
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/25/3361219

53 Station Road, Tempsford, Central Bedfordshire SG19 2AU

- 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 Gary Blick against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is CB/24/02835/FULL.
 - The development proposed is described as “demolition of existing outbuilding and summer house, and erection of replacement outbuilding and garden store.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure and Preliminary Matter

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. In addition, and prior to this decision, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. Having reviewed the changes, I am satisfied that they do not affect the substantive matters of the appeal and proceeding without further consultation with the main parties would not be prejudicial to their respective cases.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the a) whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Tempsford (Langford End) Conservation Area (CA) and b) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a detached outbuilding which is to be replaced and enlarged as part of this appeal proposal, within the curtilage of a detached dwelling. The proposal is to be situated to the bottom of the garden. Outbuildings to the rear of neighbouring properties are not uncommon and are referred to within the CA Appraisal as being timber framed structures. Moreover, and typically, outbuildings are modest in scale and height and mostly obscured in the street scene. This lends a pleasant consistency to built form and consequently to the significance of the CA.
5. The proposed replacement outbuilding is to have a larger footprint than the existing one, however this is not contested by the Council, and I have no reason to disagree. The height of the proposed building would be significant against the

previous and even with the eaves meeting the existing wall height, the overall reach would be a dominant feature in the garden. Whilst the building would sit lower than the host dwelling and other buildings, within the context of the smaller principle buildings and surrounding outbuildings, the proposal would appear large and obtrusive and would not sit comfortably in its prevailing modest context despite its limited visibility in the street scene. This effect would result in harm to the significance of the CA.

6. I have no evidence on the status of the other application referred to by the appellant. It does not appear to be sufficiently comparable to the appeal scheme. It would be significantly lower and with an alternative roofline which would have a different impact. I am not therefore minded to change my earlier findings. Whilst a structurally sound building in a good state of repair might be considered an improvement to the existing dilapidated nature of the one currently in the garden, there would be no enhancement in CA terms by virtue of the appeal scheme, given the harm its scale would cause in the manner I have set out above.
7. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing. Nationally speaking, paragraph 212 of the Framework places emphasis on great weight being given to an asset's conservation. Given the above assessment, the proposal would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Due to the scale of the development in context, the harm would be less than substantial. As directed by paragraph 215 of the Framework, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
8. It appears that the main parties have not identified any public benefits of the proposal. Be this as it may, any potential ones would be limited by the scale and scope of the scheme, such that they would attract only very limited weight. As a result, they would not be sufficient to outweigh the great weight given to the harm to the CA. Therefore, there would be conflict with Policies HQ1 and HE3 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan (CBLP) 2021 and the Framework. Together, these seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and conserve the historic environment, amongst other things.

Living Conditions

9. The evidence suggests that concerns in this regard relate to Number 7 Ivy Close (No 7). The proposal would abut the rear boundary thereof with a small separation distance between it and the boundary treatment. Even with the increased height and notwithstanding the high level of tree cover, the separation distance and positioning would be sufficient in which the outlook to neighbouring occupiers both within the dwelling and the garden would not be harmfully affected. Moreover, even with the increased height, due to the roof profile and siting of the building, the proposal would not give rise to undue harm to levels of light for users or occupiers.
10. The scheme would not therefore harmfully affect the outlook for, or light afforded to the occupiers of No 7. Resultantly, it would comply with Policy HQ1 of the CBLP, the Framework and Section 11 of the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that the living conditions of the occupiers of properties are protected.

Other Matters

11. Any concerns the appellant has with the Council during the handling and consideration of the planning application are for the main parties to establish and resolve outside of the appeal process.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. I have found in the appellant's favour on the second main issue, but this would be a neutral matter. For the reasons given above the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan in regard to the first and I have been given no compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR