



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2025

by **J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/25/3362630

43 Oxford Blue Way, Stewartby, Bedford MK43 9GF

- 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 Teena Ferguson against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02163/FUL.
 - The development proposed is two new roof dormers on front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer windows on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling in a modern residential development within the settlement of Stewartby. The appeal property is in a row of similar dwellings fronting a private driveway with a lake beyond this. The surrounding area is residential in character.
4. 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.
5. These policy requirements are reflected in further detail in Design Codes E1 and E2 of the *Residential Extensions, New Dwellings and Small Infill Developments* Supplementary Design Guidance. Of specific relevance to the appeal proposal, E2 says that in most situations an extension should reflect the detailed character of the existing building in terms of roofscape, window proportions, details and materials.
6. The detached properties in Oxford Blue Way and surrounding streets are highly uniform in their design and appearance. A number of properties have paired dormer windows on their front roof slopes, whether as part of the original design or later additions. Each dormer features a casement window with two window panels, reflecting the type and size of the windows at first floor level. As such, they appear proportionate and create a uniform front elevation to the properties.

7. By contrast, the appeal proposal involves the addition of wider dormers than those present on other properties, which would include three window panels. Consequently, the dormer windows would not match those at first floor level and this lack of uniformity would result in the dormers being disproportionate additions that would upset the otherwise uniform and well-designed appearance of the property. Moreover, due to the consistency of design and appearance of dormers on other properties, the proposal would be uncharacteristic and incongruous in relation to the character and appearance of the wider area. Due to the openness of the street scene, these harmful effects would be readily apparent.
8. I have had regard to the contention that the proposal would be no more harmful than changes at other nearby properties. The photographs provided show an unspecified property with three-panelled windows, but these are not dormer windows and, therefore, are not comparable to the appeal proposal within its surrounding context.
9. No 10 Halley Way has undergone a number of changes, as the appellant contends, but in terms of comparison with the appeal proposal the most relevant consideration is that the width and window configuration of the front dormers are consistent with the host dwelling and surrounding area. The choice of materials and other minor alterations do not have a direct bearing in this regard.
10. As such, there is no reasonable basis to find that the Council has been inconsistent in its determination of proposals for front dormers, which is the proposal before me; or that the policies and guidance referred to above are not relevant to the appeal proposal. Moreover, economic considerations or concerns about the lack of opportunity to negotiate with the Council do not have a direct bearing on this appeal decision, which is concerned with the planning merits of the proposal.
11. Therefore, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed dormer windows 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 and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030, as described.

Conclusion

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

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR