



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2025

by **A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2025

Appeal Reference: APP/K0235/D/24/3356667

2 Station Road Sharnbrook Bedford MK44 1PT

- 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 Roy Wildman against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01760/FUL
 - The development proposed is Demolition of existing conservatory, single storey side extension and new conservatory to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Demolition of existing conservatory, single storey side extension and new conservatory to rear at 2 Station Road Sharnbrook Bedford MK44 1PT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01760/FUL and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 24 07 01.
 - 3) The materials used in the external construction of the development hereby approved shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The Main Issue is the effect of the development upon the amenity of neighbouring users at 3 Station Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal site (No.2) lies within an established residential area forming part of a small group of two-storey detached dwellings of similar appearance arranged around a short cul-de-sac. Both 2 and 3 Station Road have enclosed rear gardens which abut the fenced side boundary of 7 Tythe Close, a semi-detached house which lies at a lower ground level to the south-west. The proposal would infill the space between the flank wall of No.2 and its side shared boundary with No.3, currently a high boarded fence. Elevations of these houses share a common outlook to the southwest, however the dwellings are arranged at right-angles such

that the garden to No.3 is 'L-shaped' also wraps around its wide south-eastern elevation.

4. The proposed extension would have a prominent solid roof form extending to a height similar to the mid point of upper-floor windows; the conservatory would project beyond the rear elevation of No.2 but to a much lower height. I note that the Council suggest an overbearing effect that "will be further reinforced by the development of the wall along almost the full length of the garden" but this does not reflect the fact that the affected boundary would be approximately one quarter of the entire garden perimeter¹ which is generally open in outlook. Whilst the solid roof form and the side wall of the proposed extension would be prominent and increase the sense of enclosure, this would be experienced in proximity to the north-west end of the L-shaped garden of No.3 and not in main habitable rooms or the larger part of the garden areas which would retain access to a wide southerly arc of sunlight and daylight. I consider the degree of change that users of No.3 would experience would not be unacceptable and that overall the development would not have an overbearing effect on neighbouring users.
5. I therefore conclude there would be no conflict with Policy S1 (d)² of the Sharnbrook Neighbourhood Development Plan 2030, Policy 32 (iv) of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (BBLP) or with Code E7 of The Residential Extensions, New Dwellings and Small Infill Developments guidance (RENSID) which together seek to protect the amenity of neighbouring users from unacceptable impacts on residential amenity. Consequently, for the reasons given and taking all matters raised into account, the appeal succeeds subject to the usual plans and timing conditions and a further condition to ensure the appearance of the development is not visually intrusive from the use of inappropriate materials.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

¹ The perimeter of No.3 L-shaped garden

² The Council refer to S1(c) which would appear to be an error