

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 13 January 2021 by Gareth Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/20/3261609

14 Langdale, Bedford MK41 9EG

- 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 Karl Mastrolacasa against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 20/01731/FUL, dated 7 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is two story side and rear extension and canopy roof to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two story side and rear extension and canopy roof to front at 14 Langdale, Bedford MK41 9EG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 20/01731/FUL, dated 7 August 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plan: Planning Drawings DWG No. SK01 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those on the host dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. I have used the description of development taken from the Decision Notice because it refers to the canopy roof to the front of the dwelling which more accurately reflects the development proposed. The appellant has also used this description of development on the appeal form.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling in a residential area. The dwelling is located on a roundabout and because of this the semi-detached pairs are generally built at an angle from the neighbouring pair. A number of dwellings within the street have been extended and because of this, as well as the siting of the dwellings around the roundabout, the gaps between the dwellings varies in size. Nevertheless, they contribute to the open character of the street scene.
6. Design Code E3 of the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Extensions, New Dwellings and Small Infill Developments (adopted 2000) (SPG) states that in tightly developed areas with minimal gaps between the sides of houses two storey extensions should be at least 1.5 metres (m) away from the side boundary to ensure that the setting of the street scene would not be eroded. The flank wall of the proposed two storey extension would be set in from the boundary by less than 1.5m.
7. The extension would be narrower at the front and because of this, when viewing the front elevation, the proposal would extend the house by less than half the width of the host dwelling. The ridgeline for the extension would also be set below that of the main house and the extension would be set back from its front elevation. For these reasons, the proposal would appear subservient to the host dwelling.
8. The front elevation for No.14 is set back and at a different angle to the front elevation of the adjacent No.15 and because of this, the proposed side extension would be set significantly back behind the front elevation of No.15 and its own side extension. Consequently, whilst, the separation distance would be slightly below that set out in the SPG, given the angle of the two dwellings and the separation distance that would remain between them, there would still be a clear gap between the two properties. As a result, this would avoid a terracing effect within the street scene and satisfactorily retain the open character.
9. Therefore, despite the relatively minor non-compliance with the SPG in terms of separation distance, the proposed extension would not have an unacceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the street scene. Consequently, for the reasons above I conclude that the proposed extension would be in accordance with Policy 29 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (LP) (Adopted 2020) which states that development should respect the context within which it will sit and the opportunities to enhance the character and quality of the area and local distinctiveness. The proposal would also accord with Policy 30 of the LP insofar as it requires development to take account of the principles of good design.

Conditions

10. Further to the statutory commencement condition, in the interest of certainty and the character and appearance of the area, it is also necessary to ensure that the development is completed in accordance with the approved plans and the materials used match those on the existing dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out above.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR