



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2025

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/25/3369729

24 Bunyan Road, Kempston, Bedford, MK42 8HL

- 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 Arub Chand against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00509/FUL.
 - The development proposed is demolition of shed/garage and erection of a Granny Annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the extent to which the proposed annexe can be justified as related to the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The application site is located on the eastern side of Bunyan Road, within Kempston. The site is a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse, which sits on an elongated plot and is fronted by a low level brick wall. Access is via a dropped kerb on Bunyan Road, with parking available on a shingled driveway for 2 vehicles. The application site lies within a close-knit residential area predominantly of two-storey, detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings.
4. The propose annexe would be of single-storey under hipped roofs that extend over the main rectangular area, and over a forward projection. Set within the roof slopes would be 9 rooflights providing light to the accommodation, since all the elevations but that facing down the garden would be windowless. However, there are 2 doors shown in the south side elevation.
5. The proposed accommodation would consist of a double bedroom on the north side of the main part of the building, a home office/store on the opposite side having the same floor area as the bedroom, and a toilet/shower room between the bedroom and the office store. The remainder of the accommodation, including in the forward projection, would be occupied by a kitchen, a dining area and a living-room. In effect, the proposal is a small bungalow that meets the nationally described space standard for a single-storey, 1 bedroom, 2 person dwelling.
6. Since the site is within a well-established residential area, a new dwelling would generally be acceptable, but in the rear garden of a 2-storey semi-detached house, in a close-knit area, as a separate dwelling, the appeal proposal would not be

acceptable. Hence the refusal reason, with the council clearly not accepting that the purpose of the development is not as a genuine annexe.

7. For the appellant it is explained that the annexe would consist of two reception rooms/bedrooms for the use of the occupants and as additional spare bedroom for the use of friends and family staying at the property. The annexe would also feature a bathroom and small kitchenette, as well as a home office for the use of occupants.
8. It is further explained that the proposed annexe is intended to be fully ancillary to the main dwelling. It replaces an existing rear garden shed, retaining its single-storey scale and footprint. Although it contains facilities such as a kitchenette, bathroom and bedroom, these are sometimes necessary to meet the needs of dependent relatives. The appeal statement concludes that the design ensures that the building would function as part of the host property, with no independent postal address, utility metering or separate access onto the street.
9. I find that these requirements, for the use of friends and family staying at the property are very generalised. The same justification could be made for an annexe in any garden large enough to physically accommodate it, and it does not amount to a genuine justification for the erection of a 2-person bungalow. The fact that the building would replace an existing shed is irrelevant.
10. There is a case, *Uttlesford District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment* (known as the Uttlesford case), referred to in the appeal statement, without giving proper citation, that upheld an Inspector's finding that a proposed annex remained subordinate and ancillary to the main house, even though it was capable of independent occupation and featured bathroom and kitchen facilities. The court emphasised that whether development amounts to a separate dwelling is a question of "fact and degree" and must be decided on the specific circumstances of the case. That is true here, a question of "fact and degree" and must be decided on the specific circumstances of the case.
11. The same is also true of the of the appeal case cited, where, in APP/D0840/D/22/3296848 (*Pensilva* appeal, Cornwall, September 2022), the Inspector allowed a timber granny annexe for ancillary use despite its self-contained nature. From the Inspector's decision, it is clear that the circumstance there were very different from those in this appeal. I note that the council also refer to appeal cases that are said to support its case.

Conclusion

12. I have taken account of all matters raised, but the fact is that there has been no convincing case put forward that justifies an annexe to No.24 Bunyan Road. I also find that the proposal would be squeezed between the rear and side boundaries of the residential curtilage, to the extent that 9 roof lights have been incorporated into the design to provide adequate lighting. The cramped form of the proposal is also demonstrated by the fact that all elevations but 1 have no windows. The appeal proposal is quite properly described by the council as a cramped and contrived form of development that is out of keeping with the development pattern of the street and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

13. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policies 28S (ii), 29 (i and ii) and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030. For these reasons the appeal will be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR