



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2025

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/24/3348463

Teazels, Green Lane, Renhold, Bedford MK41 0LE

- 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 Graziano against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00864/FUL.
 - The development proposed is replacement of existing double garage structure with one and a half storey structure with office/storage over.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant indicates that in addition to the development in the above description, the proposal involves the removal of a timber storage building.
1. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published on 12 December 2024. The content of the revised Framework has been considered but in light of the facts in this case it does not alter my conclusion.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed building on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached chalet bungalow located at the end of a semi-rural lane, which includes a public bridleway that runs past the appeal property to connect to a public footpath. There are dwellings to the south-west along Brook Lane, while open countryside lies to the north. The appeal site is outside the Settlement Area Boundary of the village of Renhold.
5. Policies 28S and 29 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (2020) require high quality design in new development and that it should contribute positively to the character of the surrounding area. Policy 30 requires development proposals to take account of the principles of good design, including in terms of scale, density, massing, height, materials and layout.
6. Policy 66 concerns changes to dwellings in the countryside. It says that a proposal for the creation or extension of ancillary domestic buildings will be supported where, amongst other criteria, the design and size of the proposal is in keeping with

the existing dwelling. I have had regard to the appellant's contention that Policy 66 is not relevant as it concerns the replacement and extension of dwellings. However, the final part of the policy specifically addresses the creation of ancillary domestic buildings and, therefore, is relevant to the appeal proposal, which concerns this type of building.

7. The appeal site includes a detached double garage with a flat roof to the northern corner of the plot. The proposed building would replace the existing garage; its position, in front of and to one side of the host dwelling, is not unusual. The replacement building would have a wide frontage, to accommodate two double garage doors and stairs to provide access to the upper floor.
8. The useable space in the roof combined with the frontage width and overall depth means that this would be a structure of substantive size compared to both the existing garage and other conventional forms of garage or carport. This would be particularly apparent from its height of over six metres close to the road frontage, which combined with the sharply-pitched roof and large front roof slope would result in a building that would be a dominant feature in this location. The size and bulk of the building and the extent of the roof profile would be accentuated by the three front dormers, which would be substantive features in their own right.
9. The host dwelling is a relatively large building, but predominantly due to its footprint rather than its height. The scale of the proposed building, particularly its height, combined with its forward position means that it would not appear subordinate to the host dwelling. Consequently, the building would appear as an incongruous and uncharacteristic feature, which would compete visually with the host dwelling rather than complement its character and appearance. The use of appropriate external materials would not overcome these harmful effects.
10. The public bridleway and footpath wrap around the site, including passing the front entrance. From this view the incongruous relationship between the new building and host dwelling would be readily apparent and, as such, the proposal would be harmful in views from the public realm.
11. The appellant suggests that the height of the building could be controlled by condition. However, this would not mitigate the overall effects of the building, which is of substantive size due to its width and depth, as well as its height. Additional landscaping is unlikely to mitigate the visual effects of the proposed building, not least because the principal views into the site would be from the vehicular access.
12. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed building would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policies 28S, 29, 30 and 66 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030, as described.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge that the proposed building is intended to create additional useable space, that there would be some limited economic benefits associated with construction and that the building would be built to high environmental standards. However, these matters do not overcome the harm and conflict with development plan policies that I have found would result from the proposal.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR