



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 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: 11th July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/25/3362478

8 Heron View, Caddington, Central Bedfordshire LU1 4FH

- 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 Amitkumar Patel against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is CB/24/02507/FULL.
 - The development is described as converting the existing double garage into a single-storey side extension to provide ground floor accommodation for a dependent relative. This will include the construction of a link passage connecting the garage to the main dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for development described as converting the existing double garage into a single-storey side extension to provide ground floor accommodation for a dependent relative. This will include the construction of a link passage connecting the garage to the main dwelling at 8 Heron View, Caddington, Central Bedfordshire LU1 4FH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CB/24/02507/FULL subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers: 8_LU1 4FH_A, Location Plan 22.08.2024 and Proposed Site Plan 07/07/2023.
 - 2) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

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.
3. I have used the description from the application form, but omitted the additional explanatory text for clarity as to what development the appeal relates. This has not altered any part of the appeal scheme nor prejudiced the ability of any of the main parties to make their case in respect thereof. Works in pursuant of the appeal scheme have partially taken place in respect to the conversion. I have therefore considered it part-retrospectively.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety with particular regard to parking provision.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a dwelling with a detached garage now converted into an annexe with vehicle parking to the front. Surrounding dwellings have a similar arrangement. Heron View and the nearby roads do not appear to be part of a controlled parking zone. Moreover, there are some laybys along the street which are unallocated and open to all.
6. There remains some dispute between the main parties on whether the appeal building is now a five or six bedroomed dwelling. However, for the purposes of the Parking Standards for New Developments 2023 (PS), the number of spaces required remains four regardless. This is including the annexe as I am not convinced it significantly adds to the parking demands considering it is not a separate entity to the main dwelling and has significant reliance on it. I also understand that there have been some changes in the PS in such that a double garage now only provides one vehicle space. However, the standards set out that four spaces is the minimum number required for five or more bedrooms notwithstanding what has gone before. The PS are referred to by Policy T3 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan 2021 (LP).
7. I am satisfied that based on the evidence provided and as seen on the site visit, the current situation can comfortably accommodate two vehicles side by side on the existing driveway with ease. The PS go on to say that the third and fourth spaces may be provided as accessible land that could be converted to parking by the homeowner. This could be on a grassed or planted area. Theoretically speaking, the grassed area in front of the dwelling could be converted into a space. Through a tandem arrangement, a third vehicle could be accommodated on the remaining driveway in front of the converted garage. Evidently, this could be parked so as not to impinge unacceptably on the footway.
8. Putting aside that I remain to be convinced the existing occupants of the dwelling would require four parking spaces, even if one or two vehicles (as a worst-case scenario) were displaced to the highway, the surrounding roads are unrestricted and appeared to have ample capacity for safe and sensible parking. I appreciate that off carriageway laybys are for visitor use, however the number and scale thereof would be more than sufficient to accommodate the theoretical effects of the appeal scheme and leave sufficient space for local visitors. Partial footway parking is far from ideal given road narrowness, but it is a slow-moving road with ample visibility which would not result in severe highway harm should this occur.
9. In the absence of any compelling evidence to support the supposition that the appeal scheme would give rise to additional parking stress, I can only deduce that the displacement of one or two vehicles to the road would not in and of itself give rise to harm such that the free flow of traffic, taking into account also my earlier findings, would be adversely impinged upon and thus highway safety be unacceptably compromised.
10. The scheme would therefore comply with Policies T2 and T3 of the LP, The Caddington and Slip End Neighbourhood Plan (2016 - 2031), The PS and the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 which together and amongst other things seek to ensure that sufficient parking provision is provided for new and existing development along with securing and protecting highway safety.

Other Matters

11. The appeal site is located within the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The Council is satisfied that the scheme would not result in harm to the SAC, given that the statutory body have not requested any additional information. Moreover, and due to the nature of the scheme in that it does not provide a new dwelling or strictly uplift the local population, I have no reason to disagree with their conclusions and therefore have not considered the matter further.
12. The Council's concerns regarding maintenance liability for the highway is a matter for the main parties to discuss. Moreover, this is a theoretical situation and is not considered as part of this appeal.

Conditions

13. I have referred to the approved plans for enforcement purposes. In addition, it is necessary to ensure that the materials used are to match the host dwelling to be in keeping with the area. The Council have suggested a condition for the annexe to not be occupied as a self-contained unit. However, as the permission is for annexed accommodation, any alternative use such as a self-contained dwelling would require a separate planning permission. Such a condition would therefore not be necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend it be allowed, subject to the above conditions.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the condition set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR