



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 June 2021 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/21/3272576

St Alban, 32 Bedford Road, Wootton, MK43 9JT

- 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 Mrs Samantha Dunmall against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00017/FUL, dated 5 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is front dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. In this respect, I am mindful that neither the appellant nor the Council have made any further submissions regarding the revised Framework. However, in light of this re-consultation, I am satisfied that any references made to the revised Framework within this decision would not be unreasonable to the parties.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property consists of a large two-storey detached dwelling. This section of Bedford Road consists predominantly of detached dwellings, with a school and church opposite the appeal site. The street scene is made up of a variety of property sizes, designs and materials, however the materials and features of the appeal property closely tie in with its immediate neighbours. Whilst dormer windows are not a common feature of the wider area they are
-

present on a number of properties, as depicted in photographs provided by the appellant, including the neighbouring dwelling. In that case the dormers are set down from the ridgeline and centrally within the roofspace to replicate the fenestration below. Dormers elsewhere in the vicinity tend to be small in scale and set at, or just above, eaves level such that they do not dominate the roofslope.

6. The proposal would see the erection of four dormer windows in the front roof slope. While the dormers would all be the same size and design, the number of dormers would exceed the number of first-floor windows below them which would result in a cluttered roofscape. In addition, the ridgeline of the dormers would tie in with the ridgeline of the main dwelling, unlike the neighbouring dwelling and other dormers in the wider area where such structures are set down within the roofspace to provide a subservient appearance. The position at the top of the roof slope would increase their prominence and result in a top-heavy appearance that would unbalance the appearance of the roof. Furthermore, the dormers would not align with the fenestration below.
7. As such, the proposed dormers would not complement the dwelling at the appeal site, or the immediately adjacent properties. Given the number of dormers, their position at the second-floor level and their height on the roof slope, the proposal would be discordant with the appeal property and the street scene and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. As such the proposal would conflict with policies 28, 29 and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan (January 2020). These policies all seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development complements the character of the area. The proposal would also fail to accord with the guidance of sections E1 and E2 of the Residential Extensions, New Dwellings & Small Infill Developments Design Guidance (January 2000), which seek to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

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

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR