
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by Rachel Hall BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/25/3372875

River View, 24 Amwell Lane, Stanstead Abbots, Hertfordshire SG12 8DX

- 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 Mrs A Pulford against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 3/25/0594/HH.
 - The development proposed is for removal of garage and construction of outbuilding to provide garage and gym. New gate and fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the removal of garage and construction of outbuilding to provide garage and gym, new gate and fence at River View, 24 Amwell Lane, Stanstead Abbots, Hertfordshire SG12 8DX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/25/0594/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 the approved plan: drawing reference 20932-P002-F
 - 3) The outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes incidental to the residential use of the dwelling known as 'River View, 24 Amwell Lane, Stanstead Abbots'.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. There is a discrepancy between the original description of the development as shown on the planning application form and that used by the Council on the decision notice. I have taken the description of the development in the heading above from the Council's decision notice, which the appellant has also adopted on the appeal form, as it more accurately describes the proposal.
4. The proposal includes a new gate and fence. The Council have not objected to this aspect of the proposal, and I find no reason to disagree. Consequently, my recommendation focuses on the effect of the proposed outbuilding.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed outbuilding on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. Amwell Lane is located in a residential area characterised by an eclectic mixture of dwellings. The appeal site comprises of a detached single storey dwelling situated on a long narrow plot. There is an existing double garage with a shallow pitched roof situated to the rear garden of the site, which is accessed from a private track off Woodham Way separating the appeal site and railway line.
7. The proposal would be larger than many domestic garages in the area although its location within a deep garden means it would not appear cramped or contrived within the plot. It would be situated in a similar position to that of the current garage and would remain physically and visually separate from the main dwelling and would not encroach upon most of the rear garden. It would retain a subservient relationship with the main dwelling.
8. Built structures to the rear of Amwell Lane are a common feature and while not immediately obvious from the road, they are intermittently visible through gaps between properties. The garden boundary of the appeal site runs alongside a residential cul de sac 'The Nook'. Although the proposal would be higher than the neighbouring shallow pitched roof garage at number 26 Amwell Lane, given the surrounding context, in particular the neighbouring pitched roof bungalow in 'The Nook', it would not be incongruous or have a harmful effect on the prevailing character of the area.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed outbuilding would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, it would not conflict with Policies DES4, VILL1, HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan (2018) which seek, amongst other matters, development of a high standard of design and layout, that is appropriate to the character, appearance and setting of the surrounding area.

Conditions

10. The standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary as this provides clarity. A condition is also necessary to ensure that the proposed building remains incidental to the main dwelling, in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring occupants.
11. Although the Council has suggested the use of a condition requiring external finishes in matching materials, this is unnecessary as the materials proposed are annotated on the approved plan.
12. Neighbouring residents have raised concerns about access to their garages during the construction period, as they are in daily use. The Council's Officer report suggests a construction management plan could be necessary providing details of how the development can be constructed without impeding neighbouring occupiers' ability to access their properties. However, given the modest scale of the

development, and that the appeal site has off street parking to the front that could accommodate construction vehicles if needed, I am satisfied that the proposal can be constructed whilst maintaining neighbours' access to their garages. Therefore, a condition requiring a construction management plan to be provided is not necessary in this instance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposal would accord with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
14. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Rachel Hall

INSPECTOR