



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2021

by R Jones BA(Hons)DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/21/3276314
203 Cardington Road, Bedford MK42 0BZ

- 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 M Ali against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00449/FUL, dated 15 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side and single storey rear extension at 203 Cardington Road, Bedford MK42 0BZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00449/FUL, dated 15 February 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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: Existing and Proposed Plans & Elevations: A988-1a.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr M Ali against Bedford Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

4. No.203 Cardington Road (No.203) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling on the southern side of Cardington Road. The dwelling has red facing brickwork with a pitched roof and facing gable, set a reasonable distance from the common boundary with its non-adjointed neighbour at No.201 Cardington Road (No.201).

5. The southern side of Cardington Road is characterised by pairs of semi-detached dwellings and short rows of terraced dwellings set within reasonably spacious surroundings. In particular, the semi-detached dwellings are well, and regularly, spaced with outbuildings, trees and dwellings to the rear visible between the pairs.
6. Design Code E3 of the Council's adopted *Residential Extensions, New Dwellings and Small Infill Developments Supplementary Design Guidance (2000)* (SDG) states that 'in tightly developed areas with minimal gaps between the side of houses, two-storey extensions should be at least 1.5m away from any side boundary.' The proposed two-storey extension is set back from the main elevation and down from the ridge of the existing roof of No.203 and at ground floor extends right up to the common boundary at No.201. At first floor, to allow for a reasonably sized WC and fourth bedroom, it extends to about 1m from the side boundary. I acknowledge therefore that the proposal fails to meet Design Code E3 of the SDG.
7. However, the neighbouring dwelling at No.201 is itself set well off the common boundary and has a hipped roof that slopes away from No.203. This in combination with the design of the extension, set down from the ridge of the existing roof, means that the spaciousness between the dwellings would be largely retained. There would be a clear visual break between the two dwellings with glimpses of the trees to the rear remaining. The proposed two-storey side extension would not therefore reduce the visual gap, nor would it result in No.203 and No.201 appearing as a terrace, such that it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene.
8. Consequently, although there would be a conflict with part of the SDG, the proposal would comply with Policies 28,29 and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (January 2020). These policies all seek, amongst other things, development of a high-quality design that integrates well and respects local distinctiveness and context. It would further be consistent with the guidance in the Framework that developments should be of good design, sympathetic to local character.

Conditions and conclusion

9. The standard time limit and a condition specifying the approved plans are required to provide certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is also necessary requiring external materials used in the construction of the proposed extension to match the existing dwelling.
10. For the reasons give above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions above.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR