



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/25/3368118

10 Falconers Park, Sawbridgeworth, Hertfordshire CM21 0AU

- 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 & Mrs Ashton against the decision of East Herts Council.
 - The application Ref is 3/25/0527/HH.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a single storey attached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey attached garage at 10 Falconers Park, Sawbridgeworth, Hertfordshire CM21 0AU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/25/0527/HH, in accordance with the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 0478C-0020-P, 0478C-0021-P, 0478C-0100-P, 0478C-0101-P, 0478C-0200-P, 0478C-0201-P, 0478C-1000-P, 0478C-1001-P, 0478C-1200-P1 and 0478C-1201-P1.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a residential cul-de-sac comprising a mix of building types and forms, but predominantly detached dwellings in generous plots which are quite verdant in character. Some houses have garages projecting beyond their respective principal elevations.
4. The appeal dwelling is a renovated, detached one-and-a-half storey house in an Arts and Crafts style, it has a relatively deep frontage enclosed by mature evergreen vegetation, bar the metal railed gate at the entrance. The garage would

be built off the front of an existing single storey side projection which has a gable parapet roof.

5. The proposed garage would reflect this in design and would be built on an existing area of gravel driveway, behind an existing lawn area. Although the Council rightly states that each proposal should be assessed on its own individual merits, notwithstanding the dimensions of the garage, I consider that it would be of a high quality design which mirrors existing features and detailing on the host dwelling. I acknowledge that the proposed development would be visible from certain vantage points, however, just because something is visible is not in itself a reason to refuse planning permission. The Council refers to the scheme being harmful to the verdant nature of the site, but does not substantiate this.
6. Whilst the garage would breach a notional building line, in reality by virtue of the mature vegetation that surrounds the frontage and the very fact that a quite reasonable amount of front garden would be retained between the proposed building and the highway, I consider that it would not appear unduly obtrusive in the street scene.
7. All in all, I consider that the proposed development would be viewed as a subservient addition to the host dwelling and its location, design and size would not give rise to demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area. I find that the proposal complies with Policies DES4 and HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan 2018 which together require all new developments, including the extension to existing buildings, to be of a high standard of design and layout to reflect and promote local distinctiveness whilst making the best possible use of the available land; and requiring residential outbuildings to 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 and / or the surrounding area, whilst appearing as subservient addition to the dwelling.

Conclusion and Conditions

8. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
9. Other than the standard time limit for implementation, the Council has also recommended that conditions be imposed in respect of materials matching the existing building and the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I consider that in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area, these conditions are necessary.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR