



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/W/20/3255993 5 Huntingdon Road, Kempston MK42 7EX

- 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 Noel McKoy against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01951/FUL, dated 7 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of the existing garage, the construction of a 3 bed detached house with associated external works, new car parking space to the front of the existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since refusing the original application, the Council has adopted the Bedford Borough Local Plan (2020). The policies contained within this plan replace many of the policies referred to in the Council's reason for refusal. The appeal was made after the adoption of the new plan and as a consequence, the appellant has had opportunity to comment on this matter. Accordingly, there has been no reason to go back to the parties in relation to the newly adopted plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in a gap between two semi-detached dwellings. Such semi-detached properties are commonplace within the locality and whilst there is architectural variety amongst the existing dwellings in terms of roof forms and facing materials, their semi-detached appearance is a unifying feature. The existing houses also have comparable gaps between buildings, the consequence of which is that there is a demonstrable rhythm found within the street scene.
5. The appeal building would be located within a disproportionately wide gap between the existing houses and the design would be comparable with the dwelling to the left, as viewed from the road. However, the proposal would be a detached dwelling and consequently, it would be at odds with the prevailing

house types found within the immediate locality. Moreover, although the undeveloped gap between the dwellings is disproportionately wide, the proposal would result in an uncharacteristically narrow gap between the new building and No 5. Accordingly, due to the detached form of the dwelling, and the limited space to its neighbouring property, the proposal would appear cramped on the site. This would be to the detriment of the pleasant rhythm found within the street.

6. Consequently, for the reasons identified above, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policies 29S, 30 and 31 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan (2020) and guidance contained within the Residential Extensions, New Dwellings and Small Infill Developments SPD (2000). Taken together, these seek amongst other things, high quality design.

Other Matters

7. I note the comments in relation to the need to boost the supply of housing nationally, particularly in locations such as the appeal site. I also note that the proposal would be constructed in an energy efficient manner, would comply with internal space standards and that it would provide amenity space as well as car parking spaces and refuse storage areas. These matters weigh in favour of the proposal, however, due to the limited scale of the development, the weight is also limited. As identified above, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, a matter to which I attach significant weight. Accordingly, the limited benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons identified above, the appeal should be dismissed, and planning permission refused.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR