



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2022

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/22/3298216

14 Queens Crescent, Clapham, Bedford, MK41 6DA

- 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 Ms Maureen Brown against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01516/FUL, dated 22 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension following the demolition of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policies 28S, 29 and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (adopted 2020) (LP) which together seek to ensure that developments are of the highest quality design and a scale that contributes positively to the character of the area and avoids over development.
3. This part of Queens Crescent comprises modern semi-detached and terraced houses with pitched, gable end roofs which are separated from one another by small gaps. The street scene is of no particular merit, being dominated by the large blocks of flats to the rear of the appeal dwelling and others on this side of the street. As a consequence, the gaps between the dwellings play an important role in maintaining some sense of space around the dwellings.
4. With regard to its siting, the proposed two storey side extension would be sited in line with the front wall of the dwelling and to the rear would align with the rear wall at first floor level, extending almost up to the side boundary. In terms of scale, the proposed ridge would extend out from the existing ridge at the same height and would not be set down. As such, the extension would not appear subordinate to the dwelling and would detract from its appearance. The small gap between the appeal site and its neighbour would be reduced to an unacceptable degree. This would be clearly seen from the street and particularly in the approach from the other leg of Queens Crescent, undermining any sense of space in the street scene.
5. The Council's design guidance in 'Residential extensions, new dwellings and small infill developments' (2000) (RENSID) requires that such extensions are

set back and down from the original dwelling and at least 1.5m from any side boundary to protect the character of the street scene. The proposal fails to achieve that. It does not constitute high quality design and would fail to make a positive contribution to the street scene.

6. At my visit I saw no other dwellings on this side of the street that have been extended in this way and the garage extension at no 18 retains a gap at first floor level. I have noted the appellant's reference to other approved extensions but have not been provided with any details and am not persuaded that there are any within the immediate context of the site that would set a precedent for this proposal.
7. I have noted that the Council has not raised any objection to the proposed rear extension and from what I have seen that would be acceptable but as the two extensions are not clearly severable, I am unable to issue a split decision.
8. I conclude then that the proposed side extension, by reason of its siting, scale and design, would significantly harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area, contrary to the development plan policies referred to above. There are no material considerations that would outweigh that and the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector