



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2023

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/22/3312680

Conifers, Chawston Lane, Chawston, Bedford MK44 3BH

- 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 & Mrs Hudson against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00604/FUL dated 14 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as new replacement detached garage block with storage over.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a bungalow and is located in the countryside, within a semi-rural area, residential properties in the area vary in form and design. The appeal site is a spacious plot which is screened to a degree by a large hedgerow, however due to the timber gate accessing the site views are afforded into the site from the highway. There is an existing outbuilding on the site which is in poor state of repair in the location the proposed development would be sited.
4. The proposed five vehicle garage with first floor storage incorporating five dormer windows, and other openings is significant in scale and would be visible from the highway above the existing hedgerow, as well as the existing access gate.
5. The proposed development would introduce a building substantially larger than the modest bungalow on the site. Due to the scale and design of the proposed garage block it would not be subservient to the existing property and dominate the site. The proposed development would be out of keeping with the site and would be an incongruous to the surrounding area.
6. The Appellant has drawn my attention to other large garages/outbuildings and commercial buildings within the area, however none of which are of a scale as the proposed development in terms of a residential context similar to the one

before me. The commercial buildings are large however they in the context of commercial operations. I do not find these examples comparable to the appeal proposal. Nonetheless each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.

7. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. There is conflict with Policies 28, 29, 30 and 66 of the Bedford Borough Council Local Plan 2030 (2020) which seek amongst other things to ensure development is of high design quality and responds positively to the character and context of an area and is in keeping with the existing dwelling.

Other Matters

9. The Appellant contends that the proposed development would create jobs during the construction process which would have economic benefits for the area. The short term economic benefit of work during the construction process would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area. I give this limited weight.
10. The Appellant advances that the proposed development would offer a high quality development which would improve the visual appearance of the site and contribute towards the local housing stock by improving the quality of existing living accommodation which would in turn contribute towards maintaining the vitality of existing local services and amenities.
11. I disagree, it is clear from my findings on the main issue that the proposed development would not improve the appearance of the site. The proposed development is for a multi-vehicle garage with storage above, no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate how this would improve housing stock and would contribute towards maintaining existing services and amenities. The proposal according to the Grounds of Appeal Statement is for an ancillary outbuilding for the storage of cars and would consist of a storage/workshop area associated with the maintenance and upkeep of these cars.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR