



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2026

by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/W/25/3375789

The Paddock, Higher Rads End, Eversholt MK17 9ED

- 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 Project 1 Developments Limited against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is CB/25/02820/FULL.
 - The development proposed is the change of use of land to builders yard to create a parking area of grasscrete surfacing, and associated landscaping to screen retained boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the change of use of land to builders yard to create a parking area of grasscrete surfacing, and associated landscaping to screen retained boundary fence at The Paddock, Higher Rads End, Eversholt MK17 9ED in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CB/25/02820/FULL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 16.58.Osmap7,25-01 Rev B and 25-02 Rev B.
 - 2) Within 3 month of the date of this decision, the landscaping as indicated on drawing no 25-02 Rev B, including the grasscrete surfacing and hedging, shall be implemented.
 - 3) The landscaping as indicated on drawing no 25-02 Rev B, including the grasscrete surfacing and hedging, shall be maintained for a period of 5 years. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the date of this decision die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the parking provision on the site as indicated on the plan number 25-02 Rev B shall not be used for any purpose, other than as parking provision.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, some of the works which make up the proposed development had taken place, with the fence and hedge in situ. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the submitted drawings.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:

- whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to local and national policy; and
- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Inappropriate development

4. The site falls within land defined as Green Belt. Policy SP4 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan (July 2021) (CBLP) states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. (Framework).
5. The Framework further establishes that development in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate, subject to a number of exceptions as set out in Paragraph 154 and 155. Paragraph 155 states that development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where a number of criteria are met. As the appeal scheme is not for major development, the so called 'Golden Rules' are not applicable. The parties agree that the appeal site is in a sustainable location.
6. The Framework defines 'grey belt' as land in the Green Belt that does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in Paragraph 143 (the Green Belt 'purposes'). The appeal site is not located within a large built-up area and therefore does not exist to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. The site does not sit in a location where its surroundings prevent neighbouring towns merging, nor does it serve the purpose of preserving the setting and special character of any historic towns. With this in mind, the appeal scheme and site would be considered under the definition of grey belt. Given the location, scale and nature of the proposal, it would not undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.
7. Whilst alternative sites have not been explored, the proposal would provide additional parking for an existing business operating on site which has grown over recent years. The proposed parking would be in a logical configuration. At the time of my site visit, there were numerous vehicles parked within the yard, filling the majority of the proposed parking area. Although not demonstrated, Given the previous size of the yard, I am satisfied that the additional parking required would only be possible through expansion.
8. If parking were not available within the yard, vehicles associated with the business would spill out onto the road, causing obstructions and potentially damaging the soft verges. As such, I am satisfied that there is an unmet need for parking for the existing business within the appeal site.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would comply with paragraph 155 of the Framework and would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As such, this would ensure compliance with Policy SP4 of the CBLP which, amongst other things, seeks to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development. Given the above, I am not required to assess the proposals effect on the openness of the Green Belt nor explore any considerations that may amount to very special circumstances.

Character and appearance

10. The surrounding area is rural, characterised by sporadic residential and commercial development, interspersed by open fields. Whilst predominantly bound by hedges, there is some variety in boundary treatments in the area, including solid high-level fencing. The appeal site comprises a builder's yard which has been extended into a parcel of land, which previously comprised an area of scrub.
11. Although the yard has been expanded, it does not breach the boundary of the adjacent paddock and follows an existing delineation between the two sites. As such, the proposal appears as a natural expansion of the use, and I do not consider that it has detrimentally encroached upon the surrounding countryside.
12. Whilst the removal of the scrub and the formalisation of the land have resulted in a more urbanised and developed appearance, the fence, hedge and grasscrete surfacing would be in keeping with the materials seen in the surrounding area and as such the proposal would not appear out of place or unduly industrial in character.
13. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with Policies SP7, HQ1 and EMP4 of the CBLP where, amongst other things, they require development to respond well to local context and have no adverse impacts on the location. Similarly, it would accord with the Framework where it requires development to be sympathetic to local character and landscape setting.

Conditions

14. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the Framework and where necessary I have amended the wording in the interests of effectiveness and precision.
15. Conditions are required to indicate the approved plans in order to provide certainty and ensure the timely implementation of the development. A condition requiring the submission of a landscaping scheme is not necessary as the drawings submitted as part of the appeal provide sufficient detail. Nevertheless, a condition is necessary to ensure that the landscaping is effectively maintained.
16. While Planning Practice Guidance states that conditions restricting the future use of permitted development rights often do not pass the test of reasonableness or necessity, given the rural location, in this instance, I am satisfied that it is necessary to ensure adequate parking provision both now and in the future.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole and the Framework, and therefore the appeal is allowed.

K Allen

INSPECTOR