



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2025

by **L Gardner MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/25/3366866

1 Hillhead, Perry Green, Much Hadham SG10 6DU

- 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 Adam Baines against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 3/25/0438/HH.
 - The development proposed is new detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new detached garage at 1 Hillhead, Perry Green, Much Hadham SG10 6DU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/25/0438/HH, 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 drawing nos BRD/23/035/006 and BRD/23/035/005-A.
 - 3) No development shall take place until:
 - (i) An archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and
 - (ii) Any necessary safeguarding measures to ensure the preservation in situ of important archaeological remains and/or further archaeological investigation and recording identified in the WSI have been undertaken in accordance with a specification and timetable that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The development should be carried out in full accordance with the approved details within the WSI.
 - 4) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials detailed within the application form.

Preliminary Matters

2. I understand that there is some ambiguity with regard to the exact address of the property. The address referred to in the banner heading and decision above differs slightly from that used in the application form through the omission of the word 'Cottages' after Hillhead. The appellant's statement contends that the address in the banner heading and decision is that used by the Royal Mail and is how they have proceeded on the appeal form. I am satisfied that this is a minor difference

and that neither of the main parties have been prejudiced by the use of the address in the decision above.

3. The description of development has also changed since the original application form which described a detached car port. The appellant has accepted that the description used in the Council's decision notice is a more accurate description of the proposed development. I have proceeded with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached property which, at the time of my site visit, was in the process of being extended. The property is situated at the end of a row of dwellings, which although differ in their design, have similar visual appearances. The properties in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site are all set back from the highway along a similar building alignment. Front gardens are formed of grass and hardstanding. I understand that prior to the building works relating to the recent extension, there was a greenhouse positioned in the front garden of the appeal property.
6. Development in the wider area is sparse giving a distinctly rural character to the surroundings. Other than the attached neighbouring property, the site is surrounded by open fields, some with hedged boundaries against the roadside. The existing dwelling within the site has a degree of visual prominence given its positioning at the edge of the cluster of dwellings.
7. The proposed garage would be positioned to the front and side of the dwelling in the corner of the site, broadly in the position of the previous greenhouse. In this location, the garage would be a notable feature in the immediate street scene. Nevertheless, its single storey height, and hipped roof design would mean that it would readily be interpreted as a subservient outbuilding to the host dwelling, even noting its larger scale when compared to the previous greenhouse building. In this respect the visual effect of the development would not be materially different to the prominence already experienced through the presence of the main dwelling.
8. The Council have acknowledged that there are other examples of garages to the front of properties in the surrounding area. Whilst these do not read in the same immediate street scene as the appeal site, I did observe similar forms of development during my site visit in relatively close proximity to the appeal site. These demonstrate that the rural nature of the surroundings can accommodate subservient outbuildings without them appearing as overly dominant features in the landscape.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. In this respect, it would comply with Policy MH D2 of the Much Hadham Neighbourhood Plan, which amongst other matters requires the design of new buildings to harmonise with their surroundings.
10. Policy GBR2 of the East Herts District Plan (EHDP) (2018) relates to rural areas beyond the Green Belt. In relation to extensions and alterations to existing buildings, this policy requires the size, scale, mass, form, siting, design and

materials of construction to be appropriate to the character and appearance of surrounding areas. Similarly, Policy DES4 of the EHDP includes a requirement for all development proposals to be of high standard of design to reflect and promote local distinctiveness. Policy HOU11 includes specific reference to residential outbuildings requiring, amongst other matters, for proposals to be appropriate to the setting of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. Based on the above, I find that the proposal would comply with Policies GBR2, DES4 and HOU11 of the EHDP.

Conditions

11. The Framework states that conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council in light of the Framework and where necessary I have amended the wording in the interests of precision and enforceability.
12. I have imposed a condition requiring materials to match those referred to in the application form in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. In the interests of certainty and clarity, I have imposed a condition relating to the approved plans.
13. Further details are required in relation to archaeology noting the location of the site in an area of archaeological significance and to comply with Policy HA3 of the EHDP. The Council has also suggested a condition in relation to ensuring that the garage is always available for the parking of motor vehicles. However, the area of hardstanding adjacent to the garage would be sufficient to allow for off road parking of at least two vehicles (as required for a dwelling of this size through the Council's Parking Standards) and therefore I do not consider it reasonable or necessary to insist that the garage is also available for vehicular parking.
14. In respect of the pre-commencement condition in relation to archaeological work, the appellant was given notice in accordance with Regulation 2(1)(b) of the Town and Country Planning (Pre-commencement Conditions) Regulations 2018. Confirmation has been received that the appellant would be satisfied with the terms of the condition.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan and all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L Gardner

INSPECTOR