



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/W/25/3373378

Youngs Little Acre, Medcalf Hill, Widford, Hertfordshire, SG12 8TD

- 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 and Mrs James against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 3/25/0182/FUL.
 - The development is a welfare unit and a turkey preparation and storage building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issues

2. I saw on site that development of the sort described had already been carried out. I have amended the description of the development applied for accordingly and determined the appeal on that basis.
3. The main issues are whether the development is appropriately located, having regard to the need, and its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a steep unmade track passing two houses, behind which is a sloping field containing a parking area with an L-shaped building in the corner. The building is in dark stained weatherboard, with a felt and corrugated metal roof, and contains living accommodation and poultry preparation equipment. The field contains a turkey run and a chicken run, each with sheds.
5. The appellant rears turkeys at the site for five months every year, attending three or four times a day for one-and-a-half hours but sometimes the whole day, and rears chickens all year round. A letter from the Animal and Plant Health Agency confirms the registration of the site for these purposes. The area is rural, the neighbouring houses being isolated and some way from the village of Widford.
6. The appellant states that the accommodation is necessary to comply with the Workplace Health, Safety and Welfare Regulations 1992 and that the building improves the appearance of the site compared to the previous stables, caravan and refrigerator units. However, the accommodation contains eight rooms, which include a bedroom (labelled as a 'rest area' on plan, it nonetheless contained a bed), a bathroom and a combined kitchen, living and dining room.
7. I accept that part of the site is used for agriculture and that parts of the building are used for purposes related to that. However, the runs occupy only a small area, and I saw a workshop, other machinery and materials that appeared unrelated to the

activity relied upon. I also accept that the appellant must attend the site, on some occasions for extended periods of time or overnight.

8. I also accept that the building is of a height, materials and siting, all of which assist in assimilating it into its surroundings. However, its style, elevations, landscape treatment and size – comprising a bedroom, bathroom, kitchen, living and dining room, as well as reception, plucking, preparation and two storage areas – are such that it is overly large, has domestic character and is visible from the surrounding landscape. This detracts from the rural character of the land, which is remote from the nearest settlement.
9. Overall, the building is larger than necessary for its stated agricultural function, of a character detrimental to the surrounding countryside and therefore inappropriately located in it. This is contrary to Policies GBR2 and DES4 of the East Herts District Plan 2018 (EHDP), which permits buildings in the countryside for agriculture and requires development to reflect local distinctiveness.
10. Whilst I have no evidence that the activity relied upon causes any nuisance, the appellant has stated that it is not a business and has not demonstrated that all the facilities are appropriately and sustainably located. This is contrary to Policy ED2 of the EHDP, which supports rural businesses where they are so located and do not conflict with other policies within that Plan.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR