



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by L C Hughes BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/25/3372687

16 The Graylings, Bedford MK41 9BH

- 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 & Mrs S Kosic against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01300/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as front, side and rear single and 2-storey extensions with associated internal alterations – resubmission and application with a 300mm reduction of the rearward 2 storey projection and modifications to the side extension to amalgamate the new/existing roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for front, side and rear single and 2-storey extensions with associated internal alterations – resubmission and application with a 300mm reduction of the rearward 2 storey projection and modifications to the side extension to amalgamate the new/existing roof at 16 The Graylings, Bedford MK41 9BH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01300/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: drawing references JJ24 0016 002A, JJ24 0016 001C.
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) Prior to the first occupation/use of the corresponding room, the first floor side window serving the ensuite shall be fitted with obscure glass and be non-opening up to 1.7 metres above the internal floor level and the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter. Details of the glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to installation which shall be in accordance with the approved details.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council have not raised concerns regarding the single storey front, side and rear extensions and I find no reason to disagree. Consequently, my

recommendation focuses on the effect of the proposed two storey side and rear extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The Graylings is a cul de sac focused around a central green. It is characterised by predominately two storey, semi detached dwellings that have a general coherence in terms of scale and appearance although many have been altered and or extended to the side and rear resulting in a degree of variation in the built form.
6. This is a revised scheme following a previously dismissed appeal at the site (reference APP/K0235/D/25/3362572) for a 'front, side and rear single and 2 storey extensions with associated internal alterations'. Although the footprint of the appeal proposal is the same as the previously dismissed scheme, there are alterations proposed to the roof form and fenestration.
7. The proposed two storey rear extension would not span the full width of the dwelling, and both the existing building and plot are of a sufficient size to accommodate the addition without it appearing disproportionately large or overly dominant. The two storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation and set down from the ridge height of the host dwelling. It would also be set in at least 1.5m from the boundary with number 15 The Graylings (No 15). The proposal respects the proportions of the host dwelling and achieves an acceptable level of subservience. The proposed roof form of the extensions would integrate into the existing roof profile, reflecting the existing hipped roof, which is a characteristic of the host dwelling.
8. The side extension would be visible within the street scene given the gap of separation with No 15. However, the design features and materials integrate with the host dwelling and neighbouring properties, lessening the visual presence of the proposal.
9. By its nature, the side extension would alter the balance and symmetry of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. Similar changes have already occurred within the street scene with varying side extensions and roof profiles evident, including at number 4 The Graylings, which the appellant has highlighted. These alterations have resulted in a number of the semi detached dwellings appearing visually unbalanced. Therefore, the proposal would not appear conspicuous in the surroundings given the context.
10. The proposal would not constitute an excessively large or disproportionate extension, nor would it appear unduly dominant within this street scene. It would not disrupt the established pattern of built development to a degree that creates visual intrusion. For the reasons given, the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or area.
11. The proposal would accord with Policies 28S, 29 and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (2020) and Design Codes E1 and E2 of the Residential Extensions, New Dwellings and Small Infill Development Design Guidance (2000),

which amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that development proposals are of a high quality design and standard and contribute positively to the area's character.

Conditions

12. Standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and for works to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans are necessary for enforcement purposes and clarity.
13. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, a condition requiring the external materials of the extensions to match those used in the existing building is necessary.
14. The Council have suggested a condition relating to obscured glazing of a first floor side facing window. This is necessary to protect the privacy of the neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

J Kirkaldy

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 is allowed.

L C Hughes

INSPECTOR