



---

## 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/22/3305390**

**3 Rookery Road Wyboston Bedford MK44 3AX**

- 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 Sharp against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 22/00764/FUL, dated 29 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2022.
  - The development proposed is one and two storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an one and two storey extension at 3 Rookery Road Wyboston Bedford MK44 3AX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00764/FUL, dated 29 March 2022, 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: Block and Location Plan Ref JJ21 0003 002 Rev H and All Elevations, Floor, Block and Location Plan Ref JJ21 0003 001 Rev H.
  - 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 amended the description of the development. I have used the Council's description as this provides a more accurate description of the development.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area with particular regard to its location in the Wyboston Land Settlement Association Area (WLSAA).

## Reasons

4. The appeal property, No 3 Rookery Road (No 3) is a detached dwelling set in a generous plot within the WLSAA. Rookery Road is a long straight road with a wide variety of different house styles and designs set in generally large plots, interspersed with equine/commercial uses. Several of the dwellings, including No 3, have been previously extended. Whilst in some cases they diverge from the original built form, on the whole they maintain their characteristics such as the orientation to the road, linear roofs and dormer windows. As such, these extensions have been effectively assimilated into the original dwellings and the streetscene of Rookery Road. The area still retains the distinctive spatial pattern noted as a key characteristic of the WLSAA in the explanatory text to Policy AD44 of the Bedford Borough Allocations and Designations Local Plan (BBADLP). This provides that within the WLSAA, development will be permitted where applications respect the style, scale, appearance and orientation of the original dwelling and maintain the distinctive spatial pattern, layout and scale of plots.
5. In the case of No 3 the previous extension has resulted in a large, deep rear extension whilst maintaining the appearance of an older traditional cottage to the front. The symmetrical nature of the two storey side extension now proposed at the side and rear of No 3 would avoid the harmful disproportionate effects from the proposal in the previous appeal scheme as found by the Inspector<sup>1</sup>. Whilst large, it would respect the character and design of the existing dwelling and as such would not be unduly prominent in views when approaching from the north along Rookery Road.
6. The Council's principal concerns in relation to the revised design, the subject of this appeal, relate to the lack of subordination of the front part of the extension to No 3, the lack of a step down and step back from the original dwelling and the continuation of the ridge and building line. By not providing a set back from the main front elevation and a set down from the main ridge line the proposal would not meet the guidance as set out in the Council's 'Residential Extensions, New Dwellings and Small Infill Developments' Supplementary Design Guidance (RENSID). This guidance aims to avoid an unbalancing in the appearance of the existing building.
7. No 3 has a strong linear form when viewed directly opposite from the road. The proposed addition would incorporate original key features such as the steep roof, linear form and dormer windows of the existing building. The long ridge line would enable the extension to integrate with the regular form of the host dwelling and the first floor would remain contained within the pitched roof. As such it would retain the appearance of the original building. Rather than unbalancing and overwhelming the building, it would be sympathetic to the architecture of the original dwelling. As detailed in the supporting text to the Design Code within RENSID each scheme needs to be judged on its own merits. In this instance, whilst it would not meet the guidance set out in RENSID in relation to set backs and set downs, the proposal would reflect the characteristics of the existing dwelling and would not cause harm to its scale, form and appearance.
8. Nor given the substantial size of the plot would the resulting dwelling appear overly large. It would not be at odds with the style and design of other

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeal Decision Ref APP/K0325/D/21/3286699

dwelling on Rookery Road given the retention of its key characteristics as also found in these dwellings. Due to the distance of No 3 to neighbouring properties, the sense of space found within the WLSAA would be retained. As such, the development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Accordingly there is no conflict with Policies 28S, 29 and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030, which collectively require development proposals to be in keeping with the scale and character of the area and the site's wider setting and location. Nor would it conflict with Policy AD44 of BBADLP, details of which are set out above. It would also not conflict with guidance contained in the RENDSID which allows for specific proposals to be considered on their own merits. The proposal would also be in accordance with the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework which aims to secure development which is sympathetic and which responds to local distinctiveness and character.

### **Conditions**

10. 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**

11. For the reasons given and having taken all matters into account, I allow the appeal as set out in the formal decision above.

*K Winnard*

INSPECTOR