



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2024

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/24/3345663
56 Manor Road, Caddington LU1 4ED

- 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 Darren Dargan against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is CB/24/00257/FULL.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension of 4m, a loft conversion with 2 front facing dormers and 2 rear facing dormers and the existing garage to be converted into a habitable space and connected into the 4m rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The appellant submitted an amended plan with the appeal, proposing to reduce the size of the proposed dormer windows at the front and back. The *Procedural Guide – Planning Appeals – England* advises that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme, so amended plans are not normally accepted as part of an appeal. This appeal is dealt with under the Householder Appeals procedure, which does not allow the Council or others to make any further comments within the appeal process.
3. The Council justifiably says that it has had insufficient opportunity to scrutinise the revised scheme. Although the proposed reduction in the size of the dormers would appear to simply reduce the visual impact of the proposal, I cannot be sure that the interests of concerned parties would not be prejudiced by consideration of the revised plan. I have therefore considered this appeal on the basis of drawings considered by the Council during the application process, not the revised plans submitted with the appeal.

Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and this part of Manor Road.

Reasons

5. This part of Manor Road is lined by a mix of bungalows and houses, set back from the street within reasonably spacious plots. No 56 is a relatively small, detached, hipped roof bungalow set between other bungalows. The proposal

- would add ground and first floor accommodation by extending the bungalow to the rear and forming a crown roof (flat roof section surrounded by mono-pitched roofs), with large new pitched roof dormers to the front and rear.
6. Although crown roofs do not appear to be characteristic of Manor Road, a similar roof structure has been built nearby at No 46A and this fits in reasonably well with neighbouring buildings. No 46A does not, however, have dormer windows at the front. The proposed dormers at No 56 would take up a substantial proportion of the front and rear roofs – much more than the maximum ½ roof width advised by Section 11 of the Council's *Central Bedfordshire Design Guide* (DG). The combination of the extensive crown roof with the over-sized dormer windows would create a bulky and visually dominant roofscape that would stand out within the row of bungalows and sit awkwardly within the street scene.
 7. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and this part of Manor Road. It would conflict with policy HQ1 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan 2015-2035, the Neighbourhood Plan for Caddington & Slip End 2016-2031, the DG and the National Planning Policy Framework, which aim to secure high quality design where scale, massing, orientation, materials and appearance all relate well to local surroundings and reinforce local distinctiveness.
 8. The site is within the Chiltern Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC), which is designated for its ecological importance and sensitivity. I agree with the Council that, as no new dwellings are proposed here there should be no significant impact on the SAC.
 9. The Highway Authority raises concerns regarding access and on-site parking. I note, however, that there is space within the front drive to park cars and have seen no evidence of problems with on-street parking on Manor Road, either in terms of congestion or highway safety.
 10. I recognise the appellant's reasonable wish to improve the family home. The proposal does, however, conflict with the development plan for the area. I find nothing to override this objection. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR