



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025

by N Bowden BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/W/25/3363307

Land off Icknield Way, Sundon, Luton LU3 3PE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Constantin Nitii against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is CB/25/00620/AG.
 - The development proposed is an agricultural storage container.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant did not use an application form in the original submission but provided sufficient information in a written statement. I have used the description of development given in this statement in the banner heading above.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would be lawful having regard to the requirements of Class A, Part 6 of Schedule 2 of the of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the Order) such that it would constitute permitted development.

Reasons

4. Under Class A, Part 6 of Schedule 2 of the of the Order, the carrying out on agricultural land comprised in an agricultural unit of 5 hectares or more in area of works for the erection, extension or alteration of a building is permitted development, thus meaning it benefits from deemed planning permission. In this instance, the area of land is approximately 0.5 hectares. Therefore, a new building would not be permitted development and planning permission is required. As the proposed development has failed this test, it is not necessary for me to go on to consider the remaining implications of the proposal.

Conclusion

5. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

N Bowden

INSPECTOR