



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2025

by **P B Jarvis DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/25/3372075

6 Anchor Lane Cottages, Anchor Lane, Wadesmill, Herts SG12 0TG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Libby Myers against the decision of East Herts District Council.
 - The application Ref. is 3/25/0611/HH.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of single storey lean-to at rear of house and erection of a double storey rear extension in its place.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of single storey lean-to at rear of house and erection of a double storey rear extension in its place at 6 Anchor Lane Cottages, Anchor Lane, Herts S12 0TG in accordance with the terms of application ref: 3/24/0611/HH and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 location plan, 0601 (existing plans), 0602 (proposed plans), 0603 (existing and proposed roof plans), 0604 (existing elevations), 0605 (proposed elevations), 0606 (existing site plans), 0607 (proposed site plans).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and relevant development plan policies.

Reasons

3. Policy GBR1 of the East Herts District Plan (2018) (EHDP) states that development proposals within the Green Belt will be assessed in accordance with government guidance contained in the Framework. Paragraph 154 of the Framework states that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the listed exceptions apply. These include at paragraph 154(c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the

size of the original building. Neither the Framework nor EHDP Policy GBR1 define what is to be considered as a 'disproportionate' addition.

4. Taking account of previous extensions, the Council notes that the proposed extensions would result in a 98% overall increase in floorspace compared to the original dwelling. Whilst this provides a useful indication and amounts to a fairly considerable increase, there is no similar assessment of the comparative volume increase which can also be a useful indicator in assessing what comprises a 'disproportionate' addition.
5. In terms of built form, the proposed extensions would be of subservient scale, with the first-floor element being of lower ridge height and smaller width than the original dwelling. The ground floor element would extend to a depth of around 5 metres which is quite large compared to the depth of the original dwelling, but it would nevertheless also be a subservient addition.
6. Overall, I find that the resulting additions would just be within the limits of what would be proportionate to the size of the original dwelling. The proposal would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and would thus satisfy Framework paragraph 154(c) and as such it would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
7. I note that the dwelling is located in a long row of similar dwellings, some of which have had quite sizeable rear additions and whilst part of the wider context of the appeal site, these are not determining factors in the above assessment.
8. I have also been referred to the Thundridge Neighbourhood Plan (2018-2033) but it does not contain any policies of direct relevance to the main issue.
9. Having regard to my finding that the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it is not necessary to consider the impact on Green Belt openness or purposes any further. Nor is it necessary for very special circumstances to be demonstrated. The proposal would thus comply with EHDP Policy GBR1.
10. In respect of conditions, the Council has, in addition to the standard time condition, suggested ones to refer to the approved plans and to require matching materials. I agree that these are necessary in the interests of clarity and proper planning and the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR