



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2025

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/25/3369670

5 Hunters Close, Clapham, Bedford MK41 6FG

- 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 G Bradford against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00527/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Single storey rear extension, garage conversion and new garage'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property 20 Folly Park, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. Hunters Close is a suburban cul-de-sac, comprising of a mix of detached single and two storey houses. The gardens of properties along the eastern side of Hunters Close bound those of properties located along Folly Park, a park home site.
4. The appeal property, No 5, is a detached bungalow with a shallow hipped roof, located adjacent to the end of the cul-de-sac. It is set down lower than the road level and set back from its boundary with the adjacent properties 20 and 24 Folly Park. The boundary is formed by a fence with a reasonably tall hedge extending between No 20 and the appeal property.
5. 20 Folly Park is a park home with its west elevation including two projecting bay style windows facing towards the boundary. Due to the position of the park home, these windows are located very close to the boundary hedge and fence between the two properties. Nevertheless, owing to the position of No 5, there is otherwise a lack of built form in the immediate vicinity and as such the bay windows at 20 Folly Park enjoy comparatively reasonable levels of outlook, despite the proximity of the boundary.
6. The proposal would result in the construction of a garage building with a hipped roof. This would be sited extremely close to the boundary with 20 Folly Park (a distance of around 0.5m). As such, the eaves and roof rising above the existing

boundary features would appear highly imposing in views from the bay windows at 20 Folly Park and would dominate views from its garden.

7. I acknowledge that the roof would be sloping away from the boundary. However, owing to the structure's proximity, it would nevertheless result in a substantial mass of built form extending well above the height of the boundary being positioned very close to the spaces in and around 20 Folly Park that currently enjoy a reasonably open outlook. For these reasons the proposal would contribute to an overbearing effect and significant reductions in outlook being experienced by the occupants of 20 Folly Park.
8. My above assessment is reinforced by the guidance contained at E7 of the Council's Residential Extensions, New Dwellings and Small Infill Developments Supplementary Design Guidance (2000) (the SPG). This sets out the need for domestic extensions to avoid an overbearing effect on neighbouring occupiers through their scale, massing and proximity.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of 20 Folly Park with particular regard to outlook. This would be contrary to Policy 32(iv) of the Bedford Borough Local Plan (2020) and Design Code E7 of the SPG, which, together, seek to ensure new developments preserve living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR