



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 27 October 2020

by R Sabu BA(Hons), BArch, MA, PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/20/3260425

33 Dunstable Street, Ampthill MK45 2NJ

- 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 O Martin against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref CB/20/02270/FULL, dated 6 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey rear extension at 33 Dunstable Street, Ampthill MK45 2NJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CB/20/02270/FULL, dated 6 July 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 plan: L-02 rev D.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the host dwelling and the significance of Ampthill Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The site is located in the CA, the significance of which lies in the concentration of historic architecture. No 33 Dunstable Street (No 33) is in keeping with the surrounding historic buildings and therefore provides a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
4. The proposal consists of a two-storey rear extension, the depth of which would be greater than that of the host building. However, it would extend across only part of the width of the site inline with the existing two storey extension and the proposed ridge of the roof would be set significantly lower than that of the host dwelling. Therefore, notwithstanding the depth of the proposal, it would

not dominate the host building. Furthermore, given that the neighbouring property at No 31 Dunstable Street (No 31) has a rear two storey extension of a similar depth, and views of the extension from the street would not be prominent, the scheme would not appear incongruous in the surrounding area and CA.

5. Consequently, having paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the conservation area as required under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling and would preserve the significance of the CA. Therefore, it would not conflict with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Adopted November 2009 (CS) which seeks, among other things, extensions that will be appropriate in scale and design to their setting. It would also not conflict with CS Policy DM13 which resists inappropriate development in conservation areas. In addition, it would not conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework or the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide September 2014 in this respect.

Other Matters

6. I note local concerns regarding rights of way to No 31. However, I have necessarily assessed the appeal based on planning matters, which this concern is extraneous to, and it has not altered my overall decision.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard conditions relating to commencement of development and specifying plans, a condition relating to external materials is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR