



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2022

by Emma Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7TH July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/21/3288674

21 Wood Road, Harrold, Bedford MK43 7BS

- 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 Miss Dina Malick against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01610/S73A, dated 8 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey side extension with abutment roof light to existing building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development has already been carried out. The plans before me appear to reflect the development constructed, as such the appeal is determined on the basis of the submitted plans.
3. The description of the development on the banner heading does not refer to the erection of a boundary fence. However, it is on the submitted plans and the Council considered the fence and refused permission on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling. It occupies a visually prominent corner plot at the entrance to a residential cul-de-sac of similar properties which lie to the rear of the dwelling. The site is located on the edge of the village adjacent to an area of open countryside. The front boundary treatments to the surrounding residential properties primarily consist of low brick walls, fences and/or hedges of varying heights. This, together with the views of the open countryside beyond the buildings, contributes to the pleasant soft landscaped and semi-rural character and appearance of the area.
6. The siting, height and design of the fence, as well as the materials, mean it appears as a visually prominent and alien feature in the streetscape, in stark contrast to the boundary treatments in the surrounding area. This is to the detriment of the verdant character and appearance of the area. The fence would

therefore fail to complement the visual qualities of the area or promote local distinctiveness.

7. The side extension is clearly visible from the highway by virtue of its siting on the corner plot. The design of the extension, including its shallow roof pitch and window arrangement, differs from that of the main dwelling. The Council has set out reasons why this approach to the extension is not acceptable that have not been disputed by the appellant. Given its prominence, I, therefore, have no reason to depart from their findings.
8. In light of the above, I find that the proposal would give rise to harm to the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts with those aims of policies 28, 29 and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030, which seek to promote high quality design which makes a positive contribution to place making and the quality and character of an area, and para 130 of the Framework.

Other Matters

9. I note the appellant's desire for a means of enclosure of the garden space for safety reasons and that the conifer hedge was unmanageable. However, this does not mean that this fence is an acceptable solution. Furthermore, whilst the purported environmental benefits of the materials used in the fence are noted, this would not overcome the harm identified above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons I have set out, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Emma Worley

INSPECTOR