



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 August 2021

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/W/21/3274315

62 Roxton Road, Great Barford, MK44 3LR

- 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 J. Flynn (Flynn James Properties Ltd) against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00084/FUL, dated 12 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of new 4 bedroom bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Government released a revised National Planning Policy Framework in July 2021. The main parties were invited to comment on the revised document.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether the appeal proposal would accord with the relevant local policies regarding the location of new residential development,
 - The effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, in particular the occupiers of 58 Roxton Road,
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - The effect on highway safety

Reasons

Location

4. The appeal site lies outside of the defined Settlement Policy Area boundaries of Great Barford. Policies 4S, 3S and 7S of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (the LP) allows for new residential development in and around a Settlement Policy Area if it is well-related to it or the built form of other settlements and complies with specific criteria, including that it responds to an identified community need, and there is identifiable community support and it is made or supported by the parish council.
5. While within a cluster of dwellings the appeal site is not in a settlement. It lies outside of Great Barford and does not seem to be well-related to it in terms of

access to services and facilities. No community need has been identified to support this development, and it has not been submitted or supported by the parish council.

6. My attention has been drawn to the ongoing residential development on the opposite side of Roxton Road, but this site fell within the Settlement Policy Area so was assessed against different policies to the proposed development. This development therefore carries only limited weight in the determination of this appeal.
7. The appeal proposal therefore conflicts with the requirements of Policies 3S, 4S and 7S of the LP regarding the location of new residential development, which are set out above.

Living conditions

8. The proposed bungalow would be sited close to the boundary with No. 58, and several metres to its rear. While only a single storey in height, the bungalow would be prominent in the outlook from No. 58 and overbearing due to its height, depth and proximity to the boundary when seen from the window adjacent to the boundary and from the rear garden. While the staggered siting of houses may not be an uncommon layout for residential development, in this instance the relationship would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 58.
9. The appeal proposal would therefore be contrary to the requirements of Policies 30 and 32 of the LP, which collectively require that development proposals minimise disturbance, and guidance in Residential Extensions, New Dwellings, and Small Infill Developments 2000 that development not have an overbearing effect on another property because of its scale, massing and proximity.

Character and appearance

10. Development along this side of Roxton Road is intermittent on the approach to Great Barford. The appeal site represents a gap in this cluster of dwellings, although the character of the site is domestic with a garage and an open-sided structure to the rear of the house. The site is also set down from the road level with mature planting to the front boundary that provides screening of the site from the road. The proposal is for a bungalow that would have a similar footprint to the existing and would be similar in scale and height to neighbouring properties.
11. Given these considerations, the development would not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with the requirements of Policies 28S, 29 and 30 of the LP, which collectively require that development have a positive relationship with the surrounding area, integrating well with and complementing the character of the area in which the development is located.

Highway safety

12. The proposed bungalow would share the existing highways access with the host dwelling. The application site and the adjoining land within the blue line on the application drawings are within the appellant's control, and therefore if I were minded to allow this appeal an enforceable condition could be reasonably imposed requiring that parking and turning as well as refuse storage for both

houses be provided on the site as a whole. While the site slopes down from the road, there is no reason to believe that there is not enough space available to accommodate this requirement.

13. The proposed development would therefore accord with Policy 31 of the LP, which among other criteria requires that applications give particular attention to parking provision, safety and the suitability of access arrangements for service and emergency vehicles.

Planning Balance

14. The development would result in the creation of one new dwelling, supporting the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. While there is no suggestion that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land, this is not a maximum and does not diminish the value of further housing. The development would provide a short-term economic benefit during the construction period, and in the longer term for local services.
15. The appeal site is located outside of the settlement of Great Barford and does not seem well-related to it for access to services and facilities. However, the village is within walking distance and the site lies within an existing cluster of houses where the development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. There would therefore be limited harm arising from the site's location outside of the Settlement Policy Area of Great Barford. However, there would be unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at No 58.
16. The harm arising from the appeal proposal would, in this instance, outweigh the limited benefits that would result from the creation of a single dwelling. There are therefore no considerations to indicate that this appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above, the appeal fails.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR