



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2025

by **D Ellis MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/W/25/3372714

2 Chase Close, Arlesey, Bedfordshire SG15 6UT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ben Snowden against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref CB/25/00263/FULL was approved on 17 March 2025 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
 - The development permitted is erection of a single storey side and rear extension, front extension to create bay window / porch. Demolition of conservatory and garage.
 - The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that: The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers; CBC-001, 01A, 01B, 01C, 01D, 01E, 01F.
 - The reason given for the condition is: To identify the approved plan/s and to avoid doubt.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

2. Planning permission was previously granted, subject to conditions, for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension, and a front extension to create a bay window and porch¹. The approved drawings show three car parking spaces would be provided to the front and side of the dwelling. At the time of my site visit, the extensions to the dwelling had been constructed, however only two parking spaces had been provided at the front of the dwelling and a wall and fence, which was not part of the original application, had been erected along the side boundary. The appellant seeks to vary condition 2 of the planning permission, which specifies the approved drawings, to include the two parking spaces and a 1-metre-tall fence to the side boundary.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework) sets out that planning conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. Although the Council's advice in their email dated 8 September 2025 could have been clearer, an appeal under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act) can only vary or remove a condition which does not meet these tests.
4. The main issue therefore is whether condition 2 meets these tests, having regard to car parking provision and the boundary treatment.

¹ Planning application ref. CB/25/00263/FULL

Reasons

5. The Council determined the original planning application based on the drawings submitted at the time, and drawing No. 01C clearly shows that the scheme would include three parking spaces. This drawing was included in condition 2 to specify the approved drawings and to avoid doubt. The Council suggests that the amendments requested by the appellant may be acceptable in a resubmission of a full planning permission or an application to the Council under section 73 of the Act to vary the planning permission. Notwithstanding this, I nonetheless have no evidence before me to demonstrate that condition 2 in its current form, or that providing more than the minimum number of car parking spaces, would not meet the tests as set out in the Framework.
6. Furthermore, the Procedural Guide for planning appeals states that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme, in this case by adding a fence which was not before the Council at the time of the original decision.

Conclusion

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

D Ellis

INSPECTOR