



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 1 April 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/K0235/D/24/3356916

Top Farm, The Lane, Wyboston, Bedford MK44 3AS

- 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 D Ward against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 24/01869/FUL.
- The development proposed is erection of detached garage (pitch roof).

Appeal B Ref: APP/K0235/D/24/3356917

Top Farm, The Lane, Wyboston, Bedford MK44 3AS

- 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 D Ward against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 24/01870/FUL.
- The development proposed is erection of detached garage (flat roof).

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is allowed, and planning permission is granted for erection of detached garage (flat roof) at Top Farm, The Lane, Wyboston, Bedford MK44 3AS, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01870/FUL, and 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 shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SK01-2-2 Rev G; SK01-3-2 Rev G.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no. SK01-3-2 Rev G.

Appeal Procedure

3. 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 Matter

4. I observed on my site visit that there is an existing garage at the appeal site, in a similar location to where both appeal schemes would be sited. My attention has been drawn to two previous appeal decisions for similar developments. I have referred to these where they are relevant, however my recommendation is based on the proposals which are subject of the current appeals.

Main Issue

5. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a residential property, located within a group of dwellings in the countryside. The site is close to the junction of The Lane and Roxton Road. The main building at the site is a two-storey dwelling which features a gable roof with light coloured boarding and red brick as its predominant facing materials. Similarly, most of the other buildings within the group also have gable roofs and dark coloured boarding, although some have partly flat roofs. Despite some variances to their individual design, the group of dwellings nevertheless exhibit a coherent rustic appearance, and they make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the rural area.

Appeal A

7. Even though the garage would be shorter in length than that which is currently on site, the appeal proposals steeply pitched roof would appear overly dominant when viewed from The Lane and Roxton Road. Its conspicuous presence would be amplified by the use of red brickwork on its gable elevation facing the junction which would jar with the surrounding group of buildings where gables tend to be constructed of dark coloured close boarded timber. A landscaping scheme along the boundary would not be sufficient to overcome the visual harm of the proposal.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies 7S, 28S, 29, 30 and 66 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (2020) (BBLP), which amongst other things require that developments are appropriate in the countryside, are of a high-quality design, respect their context and enhance the character and quality of the area.

Appeal B

9. The garage would be shorter in length than the current garage on site and would have a flat roof. This would allow for views of the house behind to be more apparent and would have a discrete presence in views from The Lane and Roxton Road. Even accounting for its proximity to the junction, it would appear as a low-lying structure which would mostly be screened by the boundary fence and the hedgerow. Furthermore, where the garage would be visible from the road, it would be largely absorbed by the backdrop of the main two-storey dwelling at the appeal site and it would have no obvious or harmful presence in the street scene.
10. Whilst I appreciate that the hedge may be removed or pruned at some point in the future, I have no reason to suspect either is imminent, planned or likely. I have in any event made my recommendation on the evidence before me, including my observations of the site and its surroundings during my visit. I acknowledge that a flat roofed structure would be different to the pitched roof form of most of the buildings in the group, however it would not be a completely alien feature in the locality where some flat roof structures were evident.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would comply with Policies 7S, 28S, 29,

30 and 66 of the BBLP, which amongst other things require that developments are appropriate in the countryside, are of a high-quality design, respect their context and enhance the character and quality of the area.

Both Appeals

12. In reaching my conclusions, I have had regard to the previous appeal decisions. Whilst I do not have the plans for those appeals it is clear that the Inspectors in both cases were concerned about the harm arising from the appearance of a garage in this location, in particular their roof designs and consequent visual impact when viewed from The Lane and Roxton Road.

Conditions

13. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions. I have included the standard plans condition in the interests of clarity and certainty. A materials condition is also required so that the proposal respects the character and appearance of the area, although for clarity I have amended the wording from that suggested by the Council. The requirements of the condition should not come as a surprise to either party.
14. Whilst the Council have not requested it, I have included a standard time limit condition. This is because the description of development is clear that the proposal is for the erection of a garage and there is nothing before me to indicate that the proposal is to alter the existing garage building on site. Therefore, the standard time limit condition is required in the interests of certainty and clarity. The removal of the existing structure is a matter for the Council to enforce if necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above, I recommend that Appeal A should be dismissed, and that Appeal B should be allowed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the Appeal A is dismissed, and Appeal B is allowed.

KL Robbie

INSPECTOR