



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2022

by K Winnard LL.B (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/22/3305890

11 Mitre Close Bedford Bedfordshire MK41 0SR

- 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 U Rai against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00207/FUL, dated 25 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two storey side extension and planning permission is refused for the two storey side extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 11 Mitre Close Bedford Bedfordshire MK41 0SR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00207/FUL, dated 25 January 2022 so far as is relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, 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 Elevations, Floor and Location Plan 1122/P1 and Proposed Elevations, Floor and Block Plan Ref 1122/P2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of that part of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has indicated that it has no objections to the single storey extension to the rear of the property. Accordingly I shall direct my assessment to the two storey side extension element of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 11 Mitre Close, (No 11) is a detached dwelling within a modern residential estate sited on a corner plot at the junction of Mitre Close and The Cloisters. There are a mixture of dwelling types within the estate with many sited on similar corner plots. A noticeable feature of such corner plots is a narrow amenity space at the side of the dwellings bounded by high brick walls and part timber panels adjacent to the footway. Notwithstanding the variety in the juxtapositioning of the dwellings on the estate, this gives an attractive consistency to the pattern of development found in the area. The proposed extension would infill this gap extending No 11 to meet the footway.
5. The proposed extension would be modest in size and width and would match the existing dwelling by the incorporation of the jerkinhead gable. It would be a continuation of the existing design in roof form. However, by infilling the gap at the side, it would add bulk to the dwelling and would result in a cramped and discordant addition to the streetscene in this location. Rather than creating a sense of transition from Mitre Close going into The Cloisters, it would introduce a sense of enclosure at this junction and would draw the eye. Due to its location it would be unduly prominent within the streetscene. Nor would the retention of the high hedge on the appeal site mitigate the domineering effect created as a result of the proposal.
6. I therefore conclude that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such the development would not be in accordance with Policies 28S, 29 and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (Local Plan). It would also conflict with recommendations within the Council's 'Residential Extensions, New Dwellings and Small Infill Developments' Supplementary Design Guidance. Together these policies and guidance require, amongst other things, development to be in keeping with the scale and character of the area and the site's wider setting and location.

Other Matter

7. As the single storey ground floor extension at the rear of No 11 is both physically and functionally severable, I consider that a split decision would be appropriate in this instance. Accordingly I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the single storey extension.

Conditions

8. I have attached the standard time condition and a plans condition to ensure certainty. I have also attached a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

9. The two storey side extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. There are no other considerations which would outweigh these findings or the conflict with the Development Plan. Accordingly in relation to the two storey side extension I dismiss the appeal. The element of the appeal which relates to the single storey rear extension is allowed in accordance with my formal decision notice above.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR