



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by K Craddock BA (Hons) MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/25/3372691

28 Royston Street, Potton, Central Bedfordshire SG19 2LP

- 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 and Mrs J Shorter against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application reference is CB/25/02008/FULL.
 - The development proposed is described as “demolition of existing garage and to be replaced with a side extension & internal alterations”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, the Council describes the proposal on the decision notice as ‘demolition of existing garage, and erection of two storey side and single storey front extensions, with new windows and doors and internal alterations’. This is a more accurate description, and I note that the appellant has confirmed their agreement to the amended wording in their statement.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 36 Braybrooks Drive to the side of the appeal property, with particular regard to outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in an established residential area and consists of a two storey semi-detached house, located on the end of a row of six similar properties. There is a consistency of architectural style between the appeal property and those surrounding it, with garden sizes being comparable. Some properties have been extended at the side and rear, including the neighbour at 36 Braybrooks Drive, which benefits from a two storey side extension and ground floor rear extension. The rear gardens of properties in Braybrooks Drive abut the side boundary of the appeal site. No 36 is set at a slightly lower land level than the appeal property.
5. The proposed side extension would be set back from the common boundary between the appeal property and No 36 by approximately 1 metre but would extend along the full width of the rear boundary of No 36. The majority of the side elevation would be two storeys in height. Given this expanse, and its siting close to

the common boundary, the proposal would result in a substantial increase in massing, which would create an undue sense of enclosure when experienced from the rear garden of No 36.

6. In considering the impact upon the outlook from the first floor rear windows of No 36, the proposed side extension would not be unacceptably harmful to the outlook from these windows given the distances between the respective properties.
7. I am satisfied that, with the orientation of the appeal property and the distances involved, the proposed extension would not harmfully reduce the level of daylight or sunlight into the rear garden area or the rear facing windows of No 36. The proposal would therefore accord with paragraph 11.33.1 of the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (2023) in this respect.
8. In assessing the application, the Council has referred to paragraph 11.9.1 of the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide, which states that side to back distances should be a minimum of 15 metres. However, this section is principally relating to matters of privacy rather than light. To that end, I can only give this limited weight in my decision.
9. Finally, the appellant has drawn my attention to other developments in the surrounding area including an Appeal Decision (APP/W2845/D/24/3341316) relating to a different local authority area. Whilst I have taken these into account, I am not aware of the full circumstances of these other cases and in any event each scheme must be considered and determined on its individual merits.
10. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of 36 Braybrooks Drive due to the unacceptable impact to the outlook from their garden. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy HQ1 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan 2015-2035 which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that new development does not cause an unacceptable adverse impact upon the amenity of existing nearby uses.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Craddock

INSPECTOR