



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/20/3256204

16 Chaucer Road, Flitwick, Bedford MK45 1QG

- 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 Richard Darvall against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref CB/20/01179/FULL, dated 3 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and first floor extension above existing porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to erect a single storey rear extension, mono-pitch roof over front ground floor flat roof projection and first floor extension above existing porch at 16 Chaucer Road, Flitwick, Bedford MK45 1QG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CB/20/01179/FULL, dated 3 April 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: 1113/001; 1113/002 and 1113/003.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. For clarity and precision, I have inserted 'Bedford' in the address in the banner heading above as it is listed on the appeal form and decision notice.
3. The description in the banner heading above is taken from the appeal documents. However, I have inserted 'mono-pitch roof over front ground floor flat roof projection' in the description in my decision as this element is shown on the submitted drawings determined by the Council. Both main parties have had the opportunity to respond on this issue and I have taken their comments into account in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The Council have not raised any issues in respect of the single storey rear extension or the proposed mono pitch roof over the existing flat roof front projection. On the evidence before me I have little reason to disagree with the Council on these issues.

5. Therefore, the main issue of this appeal is the effect of the first-floor front extension (the proposed development) on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The host dwelling is a linked-detached house occupying a corner site location, adjacent to the junction of Manor Way and Steppingley Road. The host dwelling occupies a visually prominent position in the street at the end of a row of 5no. similar designed properties to the host dwelling. This forms a strong and positive characteristic in the street scene. However, the host dwelling and No 18 Chaucer Road occupy a slightly different building line to No's 20, 22 and 24 Chaucer Road, as they are set back further from Steppingley Road.
7. The proposed development would project no further forward than the existing front porch and will have a mono-pitch roof that will extend upwards, just below the existing ridge height. The proposed development will create a larger bedroom at first floor, providing a modest amount of additional accommodation and would extend less than half the width of the building. Thus, whilst increasing the scale and massing of the host dwelling it would, nonetheless, be subordinate.
8. The resultant effect of the proposed development would be an addition to the host dwelling relative to its existing proportions, incorporating and complimenting existing design features. Whilst the proposed development would be readily visible from the street, I do not find that it would form a strident feature that would be at odds with the character and appearance of the host dwelling. This accords with guidance in the Council's Design Guide 2014 (CBDG), in particular Householder Alterations and Extensions¹
9. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the appeal site or surrounding area. This would accord with the design, character and appearance aims of Policy DM3 of the Council's Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009, the CBDG and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

10. I attach a condition specifying the approved plans, for certainty, and a condition to ensure that the facing materials would match those used in the existing building is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Conclusion

11. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR

¹ 7.03 Design Principles (Front extensions 7.03.03 and 7.03.04)