



The Planning
Inspectorate

Quality Assurance Unit
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0117 372 8252
Customer Services: 0117 372 6372

Mrs R V Crisp
Central Bedfordshire Council
Priory House, Monks Walk
Chicksands
Shefford
Bedfordshire
SG17 5TQ

Your Ref: CB/10/03477/FULL
Our Ref: APP/P0240/A/10/2142428/WF
Date: 7 March 2011

Dear Mrs Crisp

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mr David McNeill
Site at 2 High Street, Stotfold, Hitchin, SG5 4LL**

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal.

If you have queries or complaints about the decision or the way we handled the appeal, you should submit them using our "Feedback" webpage at www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/agency_info/complaints/complaints_dealing.htm. This page also contains information on our complaints procedures and the right of challenge to the High Court, the only method by which the decision can be reconsidered.

If you do not have internet access, or would prefer hard copies of our information on the right to challenge and our complaints procedure, please contact our Quality Assurance Unit on 0117 372 8252 or in writing to the address above.

Please note the Planning Inspectorate is not the administering body for High Court challenges. If you would like more information on the strictly enforced deadlines for challenging, or a copy of the forms for lodging a challenge, please contact the Administrative Court on 0207 947 6655.

Yours sincerely

Dianna Wride

COVERDL1



You can use the Internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of this case through the Planning Portal. The address of our search page is - <http://www.pcs.planningportal.gov.uk/pcsportal/casearch.asp>
You can access this case by putting the above reference number into the 'Case Ref' field of the 'Search' page and clicking on the search button.



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2011

by **Martin Whitehead LLB BSc(Hons) CEng MICE**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 7 March 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/A/10/2142428

2 High Street, Stotfold, Hertfordshire SG5 4LL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David McNeill against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref CB/10/03477/FULL, dated 20 September 2010, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2010.
 - The development proposed is detached dwelling to the rear garden of existing house.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings, with particular regard to matters of sunlight, daylight, outlook, privacy, noise and disturbance.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site consists of a traditional detached house that is sited on a relatively deep plot. There is a driveway at the side of the house with some outbuildings behind. The site fronts High Street, and the house is set well back from the road at the end of a staggered line of buildings which, apart from the large Liberal Club building, are mainly in residential use. These buildings sit on plots of diminishing depth and the houses that front the Mixies cul-de-sac to the rear are visible through the gaps between them.
4. The surrounding area includes two distinctly different patterns of development, which are separated by the public footpath that is adjacent to the west boundary of the appeal site. The development to the west, which is mainly accessed from Hitchen Road, is mixed with a varied pattern. It includes a large public building, called the Simpson Centre, which is sited behind other buildings, and a church that is sited on the corner of the junction of Hitchen Road with High Street. The development to the east, which includes the appeal site, has a more linear pattern with buildings fronting the adjacent roads.
5. The proposed detached dwelling would have a contemporary design which would result in a lower ridge height to the sloping roof than would be the case with a traditional 2 storey house. Whilst its design would be acceptable within

the context of the varied designs of the surrounding buildings, including the Simpson Centre, its siting behind the existing building on the site would be out of keeping with the generally linear pattern of development along that part of High Street. Although it would be on lower ground than High Street, it would be large enough to be visible through the gaps between buildings, and it would replace a green planted area in these views. As such, it would appear as an intrusive structure that would harm the street scene.

6. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Also, it would fail to accord with the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management (CBCSDM) Policy DM3, as it would not contribute positively to creating a sense of place.

Living Conditions

7. I am satisfied that the proposed house would be low enough and far enough away from the rear patio area and windows of the adjacent house at 4 High Street to ensure that there would be no unacceptable loss of sunlight, daylight or outlook to the occupants of that property. However, as the house and patio at No 4 are on higher ground than the appeal site, I am concerned that the boundary fence would be insufficient to prevent overlooking of the more private areas at the rear from the first floor bedroom window on the north elevation of the proposed house. Given that the distance between this window and the rear facing window of the single storey extension of No 4 would be about 13m, the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy.
8. With regard to noise and disturbance, the driveway and vehicle turning area would be close to the boundary with No 4. The proposal would result in vehicles manoeuvring adjacent to the raised patio area, which would cause a significant increase in noise and disturbance in what would be expected to be a quieter part of the property. Therefore, due to the unacceptable loss of privacy and increase in noise and disturbance at 4 High Street, I find that the proposal would have a significant harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of an adjacent dwelling. As such, it would fail to accord with the CBCSDM Policy DM3 in this respect.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has provided a signed and dated S106 unilateral undertaking, but I am not satisfied that it has been entered into by all the parties with an interest in the property, as it has not been signed by the mortgagee. I have therefore given it little weight. The Council has indicated that it requires contributions to be made to local infrastructure, but has not provided any details.
10. The CBCSDM Policy CS2 expects contributions from new development which would necessitate additional or improved infrastructure or exacerbate an existing deficiency. The appellant has not disputed that infrastructure contributions should be made and I accept that the occupants of the proposed dwelling would generate significant additional use of local infrastructure and facilities. Therefore, in the absence of any acceptable mechanism to mitigate the impact of the development, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on local infrastructure.

Overall Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above, I have found that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of an adjacent dwelling. Therefore, having regard to all matters raised including the Council Officer's recommended approval, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

M J Whitehead

INSPECTOR