colour, type and texture, those of the existing building.