



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 December 2022

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/22/3309231

58 Seamons Close Dunstable LU6 3EQ

- 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 R Knight against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref: CB/21/03185/FULL dated 04 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 58 Seamons Close (No.58) sits within an established residential area comprised, largely, of individual detached dwellings in good sized plots. The layout of the area suggests development has been incremental and on a plot-by-plot basis, leading to a wide variety of building forms and layout. No.58 is located on a narrow part of Seamons Close such that it is not viewed in a conventional street scene in context with neighbouring houses. It has previously been extended at the rear and presents a distinctive well-designed porch at the front but has also retained a distinctive roof profile and visual balance in the front elevation, with a steeply pitched transverse roof visible in the approach view.
4. The Council refer to the Central Bedfordshire Council Design Guide 2014 (Design Guide) at section 7 which is relevant to the proposal. Design Guidance plays an important part in ensuring development maintains high standards of design. In this case although many of the guidance examples do not directly correlate with the proposal, it is clear that the result of the extension would be to add a significant bulk to the southern (side) elevation and this would significantly change the current balance and scale of the front elevation, the retention of which is an objective of that guidance. Although the proposal would replicate the steep gable feature of the original house on the flank elevation, this is achieved by extending the original ridge line through the proposed extension which stands at the same height but has its roof at a different pitch. This would thereby appear incongruous. Overall however, it is the height and bulk of the extension and its roof orientation which disrupts the character and appearance of the host dwelling. For these reasons I consider that the proposed extension, due to its height and forward extension, would be inappropriately

dominant in the primary approach view of the dwelling and therefore, detrimental to the street scene.

5. I have noted the comments of the appellant but conclude, overall, that the proposed extension would appear disproportionate to the host building and, for the reasons given, visually harmful contrary to the principles embodied in the Design Guide and in conflict with Policy HQ1 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan (2021). Consequently, the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and on that basis the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR