



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 December 2025

by Laura Bartle BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/D/25/3375318

42 Farrer Street, Kempston, Bedford, Bedfordshire MK42 8JH

- 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 Mrs S Kaur against the decision of Bedford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01746/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Set within an average sized plot for the area, the appeal property occupies a prominent and somewhat exposed corner position at the junction between Farrer Street and Rosendale Way. The existing flat roofed outbuilding located at the end of the rear garden would be retained. The perimeter of that garden area within which the appeal proposal would be sited is defined by the rear elevation of the dwelling and high fencing to the remaining 3 sides. Beyond, to one side is a single storey pitched roof extension located to the rear of adjoining No. 40 Farrer Street and flat roofed garaging serving property to the rear on Rosedale Way.
4. Similar to other properties within this well-established residential estate layout, the appeal site comprises a modest sized two-storey dwelling of post war functional design and layout. Its horizontally proportioned windows, coherent unfussy front and rear building lines, and a shallow gable ended roof form help define its simple character and visual synergy with the appearance of its peers. Although examples of other flat roof elements form part of the surrounding built form, these do not detract from the strong presence of pitched tiled roofscapes which form part of the prevailing character of the appeal property and surrounding street scenes of Farrer Street and Rosendale Way.
5. The proposed extension would project from the rear elevation at ground floor level, covering approximately half its width, and would terminate short of the existing outbuilding. Although the flat-roof design aims to reduce height and visual impact, the resulting expanse of roof would nevertheless appear austere and utilitarian. This would create a stark contrast with the prevailing pitched-roof elements that are distinctive features of the host property and the character of the area. The flat

roof would appear particularly incongruous when seen in the immediate foreground of the neighbouring pitched-roof extension, which would be clearly visible from Rosendale Way.

6. While the proposed fenestration reflects the pattern of the host dwelling and matching external materials could be secured by condition, these measures would not mitigate the harm arising from the extension's overall roof form. The dominance and incongruity of the flat roof would remain, resulting in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling. In view of the exposed corner positioning of the appeal property, that adverse impact would extend to the character and appearance of the wider area
7. For these reasons, the proposed extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
8. In light of the harm identified above, the proposed extension would conflict with Policies 28S, 29 and 30 of the Bedford Borough Local Plan, which collectively seek to ensure that development achieves high-quality design and makes a positive contribution to local character, distinctiveness, and the quality of the streetscape.

Conclusion

9. In view of my findings, the appeal proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Laura Bartle

INSPECTOR