



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 March 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/25/3359295

Wood Farm, Wood End Road, Kempston, Bedford MK43 9BD

- 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 Ray Steele against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01633/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension, with a new constructed entrance hall along with a single garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two storey extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the entrance hall and single garage. Planning permission is therefore granted for a new constructed entrance hall along with a single garage at Wood Farm, Wood End Road, Kempston, Bedford MK43 9BD in accordance with the terms of application reference 24/01633/FUL, 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 plans as far as they relate to the entrance hall and single garage only: drawing references DSM/01/2024/01 2 of 3 and DSM/01/2024/01 3 of 3.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. For ease, I have omitted the superfluous introductory wording from the beginning of the above description, which is taken from the application form. In addition, it is sufficiently clear from the Council's reference to the individual aspects of the appeal scheme and their identification of the front extension element in the singular, that their objections relate to the two storey front extension only. It is implicit, in the absence of any substantive concerns over the entrance hall and the garage, that these elements are acceptable. I have no compelling reason to disagree. Hence it is recommended they be allowed. My recommendation thus focusses on the two storey front extension and its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

4. There is nothing conclusive before me to suggest that the Residential Extensions, New Dwellings & Small Infill Developments Design Guidance (Design Guidance) has been superseded by anything more recent. I am therefore content to take it into account as being relevant to my findings. The appellant is aware of the document and the codes therein that are relevant to the appeal scheme, thus they would not be prejudiced by my actions in regard thereto.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal building is a large, detached house set within a farmyard quite far off Wood End Road at the end of a private access. It is two storeys and has been extended subserviently both to the rear and the side. It has a simple appearance with a pleasant sense of traditionality to its scale, composition, shape and design features. Local buildings are similar in their aesthetic albeit exactness of design differs. There are some more modern examples as well as bungalows. Dwellings are surrounded by the open countryside. These elements and the consistency of the scale of past additions to the appeal building contribute positively to a prevailing rural feel both to it and the character and appearance of the area.
6. The two storey extension would be a substantial non subordinate addition to the front elevation, projecting more than marginally forward and to the side. It's large scale and land take would not only dominate the host building but significantly erode the traditional qualities of its size and detract from its features such as the symmetrical frontage of the main section and the consistency of previous additions. Its width and use of twin forward facing gables would result in a confused building overall which would lack the coherence and rural appeal of the original.
7. The building's location relative to Wood End Road limits both its obviousness in the public realm and thus the visual effects of the appeal scheme. That said, the glimpses into the site that are available would be sufficient to appreciate the discordance of the proposed extension and would not sufficiently lessen the harm I have found to the point that it would be acceptable.
8. The adverse effect the appeal scheme would have on the character and appearance of the area by virtue of the above would lead to conflict with Policies 7S, 28S, 29, 30 and 66 of the Bedford Borough Council Local Plan 2030 (2020). These require, amongst other things, that development proposals are of a high quality and have a positive relationship with the surrounding area. As well as the size and design of any extensions respecting the existing building and not being visually intrusive in the countryside. Policy 31 relates to access impacts. It is not therefore sufficiently relevant to the main issue.
9. The proposal would also conflict with Design Codes E1 and E2 of the Design Guidance which set out, amongst other things and in regard to rural areas, that it is particularly important there should be no adverse effect on the rural character and appearance of the area and that extensions should respect the architecture, character, size, scale and siting of the original dwelling.

Conditions

10. I have set out a condition requiring the approved elements of the scheme to be commenced within the usual time period as well as referring to the approved plans insofar as they relate to the matters granted planning permission only. A condition

requiring external materials to match is not necessary given that the approved plans state as much.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan for the reasons I have set out. There are no other considerations which would alter this finding. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR