



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025 by S Jamieson BA (Hons) MPlan

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/25/3364164

96 Ailesbury Road, Ampthill MK45 2XD

- 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 Patrick Kelly against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
- The application Ref is CB/25/00146/FULL.
- The development proposed is a single storey front, side and rear extension including two rooflights.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front, side and rear extension including two rooflights at 96 Ailesbury Road, Ampthill MK45 2XD, in accordance with the terms of application, Ref CB/25/00146/FULL, 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: Single Storey Front, Side and Rear Extension 2443 - 01.
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - a) the character and appearance of the area; and
 - b) the living conditions of occupiers of 98 Ailesbury Road (No 98), with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site, No 96, is located on a residential estate on the edge of Ampthill and is the last property in a row of three semi-detached pairs. There is much

symmetry between these respective pairs, although there is variety in house types and design in the wider street. There are also examples of semi-detached dwellings nearby where one of the dwellings in the pair has been extended and so differs from the adjoining property. Even so, dwellings are mainly two storey in scale, generally have similar facing materials and where extensions have taken place they are more often of a subservient design. Overall, these characteristics give local distinctiveness to Ailesbury Road.

5. Due to its substantial set back from the front elevation and single storey scale, the proposed side extension would clearly read as a secondary addition to the main house. The matching materials would ensure that the extension does not stand out from its host. Consequently, the original two storey front elevation would remain at the forefront in views from the street and a suitable symmetry would be retained with the adjoining dwelling at No 98.
6. I accept that the side extension would not meet all the guidance in Section 11 of the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (2023) (Design Guide) as it would not be 'significantly less' than the width of the main house. Even so, given the other aspects of the side extension's design would ensure a suitable relationship with the street, the modest single storey scale of the extensions, and the limited visibility of the rear elevation from outside the site, the extensions would not compromise the character of the dwelling or the respective semi-detached pair. Consequently, the development would accord with the overall thrust of the guidance in this particular instance.
7. The proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it would comply with the requirements in Policy HQ1 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan (2021) to ensure that developments are of the highest possible quality and respond positively to their context, and that the size, scale, massing, materials and appearance relate well to the existing local surroundings and reinforce local distinctiveness.

Living Conditions

8. The extension would be visible from the rear elevation windows and rear garden at No 98. The Council's reason for refusal in respect of this matter cites conflict with Section 11 of the Design Guide. The Design Guide confirms that the Council will use '45° guidance' in assessing the relationship of a rear extension with a neighbouring property. There is no specific detail before me in respect of any detailed assessment carried out by the main parties in respect of this guidance. From my own observations there is the potential that the development would marginally breach a 45° line taken from the centre of the nearest habitable room window at No 98.
9. Even so, the eaves of the extension would sit just above the height of an existing fence which sits along the shared boundary. Furthermore, given its position set slightly in from the boundary, and the design of the roof which would incorporate a shallow pitch only reaching its full height away from the boundary, the extension would not have undue dominance when experienced from No 98. This is particularly so given that No 98 benefits from a generous garden and this would further ensure that a suitable outlook would be maintained for neighbouring occupiers in this particular instance.

10. Moreover, due to the single storey scale of the extension, the relative orientation of the development to No 98 factoring in the sun's path, and the size of the garden and windows serving No 98, it is unlikely that there would be any material effects on levels of sunlight or daylight received by this neighbouring property. There is no detailed evidence to the contrary.
11. For these reasons, the proposal would have an acceptable effect in relation to the living conditions of occupiers of No 98, with particular regard to outlook and light. In that regard, the proposal would comply with Policy HQ1 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan which requires that developments do not result in an unacceptable adverse impact upon nearby amenity.

Conditions

12. A standard implementation condition (1) is required, along with a condition (2) listing the approved plans to provide certainty over what has been approved. In addition, a condition (3) requiring matching external materials is also necessary in order to ensure that the development harmonises with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR