



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2025

by **D Ellis MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/25/3374400

4 Watbridge Cottages, Copt Hall Road, Hyde, Central Bedfordshire LU2 9PH

- 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 Caitlin against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is CB/25/01920/FULL.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and construction of double storey side extension. Alterations to front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of a group of two pairs of semi-detached properties. The pairs of dwellings are of a matching design, with central two-storey front gables and hipped catslide roofs to the sides. The properties have not been previously extended to the side. This uniformity of design creates a pleasant and distinctive appearance which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposed side extension would replicate the central two-storey front gable. However, the extension would add significant additional bulk and massing to the side of the property which would not be subservient to the existing building. Furthermore, it would disrupt the symmetry, form and rhythm of the group of properties, detracting from their distinctive appearance.
5. My attention has been drawn to planning permissions for previous two-storey side extensions at the appeal property. The 2011 permission¹ was for an extension which replicated the existing cat slide roof, and as such the approved extension had significantly less bulk and massing than the proposed extension. No details are provided of the 2008 permission² so I am unable to make any comparison between it and the appeal scheme. As such, I am not persuaded that these previous permissions are directly comparable to the proposal before me.

¹ Planning application ref. CB/11/01227/REN

² Planning application ref. SB/08/00419

6. Although the appellant would agree to a condition requiring the submission of detailed drawings of the bay window, this would not mitigate the visual impact of the side extension. I also note that the Council has raised no objection with regards to the proposed porch and based on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree.
7. Nevertheless, the proposed side extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy HQ1 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan 2015-2035, which requires the size, scale, massing, and appearance of development to relate well to the existing local surroundings and reinforce local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

8. The appeal site is within the Green Belt however the Council have not raised any objections in this regard. Based on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree.

Conclusion

9. I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

D Ellis

INSPECTOR