



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2024

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/24/3339564

32 Clifton Road, Shefford, Central Bedfordshire, SG14 5AE

- 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 L Clancy against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref CB/24/00018/FULL dated 3 January 2024, was refused by notice dated 15 February 2024.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension, single storey front extension and side extension with loft conversion with rear dormer and two roof lights to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character of the existing dwelling and visual amenity of the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey, semi-detached, dwelling located on a corner plot. The appeal site fronts onto Clifton Road, however, also shares a boundary (onto which the side elevation faces) with Victoria Road where I note vehicular access is taken from. There are several elements to the appeal proposal, however, the Council's delegated report confirms that permission was granted for a two-storey side extension, single storey front extension, loft conversion with rear dormer and two front roof lights under application reference CB/23/01021/FULL. The main difference between the existing permission, and the proposal before me, is stated to be the parking layout and an extension of the approved front extension. Given the existing permission, and the wording of the refusal reason before me, this appeal will largely focus upon the front extension in the context of the main issue outlined above.
4. At the time of my site visit I found that the character and appearance of the built form around the appeal site was varied with detached, terraced, and semi-detached dwellings of varying styles and materials. Despite this, I did not find any examples of properties benefiting from a crown roof with the appellant acknowledging that a crown roof design is not readily evidenced in the locality. The proposal would, therefore, be uncharacteristic for both the host dwelling and the surrounding area by design. The proposed crown front extension would, cumulatively with the other extensions already approved, also result in disproportionate additions to the host dwelling with the front extension, as a

- result of design and bulk, not relating well to its surroundings within a visually prominent location.
5. The proposal would result in differing roof types as a result of the proposed lean-to pitched element of the front extension as well as the existing, and proposed, hipped roof of the host dwelling itself. The proposed crown roof front extension would, I find, appear as awkward contrast to the existing and proposed built form which would be out of character with the host dwelling itself as well as other similar properties in the locality as a result of crown roof designs not being readily evidenced in the locality.
 6. I acknowledge that there have been attempts to make the roof slopes, where possible, consistent with the existing dwelling and the proposed two storey side extension as well as the previously approved single storey front elevation extension, however, I do not find that this would result in a sympathetic roof scape across the whole dwelling. Whilst the crown roof design seeks to restrict the height of the front extension, it fails to sympathetically tie all elements of the proposals together as a result of contrasting roof designs. The proposal for a larger front extension, as is before me, would not result in an appearance which is sympathetically designed or subservient in scale to the host dwelling. The proposal would be out of character for the host dwelling as well as impacting upon the outward visual qualities of the area.
 7. The front single storey extension, already approved, would be increased in terms of floor area as a result of the proposals before me and I find that the proposal is of poor design in that it is unsympathetic to the host dwelling, and the pair of dwellings which the appeal site is part of as well as being detrimental to visual amenity as a result of the proposal being highly prominent in location at a corner junction with Victoria Road and Clifton Road. As shown, within the appellant's photographs, and as seen on site, the appeal proposals would be highly visible within the immediate area including in longer views beyond (around) the mini roundabout at the junction of Clifton Road and Hitchen Road.
 8. Overall, the proposed crown roof front extension, as a result of size and design, would be out of character with the host dwelling, other similar properties in the locality and would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area as a result of poor design insofar as it would be unsympathetic due to scale and design which would result in a collection of incompatible roof designs and cumulative extensions at the appeal site. The proposal would be contrary to Central Bedfordshire Local Plan 2021 Policy HQ1 which seeks to ensure that all developments are of the highest possible quality and respond positively to their context. Development proposals, including extensions, will only be permitted where the size, scale, massing, orientation, materials, and appearance relate well to the existing local surroundings and reinforce local distinctiveness, both built and natural.
 9. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023, which outlines that decisions should ensure developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

10. I note that the Town Council have objected to the proposal in relation to three main matters which include fencing, parking, and an outbuilding. The Town Council refer to an outbuilding within their objection, however, the proposal does not include outbuildings, and this cannot be taken into consideration as part of this appeal. Objection is also raised in relation to the number of parking spaces; however, the proposal would provide a fourth bedroom and the Council confirm that the required amount of parking spaces for a four-bedroom semi-detached dwelling is three parking spaces, which would be consistent with the parking standards set out in the relevant supplementary planning document. Furthermore, highways, as a consultee, have raised no objection to the proposal and I have no evidence before me to conclude differently on such matters.
11. Comments regarding fencing are noted with particular regard to the height of the fencing currently on site, however, the plans before me show a 1-metre-high boundary fence, dropping to 600mm high at points from access, and the highways consultee has raised no objection to the proposed fencing on the grounds of highway safety. Matters relating to existing fencing, insofar as it could be unauthorised, are not within the scope of this appeal and any potential enforcement action relating to such fencing is outside the scope of the appeal as I am only able to consider matters as they are submitted before me.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR