
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/25/3362572

16 The Graylings, Bedford MK41 9BH

- 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 & Mrs S Kosic against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02221/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as “front, side and rear single and 2-storey extensions with associated internal alterations.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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. The description on the application form differs to the decision notice. There has been no agreement by the appellant for this change prior to the appeal submission. I am satisfied that the description on the former accurately describes the proposal.
4. The Council have not raised concerns with the single storey rear extension, and I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, my recommendation focusses on the two-storey element of the proposals and, specifically, its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal building is one half of a pair of two storey hipped roof dwellings. They both appear to be largely original and therefore symmetrical. In association with other unaltered examples, there is a high quality to the consistency of built form. Some have been added to through, on the whole, extensions that appear subservient, tied into the main roof and reflective of their originality. These elements contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. There would be some subservience in the scheme by virtue of stepping the two storey section down and back. However, the contrasting and inconsistent roof profiles along with the awkward intersections of the extension would result in an incongruous addition that would detract from the prevailing harmony of built form in the street scene. The limited visibility of some elements would not make the scheme, as a whole, acceptable.

7. Photographs and a decision notice have been provided as an example of similar development at Number 4 The Graylings. I note however that whilst the same design guidance was in place, a different local plan prevailed at the time. Moreover, the schemes are not directly comparable due to the different roof profiles, scale and massing. Moreover, minimal photographs and addresses of other examples of similar development within the cul-de-sac have been provided. I am, however, unaware of the finer details thereof such as the circumstances, context or matters taken into account at the time. Resultantly, they do not affect my findings sufficiently for them to change.
8. The proposals would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and conflict with Policies 28S, 29 and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 and Design Codes E1 and E2 of the Residential Extensions, New Dwellings & Small Infill Development Design Guidance (DG) 2000 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Other Matter

9. Notwithstanding the age of the DG and the new development plan which has replaced the previous, it is still an adopted supplementary planning document and the weight it attracts has not changed. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan in any case which has primacy. This would not change in the event that the development accorded with the DG. Which it would not for the reasons I have set out.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan, and I have been given no other compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR