



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2026

by **S F Barnes MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/D/25/3376039

3 Sage Close, Biggleswade, Central Bedfordshire SG18 8WH

- 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 Chris and Mrs Marta Kwiatkowski against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is CB/25/01267/FULL.
 - The development proposed is a part single and part double storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single and part double storey rear extension at 3 Sage Close, Biggleswade, Central Bedfordshire SG18 8WH in accordance with the terms of the application ref CB/25/01267/FULL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: TQRQM24206182820923 and 44439_02 Rev. 6.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - character and appearance of the area; and
 - living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 5 Sage Close, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a semi-detached, 2-storey dwelling within a large, cohesively designed residential development. The dwelling has been previously extended with a rear dormer, front porch, and a detached rear garden outbuilding. I saw that several neighbouring properties have ground floor rear extensions, including at the attached property, 1 Sage Close. In respect of both main issues, the Council considers the ground floor element of the proposed extension to be acceptable, a view with which I concur given its appearance and modest scale.

Character and appearance

4. At first floor, the proposal would project a very modest depth beyond the existing rear wall, broadly following the proportions of an existing first floor bedroom. Its

massing would be well set back from the boundary with No.1, whilst the overall height would be set down from the main roof ridge. The modest massing and scale of the extension in totality would ensure an acceptable response which avoids dominating the original building.

5. The junction between the proposal's roof and the existing dormer window would be somewhat awkward. However, the hipped roof form would ensure the proposal would not be a bulky addition and due to its position to the rear of the property would have no demonstrable impact on the street scene. The use of matching facing materials would ensure that the proposal would relate well to the appearance of existing local surroundings.
6. I therefore find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. This would accord with relevant provisions of Policy HQ1 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan 2015 - 2035 (2021) ('LP') and Policy BPD3 of the Biggleswade Neighbourhood Plan (2022) ('NP'). Those policies, amongst other things, seek developments of the highest possible quality and which respond positively to their context. I likewise find no conflict with the guidance of the Bedfordshire Design Guide (2023) ('BDG') which, amongst other things, seeks additions that relate well to the character and context of their surrounding area.

Living conditions

7. The appeal building is separated by a narrow passageway from a short terrace of similarly scaled dwellings, the closest of which is 5 Sage Close (No 5), which is slightly lower in height compared to the appeal property. There is some variation in the rear building line of these properties, with the bulk of the appeal property projecting a modest length beyond the rear wall of No 5. At my visit, I also observed that the 2-storey side wall of the property at 9 Sage Close projects a greater length beyond the main rear wall of 7 Sage Close.
8. The proposed first-floor extension would result in a greater extent of flank wall projecting rearward of No 5. However, the increase in depth would be modest and separated by the width of the passageway from windows and the garden space of No.5. Although there is a difference in height, the proposed extension would be well set down from the ridge of the appeal building. Whilst the change would be noticeable, there would not be a dominating effect when viewed from the rear garden at No 5, nor from its rear windows, which would continue to have unobstructed aspect over its garden space. My observation of the existing, similar relationship between 7 and 9 Sage Close reinforces my conclusion in this respect.
9. For these reasons, the proposal would not harm living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 5 Sage Close, with particular regard to outlook. This would accord with relevant provisions of Policy HQ1 of the LP and Policy BPD3 of the NP. I likewise find no conflict with the guidance of the BDG insofar as it seeks to ensure additions avoid an overbearing appearance through their design.

Other Matters

10. The Council queried whether the submitted ownership certificate was correct, as it suggests the proposal's guttering and roof eaves would overhang a shared access. However, the appellant confirmed in the appeal form that they own the land subject to the appeal. I have not been provided with any substantive evidence

to indicate that the appellant is not its sole owner. In any case, this is a private matter which has not affected my consideration of the main issues.

Conditions

11. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions against the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to a standard timescale condition, a condition specifying the approved drawings is necessary to provide certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is also necessary in the interests of character and appearance.
12. The Council also suggested a condition to restrict the insertion of any windows into the proposal's side wall under Permitted Development, in order to avoid harmful overlooking. However, at ground floor, the height of boundary treatments would maintain standards of privacy were this to occur. At upper floors, the relevant rights are subject to a condition¹ requiring adequate measures to preserve privacy should windows be inserted into a side wall. The suggested condition is therefore unnecessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all the other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S F Barnes

INSPECTOR

¹ Condition A.3(b) of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015