



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2024

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/24/3344266

19 Astwick Road, Stotfold, SG5 4AT

- 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 Mr Charlie Sewell against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is CB/24/00217/FULL.
 - The development proposed is erection of part single, part two storey rear extension, external alterations, brick boundary wall, entrance gates, new and replacement fencing, and detached triple garage. Demolition of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling; and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling, which is situated to the rear of properties on Astwick Road. It is served by a private drive, which is shared with number 17 Astwick Road (number 17). A new residential development adjoins the site on its north-eastern side.
4. The proposal contains a number of different elements, as described in the heading above. A new detached triple garage, with a room above, would be constructed at the front of the property. A part single, part two storey extension would be constructed at the rear. In addition, new walls, fencing and entrance gates also form part of the proposal.
5. The Council contends that the proposed garage and rear extension would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of both the area and the dwelling because of their disproportionate size and scale. It considers that the proposal would conflict with Policy HQ1 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan (LP) and with Section 11 of the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (CBDG).
6. Policy HQ1 of the LP requires (amongst other things) high quality development and for proposals to relate well to the local surroundings. This policy is reinforced by the guidance in the CBDG, which advises that garages should

respect the scale and character of the property and do not dominate the house. It also states that the bulk, volume, or character of an extension should not dominate the existing dwelling and that it should appear as a subservient addition. The principle of good design and for proposals to reflect the character of the area is also contained in paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023.

7. Whilst both the proposed garage and the extensions to the dwelling would be large and would add significantly to the amount of built development at the site, this, should not automatically mean that the proposal is unacceptable. The existing dwelling is of no particular architectural merit and the scale of the proposed extensions at the rear would not be dissimilar to the extensions that have been built at the rear of number 17. In that regard the proposed extensions would not be at odds with the surroundings.
8. Likewise, the proposed garage would be a relatively large structure, but it would be viewed in isolation from the appeal dwelling and its design and overall appearance would not be unacceptable given the mix of building sizes and types in the vicinity of the site.
9. Therefore, on this issue, I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of either the existing dwelling or on the surrounding area.

Living Conditions

10. The proposed garage and extensions to dwelling would be built close to the rear garden boundaries of the recently constructed dwellings on Cherry Orchard. These new properties have relatively short gardens and I consider that the overall height, mass and close proximity to the boundaries of both the garage and the extensions would have an unacceptably dominating and overbearing impact on the outlook from both the dwellings and gardens. As a result, the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of the occupants.
11. Policy HQ1 of the LP states that development will be permitted provided it does not have an unacceptable adverse impact upon nearby existing or permitted uses. Furthermore, Section 11 of the CBDG advises that extensions should not have an overbearing effect on neighbours. For the above reasons, I consider that the proposal would conflict with the provisions of both the LP and the CBDG.
12. In reaching my decision, I have fully considered the appellant's arguments, including the proposed angular relationship between the development and neighbouring properties. However, these do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above in relation to the effect on the neighbouring dwellings, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR