



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2024

by G Sylvester BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/24/3341353

7 Dynes Place, Moggerhanger, Bedfordshire MK44 3RH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Emma Moore against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is CB/23/03945/FULL.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "proposed extension & internal alterations".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part two storey front and side extensions and part single storey front extension at 7 Dynes Place, Moggerhanger, Bedfordshire MK44 3RH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CB/23/03945/FULL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: JE/291/A1/04 Revision A and JE/291/A1/03 Revision B.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the grant of planning permission above is taken from the appellant's appeal form and the decision notice, which more accurately describes the proposal, particularly as internal alterations are not development. As this description formed the basis of the Council's publication and notification of the planning application, determining the appeal based on this description would not unfairly prejudice the interests of any party.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The character and appearance of the area is generally defined by a ribbon of 2 storey semi-detached dwellings of broadly similar sizes, along with the occasional detached dwelling, which front onto Bedford Road on the eastern approach to the settlement. Although this ribbon of development is punctuated

by the short cul-de-sac of Dynes Place, the area remains strongly defined by semi-detached dwellings set on discernible building lines and constructed to mostly common built forms with simple proportions.

5. The drawings show the appeal dwelling as forming part of a short terrace. This terrace occupies land at the end of a short unmade track that extends off Dynes Place, and is set further back from Bedford Road than the other dwellings in the area. In this position, the terrace does not front on to the road or follow an established building line. Instead, its front and rear elevations, which face out towards the long private gardens and open fields respectively, are all but hidden from public views. The terrace's north facing gable is the only part noticeably visible from Bedford Road and Dynes Place, and this would not be altered by the proposal.
6. Consequently, the terrace of which the appeal property forms part is visibly detached from the established linear pattern of development in the area. Although built to simple proportions under a gabled roof, it is nevertheless of a different character and appearance to that which prevails in the area. As such, it does not make an important contribution to local distinctiveness.
7. The proposal would add a sizeable extension to the appeal property in place of an existing 2 storey wing. The design of the proposed extension would broadly duplicate that of the existing terrace and its width would not be significantly less than that of the existing dwelling. As such, it would not comply with Paragraphs 11.21.1 and 11.23.1 of the Design Guide¹, insofar as they require an extension to take the appearance of an addition in a supporting role, with a markedly stepped down roofline and stepped back front wall.
8. However, the proposed extension would be contained on the southern end of the terrace where it would be substantially screened in street level views from Bedford Road or Dynes Place by the terrace itself and nearby buildings. Therefore, it would not noticeably affect the appearance of the terrace in the street scene.
9. Furthermore, by broadly duplicating the alignment of the host terrace's walls and roof, the proposed extension would respect its simple gabled appearance and it would not constitute a dominant addition on the end of the terrace, nor overwhelm or unbalance its horizontal proportions. It would be in-keeping with the character, style and appearance of the host terrace, which would not be lost to the proposal, consistent with the first 2 sentences of Design Guide Paragraph 11.21.1. Moreover, the appearance of the terrace in its proposed extended form would not be out of keeping with the nearby buildings.
10. For these reasons, the appearance of the host terrace in its proposed extended form would not be visually harmful in public views from Bedford Road and Dynes Place, or private views from nearby properties. The appeal proposal would, in the context described above, be broadly consistent with the overarching principles in the Design Guide.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and area, consistent with Policy HQ1 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan 2015-2035 (July 2021), which requires the size, scale, massing, orientation, materials and appearance of

¹ Central Bedfordshire Design Guide August 2023

development to relate well to the existing local surroundings and reinforce local distinctiveness. It would also accord with the achievement of well-designed places policies in Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

12. For certainty, it is necessary for the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings. To be in keeping with the appearance of the host property it is necessary for the materials of the proposed extension to match it.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal proposal is consistent with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with that plan. The appeal should be allowed.

G Sylvester

INSPECTOR