



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 June 2021

by A Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/21/3272121

8 High Street, Eyeworth SG19 2HH

- 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 Peter Kendall against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref CB/20/04351/FULL, dated 26 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. No. 8 is a semi-detached house located in a row of houses on the north-west side of High Street. The existing house has a main section with front and rear dormer windows, and a slightly smaller part to the side which is set in at the front and back and set down from the eaves and ridge of the main part of the building. The adjoining semi-detached house at No.7 is similarly designed and the two display a strong sense of symmetry. This characteristic is also repeated at other pairs of houses along this part of the road, including at Nos 9 and 10 who also have subservient sections to their sides, and it is a positive feature of the street scene.
4. The proposed side extension would project from the existing smaller side section and would respect its height and detailed design, including in respect of its fenestration and materials. However, it would be excessively wide and due to this, the smaller section would cease to appear subservient to the main part of the house. It would also have the effect of weakening the sense of symmetry which exists with No.7. The reduction of this symmetry would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the pair and the street scene.
5. The appellant is correct to say that neighbours cannot be forced to extend symmetrically and simultaneously to maintain the symmetry of a pair. Nonetheless it is also the case that the symmetry of a pair of semi-detached houses can be a key characteristic which should be respected. The proposal fails to do this. Indeed, this is the advice in the Council's Design Guide on

House Extensions and Alterations which, although not policy, is a material consideration.

6. Consequently, the extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene. It therefore would fail to accord with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document, which requires development to be appropriate in scale and design to its setting. It would also conflict with the advice in the Design Guide as set out above.

Other Matters

7. The appellant provides drawings of an extension that could be built under the property's permitted development rights. However, whilst this would also disrupt the symmetry of the pair, it would be more subservient and not as prominent. It would therefore not be as harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the street scene as the current proposal and so it is not an advantageous fall back position for the appellant in this appeal.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

A Owen

INSPECTOR