



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/22/3300817

121 Cardington Road, Bedford, MK42 0BY

- 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 and Mrs J & K Singh & Kaur against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03044/FUL, dated 12 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'single storey front, side and rear extension with two storey side extension'.
-

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 street scene. 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. The appeal site is set back from Cardington Road, a busy dual carriageway. It comprises an end terrace house in a row of terraced and semi-detached houses on this side of the road, built in the 1950's in a plain style typical of local authority housing of that period. Contrary to the appellant's assertion, the dwellings are mostly homogenous in their appearance and there is a consistency in the character of the row. This terrace retains much of its original character and appearance and has not been subject to other side or front extensions. Gaps of no more than the width of a driveway on each property have a role in creating a sense of space between dwellings and together with the symmetry of the terraced blocks, contribute to the rhythm and character of the street scene.
4. The appeal dwelling projects slightly forward of its adjoining neighbour and has a hipped roof and symmetrical placement of its front door with flat roof canopy above and windows, matching that of the other end dwelling in the terrace.
5. The proposed single storey extension would wrap around the front, side and rear elevations, having a hipped roof relieved by a gable roof over the front door. It would extend across the full width of the front elevation and beyond the side wall up to the side boundary. The extension beyond the side wall

would give the front elevation an awkward appearance when seen from the street and the hipped/gabled roof would be overly fussy and at odds with the simpler flat roofs of the front canopies of the terrace. It would dominate the front elevation, detracting from the symmetry of both the dwelling and the terrace.

6. The two storey side extension would be set back only very slightly from the front wall of the dwelling and would align with the rear wall. The ridge would be set down only very slightly from the main ridge and it would be set in only 900mm from the side boundary. It would fail to meet the Council's design guidance in 'Residential extensions, new dwellings and small infill developments' (2000) (RENSID) which requires that such extensions are set at least 1.5m from any side boundary to protect the character of the street scene. I have noted that the adjacent semi-detached dwelling at no 123 has been extended with a permitted two storey side extension, leaving a gap of some 1m from the side boundary. However, the set back from the front wall and set down from the main ridge proposed here are insufficient and would exacerbate the effect of the narrow gap. The extension would not be sufficiently subordinate to the original dwelling. The Nicholls Road houses are sited some distance to the rear of the property and therefore have little bearing in the context of the gap. The proposed two storey side extension would, therefore, unduly dominate the dwelling and would detract from the symmetry of the terrace. The significant reduction of the gap at first floor level, despite the hipped roofs of both the appeal dwelling and no 123, would result in a cramped, overdeveloped appearance and would disrupt the rhythm of gaps in the street scene which contribute positively to its character.
7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would fail to make a positive contribution to the character of the area and does not therefore represent high quality design. It would, by reason of its siting, scale and design, significantly harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene, contrary to the development plan policies referred to above. Although it would provide additional accommodation for the occupiers, this does not outweigh the wider public harm that would be caused. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colbourne

Inspector