



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2020

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date 25 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/20/3252917 5 Wrestlingworth Road, Potton, SG19 2DP

- 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 & Mrs Dance against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref CB/20/00668/FULL, dated 18 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is side and rear two storey extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for side and rear two storey extensions at 5 Wrestlingworth Road, Potton, SG19 2DP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CB/20/00668/FULL, dated 18 February 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1025 07, 1025 05 and 1025 04.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no. 1025 05.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr & Mrs Dance against Central Bedfordshire Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

3. The effect on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect on the adjoining neighbour's living conditions, particularly any overbearing impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a modest semi-detached dwelling standing towards the front of a large plot used as a farmstead, accommodating various outbuildings and animals. The property is located off a long country road with only intermittent and sparse development, comprising further semi-detached dwellings. Extensive tree and hedgerow planting line Wrestlingworth Road such that only glimpsed views of the buildings are possible on passing by.

5. The existing dwelling and its adjoining neighbour have both been extended to the side, maintaining a balanced and uniform appearance, albeit that more extensive extensions have occurred to the rear of the adjoining property. The proposed extension would be substantial but, viewed from the public realm, the side extension would be set down from the ridge and back from the front elevation so as to appear subordinate, aided by the proposed contrasting scorched larch cladding which would differentiate the extension as an addition.
6. The main mass and bulk of the extensions would be to the rear of the existing property, where large extensions to the adjoining neighbour's property are already evident. The substantial additions would undoubtedly alter the modest scale, proportions and appearance of the existing building. However, given the extensive rural plot, countryside surroundings and lack of public view, this would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, I find no conflict with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) (CS&DMP) or the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), both of which require high quality design.

Living conditions

7. The proposed extensions would be sited away from the boundary of the adjoining neighbour and whilst the closest single storey element would protrude for some distance from the existing rear elevation, it would have a modest height under a flat roof such that only a very small proportion would be visible over the existing fence line, particularly given the presence of tree planting on the boundary. The neighbour's existing extension is itself set off the boundary with no opposing openings from which to observe the development, further reducing any potential view of the development.
8. The development would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupants and I find no conflict with policy DM3 of the CS&DMP or the Framework, which require the protection of neighbouring amenity.

Conditions

9. The Council suggests a number of conditions if the appeal is allowed. I have attached the standard time period for commencement of development and a requirement for the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. I do not consider it reasonable or necessary to impose the requested condition requiring external materials to match the existing property. That would be in conflict with the appeal proposals, which suggest an entirely appropriate scorched larch cladding. I have instead imposed a condition requiring use of the materials stated on the approved plans.

Conclusion

10. The development would not harm the character and appearance of the area or the living conditions of neighbouring occupants and I have found no conflict with the development plan.
11. In light of the above, the appeal is allowed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR