



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2023

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/23/3328054

57 Wingfield Road, Bromham, Bedford MK43 8JY

- 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 S Kaur against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01360/FUL, dated 21 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 August 2023.
 - The proposed development is two storey side / rear extension and single storey rear extension including front porch.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The Council has described the development as "one and two storey side and rear extension and front porch". This more accurately describes the development and is used below.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for one and two storey side and rear extension and front porch at 57 Wingfield Road, Bromham Bedford MK43 8JY in accordance with the terms of application ref: 23/01360/FUL dated 21 June 2023 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) This permission shall relate to the following approved plans: drawing no. 5722/P1 (existing elevations, floor and site location plan) and 5772/P2A (proposed elevations, floor and site plan).
 - 3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within a residential area along a road characterised by semi-detached properties with attached garages, some of which have been extended. They are generally set back from the road behind generous grass verges though some lie closer as a result of which there is some variation to the pattern of the built form. The property on the appeal site is located right

- up to the road frontage which is marked by a low brick wall with the dwelling set back behind a small landscaped front garden area.
5. The adjoining property to the east, No. 55, is set further back behind a wide grass verge with the majority of the dwelling located behind the line of the rear elevation of No. 57 such that almost the whole flank gable of the dwelling on the appeal site is visible in the street scene. The proposed two storey side extension would occupy much of the area to the side of the dwelling, replacing the existing garage and set back from the front elevation and set down from the ridge of the main roof of the host dwelling.
 6. The Council's Residential Extensions, New Dwellings and Small Infill Developments SPD (2000) (RENSID) sets out guidance which seeks to ensure that extensions complement their setting and the building form. Design criteria E1 goes on to state that in most situations it is appropriate for an extension to 'step down and back' and appear secondary to the existing building.
 7. As a result of the staggered relationship with No. 55, the proposed side extension would be clearly visible in the street scene. However, in views from the east approaching along Wingfield Road it would be seen against the existing gable end elevation of the host dwelling reflecting the appearance and built form of the host property but of reduced scale. From the front, the original front elevation of the host dwelling would remain as the dominant built form with the proposed extension seen as a secondary element.
 8. RENSID design criteria E3 deals with the space around the buildings and seeks to ensure that the character of the street scene or setting is not eroded. It states that in tightly developed areas with minimal gaps between the sides of houses, two storey extensions should be least 1.5m away from any side boundary.
 9. The front part of the side extension would be set only 1 metre from the side boundary but this would adjoin the front garden area of No. 55 rather than the dwelling itself such that a feeling of space around the building at that point would be maintained. In views looking directly towards the front of the property the proposed side extension would appear to result in the loss of part of the 'visual gap' that is currently afforded by the separation between No. 55 and 57. However, that boundary is not straight, nor are the dwellings sited parallel to it, such that the gap widens towards the rear. Taking into account these factors and the staggered relationship between dwellings, the effect of the extension would not be such as to unacceptably reduce the space around these buildings.
 10. The proposed rear extension would have the effect of reducing somewhat the space at the rear of the dwelling that can be seen in views from the east but not to a significant degree and, in any event, the Council did not raise an objection to this element of the proposal.
 11. I have taken into account the previous appeal decision¹ and note that there are a number of differences between that proposal and the scheme before me, in particular the previous Inspector noted the lack of set back from the front elevation and the marginal set down from the ridge. In addition, the depth of

¹ APP/K0235/D/23/3316672

the full two storey element along the side boundary has decreased reducing the overall mass of the extension. As such, the side extension would not be a discordant feature nor would it be at odds with the prevailing built form which I note is not of uniform spacing given the various extensions that have been added to properties nearby within the context of the appeal site.

12. Overall, therefore I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene. It would thereby accord with Policies 28S, 29 and 30 of the Bedord Borough Local Plan (2020) which seek to ensure that development contributes to good place making, is designed to the highest standards and takes account of context, contribution to townscape and quality of development. It would also satisfy the aims and objectives of the RENSID.
13. I have been referred to the Bromham Neighbourhood Plan and note that whilst there appear to be no directly relevant policies, the vision and aims include that the village should retain its identity and integrity as a rural village. For the reasons set out above I find no conflict with these aims.
14. I have also taken into account the National Planning Policy Framework and find that the proposal would accord with its policies that seek well designed development that is sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Conclusions

15. The Council has suggested conditions to ensure matching materials are used and that the proposal is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I agree that these are necessary in the interests of proper planning and visual amenity.
16. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR