



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2025

by **A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th March 2025

Appeal Reference: APP/J1915/D/24/3351619

Beauchamps Cottage Wyddial Buntingford SG9 0EP

- 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 S Cooper against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 3/24/1291/HH.
 - The development proposed is Erection of three bay oak framed detached car port with external staircase to provide access to the roof space and three proposed dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Erection of three bay oak framed detached car port with external staircase to provide access to the roof space and three proposed dormer windows at Beauchamps Cottage Wyddial Hertfordshire SG9 0EP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/24/1291/HH, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 20839-P002-1.
 - 3) Prior to any above ground construction works being commenced, the external materials of construction for the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and thereafter the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) The building shall be used only for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse and shall not be used as additional living accommodation or for any commercial activity.

Main Issue

2. The Main Issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal is to construct an open-fronted three-bay garage with a gabled roof that accommodates an upper floor room provided with access from an external stairway. The building would be 9.8m wide and have an internal depth of 6.4m and a ridge height of 5.8m. It would stand in place of a previously-approved, but not yet built, single storey oak-framed car port with a similar footprint incorporating a fully-hipped roof and a ridge height of approximately 4.3m. The proposed garage would be ancillary to Beauchamps Cottage (main dwelling) which is a replacement dwelling¹ for a previous barn conversion within the setting of (and thereby curtilage-listed) Grade II listed 'Beauchamps', a substantial house dating from the seventeenth century with Victorian-era modifications.
4. Given that a substantial two-storey ancillary building within the current curtilage of 'Beauchamps' sits between that building and the proposed garage, the additional height of the proposed building² at a distance of over 35 metres would not be impactful upon the setting or significance of the heritage asset. The proposed building would appear as an incidental building within an established residential curtilage to a design compatible with the host dwelling in terms of materials and general appearance.
5. The Council suggest that the structure would not appear as subservient to the host dwelling resulting in a cumulative visual and spatial encroachment into the countryside. However that is to disregard the overall setting which is a group of buildings set within a much wider landscape of level agricultural fields with distant tree groups and tree'd boundary hedges. The dominant built form in the locality, and in particular in the approach view, is the horizon-breaching Jacobean roof form of Beauchamps around which seemingly lesser buildings are arranged. The proposed building would not significantly increase the impact of the permitted garaging, or in longer views, even be discernible and would be within an established residential curtilage.
6. I therefore find no conflict with Policy GBR2 of the East Herts District Plan (October 2018) (EHDP) which seeks to maintain the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt as a valued countryside resource. Given the position of the Council on what has already been approved, I find little conflict with Policy DES4 which seeks a high design standard nor, given my assessment of the proposals, with HOU11 which seeks that residential outbuildings shall be of a size, scale, mass, form, siting, design and materials of construction that are appropriate to the character, appearance and setting of the existing dwelling.
7. Consequently, the appeal succeeds subject to conditions. In addition to the usual timing and plans conditions, approval of materials are appropriate having regard to the listed building setting, as is the need to ensure the use of the building remains incidental to the primary residential use of the site.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

¹ Under construction at the time of site visit

² A difference of 1.3m compared to the building approved 3/23/2394/HH