The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2020

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/20/3249978
53 Lamb Meadow, Arlesey SG15 6RY

- 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 Ms Radojka Nikolic against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
- The application Ref CB/19/03558/FULL, dated 10 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2020.
- The development proposed is a first floor side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 53 Lamb Meadow, Arlesey SG15 6RY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CB/19/03558/FULL, dated 10 September 2019, 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: Site Location and Block Plans PO1, Existing and Proposed Elevations PO2 and Proposed and Existing Floor Plans PO3.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's decision notice refers to the effect of the development on a property at 4 Albert Close. However, the correct address as stated within the officers delegated report is 4 Albert Road.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposal on the:

   - character and appearance of the area; and
   - living conditions of adjoining occupiers with particular regard to outlook and light at 4 Albert Road.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site forms an end of terrace property that is located within a residential estate. The proposal seeks to erect a first floor extension over an existing single storey element to create an additional bedroom and bathroom.

The area is suburban in character and contains a variety in size and style of property and has a close knit character which is reflected in the layout of dwellings across the estate.

5. The appeal site is part of a row of properties extending from 49 – 53 Lamb Meadow which are staggered as the road curves round towards Albert Road. As a result, the two storey and single storey elements of the appeal property sit forward of the remaining properties to the south. Given the positioning over the existing single storey element, the proposed extension would also sit forward of the main two storey façade, with its ridge height matching the existing roof line.

6. The Council refer to its Design Guide[1] (the DG) which requires side extensions to be set back from the front elevation by at least 300mm and the ridge height dropped. However, this particular requirement relates to side extensions to semi-detached properties which are likely to be susceptible to the terracing effect. For this reason, I attach limited weight to the Council's DG in this case, so far as it seeks subservience and the maintenance of symmetry.

7. The relevant policies from the Central Bedfordshire Council Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009 (the CSDMP) are CS14 and DM3 which require, amongst other things, that developments are of a high quality which respects local context and is appropriate in scale and design to their setting. The proposed development would project no further forward than the existing front element and would have a pitched roof to match the existing roof in terms of height. Although I accept that it would not appear subordinate, the proposed extension would nonetheless utilise matching materials and would appear integrated with the existing property.

8. The development also incorporates a flat roof element to the rear to facilitate access into the proposed extension. Although this part of the extension would be visible from the car park to the rear, given its size in comparison to the overall development, the suburban context of the appeal site and its siting of to the rear of the property, I am not persuaded that it amounts to such harm to render the entire development unacceptable.

9. The development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and I find no conflict with Policies CS14 and DM3 of the CSDMP and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments are of a high quality, function well and add to the overall quality of the area.

Living Conditions

10. To the north of the appeal site is 4 Albert Road (No. 4) which is a semi-detached dwelling. The rear elevation of No. 4 faces onto the side of the appeal property and where the proposed first floor extension would be erected. A single storey outbuilding within the rear garden of No. 4 separates the two sites.

11. The proposed extension would bring the appeal property closer to the rear elevation of No. 4. However, as a result of the orientation of No.4 to the north of the appeal site, a degree of overshadowing and indeed, loss of day light, already occurs through the siting of the existing two storey dwelling to its

[1] Central Bedfordshire Design Guide, September 2014

south. As the proposed extension would also be to the south of No. 4 and would follow the building line of the existing dwelling , I am not persuaded that it would affect light to No.4 so significantly over that which already occurs.

12. With regard to outlook, the Council refer to the bedroom window at first floor level of No. 4. Whilst I accept that the development would bring its side elevation closer to this window, I am satisfied that, given the context of the development, the remaining separation distance would ensure that the extension does not become so overbearing that the outlook from that window would be affected to a significant degree.

13. Thus, the development would not result in harm to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. It would not be in conflict with Policies CS14 and DM3 of the CSDMP and Section 12 of the Framework, which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments respect the amenity of surrounding properties.

Conditions

14. I have considered the suggested conditions in accordance with the Framework and the national Planning Practice Guidance. Along with the standard time condition, the approved plans should also be specified to provide certainty. As the submitted plans also indicate that the materials to be used in the construction of the extension would match the existing building, there is no requirement to control this matter with a further condition.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is allowed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR