



PLANNING APPEAL - STATEMENT OF CASE

17 Bedford Road, Ickleford, Hitchin, SG5 3XH

Job Ref: 25/128

Date: March 2026



Prepared by Tom Donovan BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI on behalf of

PETER GEORGE TOWN PLANNING



PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Table of Contents

<i>Section 1: Introduction & Background</i>	4
<i>Section 2: Analysis of the Site and Surroundings</i>	7
<i>Section 3: The Development Proposal</i>	8
<i>Section 4: Planning Analysis</i>	10
<i>Section 5: Summary & Conclusions</i>	23

Appendix 1: Decision Notice Application Ref. 26/00231/LDCP

Appendix 2: Delegated Report Application Ref. 26/00231/LDCP



Section 1: Introduction & Background

- 1.1 Peter George Town Planning has been instructed by Mr Sajjad Fozi to submit an appeal on their behalf against the decision of North Hertfordshire District Council (the Council) to refuse to grant a certificate of proposed development for the erection of a detached outbuilding and extension of the existing driveway at 17 Bedford Road, Ickleford, Hitchin, SG5 3XH.

Background

- 1.2 Application reference 26/00231/LDCP was refused by the Council by notice (attached at **Appendix 1**) dated 12 March 2026 for one reason which reads as follows:

“A Certificate of Lawfulness (proposed) cannot be issued on the basis that the proposal does not comply with the following criterion: E.(a), Class E, Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended.”

- 1.3 Read in conjunction with the planning officers delegated report (attached as **Appendix 2**), it appears that the Council were satisfied that the proposed



outbuilding would be permitted development insofar that it would comply with the requirements of Part E.1, E.2 and E.3 of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the Order). The refusal was thus issued on the basis that the Council did not consider that the proposed outbuilding would be ‘incidental’ to the enjoyment of the host dwelling due to its size.

- 1.4 Accordingly, this statement sets out that the proposed outbuilding would be utilised for purposes ‘incidental’ to the enjoyment of the host dwelling and thus that the Council’s reason for refusal is not well-founded. The detailed reasons for this, and why the proposals are compliant with the other requirements and conditions of the Order, are addressed in later sections of this Statement.

Procedural

- 1.5 The original submission to the Council sought confirmation that planning permission would not be required for two distinct items: a) the erection of a detached outbuilding under Class E of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Order and b) the extension of the existing driveway under Class F of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Order.



- 1.6 However, it appears that the Council only considered the acceptability of the proposed outbuilding and it was this part of the proposal that was the focus of the decision. The proposed driveway extension was not mentioned in the refusal nor indeed within the planning officer's report. Accordingly, it does not appear that a determination was made by the Council with respect to this part of the proposal.
- 1.7 Accordingly, in the absence of a determination on the acceptability of this part of the proposal, the appellant would like the Inspector to consider and reach a decision upon this part of the proposed development.

Relevant Planning History

Ref.	Proposal	Decision (Decision Date)
26/00231/LDCP	Detached outbuilding and extension of the existing driveway	Refused 12/03/2026
25/02526/FP	Erection of one dwelling following demolition of existing outbuilding including cycle storage, parking and creation of vehicular access off Ryder Avenue.	Refused 11/12/2025



Section 2: Analysis of the Site and Surroundings

The Appeal Site

- 2.1 No.17 Bedford Road is a semi-detached dwelling situated at the junction of Bedford Road and Ryder Avenue. It appears to have been constructed in the 1930's. It has cream roughcast render to the external walls and has a concrete tiled roof.
- 2.2 Its principal elevation is its front elevation and this primarily fronts Bedford Road. The property has an existing gravel driveway to the front and side. The side elevation of the property and its southern boundary fronts Ryder Avenue. An existing outbuilding is situated in the rear garden which is otherwise largely laid to grass.
- 2.3 The property retains its permitted development rights.



Section 3: The Development Proposal

3.1 The appeal development was described on the decision notice as follows:

“Detached outbuilding and extension of the existing driveway.”

3.2 The proposed development involves two related aspects: a) The erection of a proposed, detached L-shaped outbuilding comprising double garage, garden room and shed, and b) the extension of the existing driveway with a permeable surface.

Proposed Outbuilding

3.3 The proposed garage/outbuilding would have an L-shape plan with a gross internal area of approximately 72m² (83.5m² gross external area, 72m² gross internal area). It would have pitched roof and measure 2.5m to eaves height and 4m to ridge height.

3.4 It is proposed to be constructed in blockwork with a rough-cast render to match the house. It would have a tiled roof to match the main house. The outbuilding is proposed to be used in connection to the main house as double garage, garden shed and garden room.



Proposed Driveway Extension

- 3.5 The proposed extension to the driveway would extend the existing driveway to the rear of the property. It would be constructed in a permeable material.



Section 4: Planning Analysis

Key Issues

- 4.1 We consider the key issues in the consideration and determination of this appeal to be as follows:
- a) Would the proposed detached outbuilding be ‘incidental’ to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse and otherwise be compliant with Parts E.1, E.2, E.3 and E.4 of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Order.
 - b) Would the proposed extension to the hardstanding be compliant with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class F of the Order.

Proposed Outbuilding

Whether Incidental

- 4.2 The ‘Permitted development rights for householders: technical guidance’ (the technical guidance) states that:

“Class E sets out the rules on permitted development for buildings etc within the curtilage of a house. Buildings which are attached to the house are not permitted under Class E (they would be subject to the rules in Class A).

Buildings under Class E should be built for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the house. Paragraph E.4 of Class E indicates that purposes



incidental to the enjoyment of the house includes the keeping of poultry, bees, pet animals, birds or other livestock for the domestic needs or personal enjoyment of the occupants of the house.

But the rules also allow, subject to the conditions and limitations below, a large range of other buildings on land surrounding a house. Examples could include common buildings such as garden sheds, other storage buildings, garages, and garden decking as long as they can properly be described as having a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the house. A purpose incidental to a house would not, however, cover normal residential uses, such as separate self-contained accommodation or the use of an outbuilding for primary living accommodation such as a bedroom, bathroom, or kitchen.”

- 4.3 In the planning officers report (attached as **Appendix 2**), it is stated that:
- “The proposal would result in a relatively substantial structure on the garden plot abutting the footpath/highway. The proposed outbuilding would be L-shaped, measuring 10.5m wide at its widest point and 10.25m deep at the deepest point. The resultant internal floorspace would be ~72m². This would result in a footprint larger than the host dwelling. The proposal includes a driveway to the front of the outbuilding. While the floor plans do not make an indication of uses ancillary to the host dwelling, given*



the proposed outbuilding would have a noticeably and materially larger footprint than the host dwelling, I do not conclude that the purpose of the proposed outbuilding can be considered as incidental. As such, the proposed development is not compliant with this criterion.”

4.4 There is firstly an important correction to make here in respect to the first sentence of the above. The proposed outbuilding is not proposed to abut the footpath/highway. Rather it is proposed to be set back 2m from the boundary that fronts Ryder Avenue and would otherwise be positioned at least 2m from all other boundaries.

4.5 Secondly, in terms of the use of the building, there appears to be some confusion as the outbuilding was described by the planning officer at paragraph 4.2.1 of this report as being “... *a single storey outbuilding to facilitate art studio and maintenance workshop.*”

4.6 Based on the submitted plans and the covering letter provided with the original application, it is clearly not the case that the outbuilding was proposed to be used as an art studio and maintenance workshop (it is proposed to be use for garaging, shed and garden room). Accordingly, the appellant is concerned that the Council have misunderstood the proposals



and thus that their consideration and judgement as to whether the proposed building would be ‘incidental’ the host dwelling is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of the proposals. This is discussed further below and in the associated costs claim.

- 4.7 Case law (*Emin v SSE & Mid Sussex DC* [1989] JPL 909) has established that the activities to be carried out in an outbuilding must be incidental to the property’s main use as a dwellinghouse and not for extraneous purposes. The court also held that it follows that the scale of the activities will be important to whether they are incidental, or subordinate.
- 4.8 The size of a proposed building may, in the context of the planning unit, be indicative of whether it is to be used for incidental or subordinate purposes. However, the court held that size alone is not conclusive and it is relevant to note that paragraph E.1. of Class E imposes certain limitations on size. Indeed, and as mentioned, the Council acknowledge that the proposed outbuilding would be permitted development if considered in context of the requirements of part E.1 of Class E.
- 4.9 The site is situated on a corner plot and has a reasonably generous undeveloped curtilage measuring approximately 300m² to the front, side



and rear. The main dwelling is one half of a semi-detached pair with accommodation spread over two levels and has a reasonably steep pitched roof. Accordingly, it has an overall size and internal floor which gives it a reasonably substantial presence on the plot.

4.10 In terms of the proposed outbuilding, the Council state that, because it would have a footprint larger than the footprint of the principal dwelling, it cannot be considered to be incidental. However, footprint is only one metric by which to consider its size in relation to the principal dwelling and, as mentioned above, the principal dwelling has two storeys and is clearly of an overall size that would be much more substantial than the proposed outbuilding. In that context, from a purely volumetric standpoint, the proposed outbuilding would be much smaller than and appear incidental to the principal dwelling.

4.11 Moreover, given the relatively large curtilage that the property benefits from, the outbuilding could be constructed in a manner that would result in the retention of a generous undeveloped curtilage around the property. This further speaks to the case set out above that the proposed outbuilding would appear incidental to the principal dwelling.



- 4.12 In terms of the specific uses proposed, it is proposed to accommodate within the outbuilding a proposed double garage, shed and garden room. Justification for each is addressed in turn.
- 4.13 The proposed garaging would occupy the largest part of the proposed outbuilding. In terms of the need, the appellant and his family have a number of vehicles and bicycles and there is currently no garaging at the property. Accordingly, we consider that the provision of a double garage of the size proposed to provide secure parking for up to two cars and motorbikes/bicycles would be reasonable given the size of the principal dwelling.
- 4.14 The second largest segment of the proposed outbuilding would be utilised as a garden room with windows on the south and east-facing elevations and a set of French doors to the north-facing elevation facing into the garden. It would have a footprint slightly smaller than the part of the building proposed to house the garage.
- 4.15 The garden room is intended to provide a separate space for the occupants of the property to enjoy its garden. Moreover, given the relatively small ground floor area of the existing house and the slightly awkward prospect



of extending to the rear (due to the awkward boundary between no.17 and the adjoining property), it is considered that the provision of an additional communal living space within the garden of the property of the size proposed would be reasonable.

4.16 The shed is proposed to be incorporated into the building as a small, secure storage area for garden implements and machinery, tools and other similar items associated with the ongoing maintenance of the house and its grounds. The shed would occupy only a small part of the proposed outbuilding, and it is considered that this would also be reasonable in terms of its function and size.

4.17 In all, it is considered that the use of the proposed outbuilding as garaging, garden room and a shed would be incidental to the enjoyment of the principal dwellinghouse and that each use is justified given the facts of the case. Further, the proposed outbuilding would have a size and visual relationship with the principal dwelling and would be sited such within its curtilage that it would appear incidental in this context.



Requirements

4.18 Parts E.1-E.4 of The Order sets out the terms under which development is permitted. Each is addressed in turn below.

	Criteria of E.1	Compliance
(a)	permission to use the dwellinghouse as a dwellinghouse has been granted only by virtue of Class G M, MA, N, P, PA or Q of Part 3 of this Schedule (changes of use);	Compliant
	<i>Commentary: The dwellinghouse was not granted by virtue of any of the noted classes.</i>	
(b)	the total area of ground covered by buildings, enclosures and containers within the curtilage (other than the original dwellinghouse) would exceed 50% of the total area of the curtilage (excluding the ground area of the original dwellinghouse);	Compliant
	<i>Commentary: The existing curtilage is 617m² whilst the gross external area of the proposed outbuilding would be 83.5m². This would thus represent the development of approximately 13.5% of the curtilage. The existing outbuilding would be removed. Hardstanding is not part of this calculation.</i>	
(c)	any part of the building, enclosure, pool or container would be situated on land forward of a wall forming the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse;	Compliant
	<i>Commentary: No part of the building would be situated on land forward of a wall forming the principal</i>	



	<i>elevation of the original dwellinghouse which is that which fronts Bedford Road.</i>	
(d)	the building would have more than a single storey;	Compliant
	<i>Commentary: The building would not have more than a single storey.</i>	
(e)	the height of the building, enclosure or container would exceed— (i) 4 metres in the case of a building with a dual-pitched roof, (ii) 2.5 metres in the case of a building, enclosure or container within 2 metres of the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse, or (iii) 3 metres in any other case;	Compliant
	<i>Commentary: The building would have a dual-pitched roof, and it would not exceed 4 metres in height. The building would not be located within 2 metres of the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse.</i>	
(f)	the height of the eaves of the building would exceed 2.5 metres;	Compliant
	<i>Commentary: The height of the eaves of the building would not exceed 2.5 metres.</i>	
(g)	the building, enclosure, pool or container would be situated within the curtilage of a listed building;	Compliant
	<i>Commentary: The building would not be situated within the curtilage of a listed building.</i>	
(h)	it would include the construction or provision of a verandah, balcony or raised platform;	Compliant



	Commentary: It would not include the construction or provision of a verandah, balcony or raised platform.	
(i)	it relates to a dwelling or a microwave antenna;	Compliant
	Commentary: No works to a dwelling are proposed. The proposals don't involve the provision of a microwave antenna.	
(j)	the capacity of the container would exceed 3,500 litres	Compliant
	Commentary: A container is not proposed.	
(k)	the dwellinghouse is built under Part 20 of this Schedule (construction of new dwellinghouses).	Compliant
	Commentary: The dwellinghouse was not built under Part 20 of this Schedule.	
	Criteria of E.2	
E.2	<i>In the case of any land within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse which is within—</i> <i>(a) an area of outstanding natural beauty;</i> <i>(b) the Broads;</i> <i>(c) a National Park; or</i> <i>(d) a World Heritage Site,</i> <i>development is not permitted by Class E if the total area of ground covered by buildings, enclosures, pools and containers situated more than 20 metres from any wall of the dwellinghouse would exceed 10 square metres</i>	Compliant
	Commentary: The dwellinghouse is not within the AONB, the Broads, a National Park or a World Heritage Site.	



	Criteria of E.3	
E.3	<i>In the case of any land within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse which is article 2(3) land, development is not permitted by Class E if any part of the building, enclosure, pool or container would be situated on land between a wall forming a side elevation of the dwellinghouse and the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse.</i>	Compliant
	Commentary: The dwellinghouse is not on article 2(3) land.	
	Criteria of E.4	
E.4	For the purposes of Class E, “purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse as such” includes the keeping of poultry, bees, pet animals, birds or other livestock for the domestic needs or personal enjoyment of the occupants of the dwellinghouse.	N/A
	Commentary: Livestock is not proposed, but the use would be ‘incidental’ as discussed above.	

4.19 It is considered that the proposed outbuilding would be compliant with Parts E.1, E.2, E.3 and E.4 of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Order.



Proposed Extension to Existing Driveway

Requirements

- 4.20 Schedule 2, Part 1, Class F of the Order sets out that, subject to certain requirements and conditions being met, the following would be permitted development:

F. Development consisting of—

- (a) the provision within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse of a hard surface for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse as such; or***
- (b) the replacement in whole or in part of such a surface.***

Requirements

- 4.21 Part F.1 of The Order sets out the terms under which development is permitted. Each is addressed in turn below.

	Criteria of F.1	Compliance
(a)	permission to use the dwellinghouse as a dwellinghouse has been granted only by virtue of Class G, M, MA N, P, PA or Q of Part 3 of this Schedule (changes of use);	Compliant
	<i>Commentary: The dwellinghouse was not granted by virtue of any of the noted classes.</i>	
(b)	the dwellinghouse is built under Part 20 of this Schedule (construction of new dwellinghouses).	Compliant
	<i>Commentary: The dwellinghouse was not built under Part 20 of this Schedule.</i>	



Conditions

4.22 Part F.2 of The Order sets out that:

F.2 Development is permitted by Class F subject to the condition that where—

(a) the hard surface would be situated on land between a wall forming the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse and a highway, and

(b) the area of ground covered by the hard surface, or the area of hard surface replaced, would exceed 5 square metres, either the hard surface is made of porous materials, or provision is made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse.

4.23 The hard surface would not be situated on land between a wall forming the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse and a highway. However, and as noted on the submission drawings it would be constructed in a porous material in any event thus ensuring compliance with Part F.2.

4.24 Based on the assessment carried out above, the proposed extension to the existing driveway would be permitted development in line with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class F of the Order.



Section 5: Summary & Conclusions

- 5.1 The key issue in the determination of this appeal is whether the proposed outbuilding would be incidental to the enjoyment of the principal dwellinghouse and whether it would otherwise be compliant with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Order. A secondary matter that requires a determination due to the Council's failure to make one is whether the proposed extension to the driveway would be permitted development in compliance with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class F of the Order.
- 5.2 Regarding the first issue, it is considered that the proposed outbuilding would be 'incidental' to the enjoyment of the principal dwellinghouse and that it would otherwise be compliant with the requirements of Parts E.1-E.4 of Class E. Accordingly, it is the appellants view that the proposed outbuilding would be compliant with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Order and would thus be permitted development .
- 5.3 Regarding the second issue, it is considered that the proposed extension to the driveway would be compliant with the requirements of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Order and would thus be permitted development.



5.4 Consequently, it is hereby respectfully requested that the appeal be allowed, and the Lawful Development Certificate granted.



Appendix 1: Decision Notice Application Ref. 26/00231/LDCP

	NORTH HERTS COUNCIL Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 191 REFUSAL TO GRANT CERTIFICATE OF PROPOSED LAWFUL USE OR DEVELOPMENT	Town Planning Ref.No. 26/00231/LDCP
--	---	---

Correspondence Address:

Peter George Town Planning
Nine Hills Road
Cambridge
CB2 1GE

Applicant:

Mr Sajjad Fozi

Date of Receipt of Application: 10.02.2026

Site: **17 Bedford Road, Ickleford, Hitchin, Hertfordshire, SG5 3XH,**

Description of development: Detached outbuilding and extension of the existing driveway

The North Herts Council, in pursuance of their powers under the above-mentioned Act and the associated Orders and Regulations, hereby REFUSE TO GRANT A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT for the operations described above in respect of the aforementioned land and edged in red on the plan attached hereto.

1. A Certificate of Lawfulness (proposed) cannot be issued on the basis that the proposal does not comply with the following criterion: E.(a), Class E, Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended.

Signed:



Shaun Greaves
Development and Conservation Manager

Development Management
North Herts Council
Council Offices
Gernon Road
Letchworth
Herts
SG6 3JF

Date: 12 March 2026

The Council's Privacy Notice is available on our website: <https://www.north-herts.gov.uk/home/council-data-and-performance/data-protection/information-management-gdpr>

NOTES

If you are aggrieved by this decision, you may appeal to The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN, by notice given on a form available from that office (Tel: 0117 372 6372), or on the website at www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk, within 6 months of this decision or, in exceptional circumstances, such longer period as the Secretary of State may agree.



Appendix 2: Delegated Report Application Ref. 26/00231/LDCP

DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...William Thompson.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
26/00231/LDCP	Detached outbuilding and extension of the existing driveway	17 Bedford Road Ickleford Hitchin Hertfordshire SG5 3XH

Submitted Plan Nos

P01 P02 P03

2.0 **Site History**

- 2.1 25/02526/FP - Erection of one dwelling following demolition of existing outbuilding including cycle storage, parking and creation of vehicular access off Ryder Avenue.

Refused

3.0 **Representations**

- 3.1 No consultation required

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

- 4.1.1 The site accommodates a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated off Bedford Road/Ryder Avenue, Ickleford. The site benefits from a driveway, rear garden and existing outbuilding.

4.2 **Proposal**

- 4.2.1 A Certificate of Lawfulness (proposed) is sought for a single storey outbuilding to facilitate art studio and maintenance workshop following demolition of existing sheds.

4.3 **Key Issues**

- 4.3.1 The key issues for consideration are whether the proposed development would require a specific planning permission or be considered 'permitted development' in line with the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, Schedule 2, Part 1.

4.3.2 **Class E – buildings etc incidental to the enjoyment of a dwellinghouse**

E. The provision within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse of—

(a) any building or enclosure, swimming or other pool required for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse as such, or the maintenance, improvement or other alteration of such a building or enclosure; or

The proposal would result in a relatively substantial structure on the garden plot abutting the footpath/highway. The proposed outbuilding would be L-shaped, measuring 10.5m wide at its widest point and 10.25m deep at the deepest point. The resultant internal floorspace would be ~72m². This would result in a footprint larger than the host dwelling. The proposal includes a driveway to the front of the outbuilding. While the floor plans do not make an indication of uses

ancillary to the host dwelling, given the proposed outbuilding would have a noticeably and materially larger footprint than the host dwelling, I do not conclude that the purpose of the proposed outbuilding can be considered as incidental. As such, the proposed development is not compliant with this criterion.

E.1 Development is not permitted by Class E if—

(a) permission to use the dwellinghouse as a dwellinghouse has been granted only by virtue of Class M, N, P or Q of Part 3 of this Schedule (changes of use);

The proposed development is compliant with this criterion.

(b) the total area of ground covered by buildings, enclosures and containers within the curtilage (other than the original dwellinghouse) would exceed 50% of the total area of the curtilage (excluding the ground area of the original dwellinghouse);

The proposed development is compliant with this criterion.

(c) any part of the building, enclosure, pool or container would be situated on land forward of a wall forming the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse;

The proposed development is compliant with this criterion.

(d) the building would have more than a single storey;

The proposed development is compliant with this criterion.

(e) the height of the building, enclosure or container would exceed—

(i) 4 metres in the case of a building with a dual-pitched roof,

(ii) 2.5 metres in the case of a building, enclosure or container within 2 metres of the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse, or

(iii) 3 metres in any other case;

The proposed outbuilding would not be within 2m of the boundary, would have a dual-pitched roof and is proposed to be 3.9m in height. As such, the proposed development is compliant with this criterion.

(f) the height of the eaves of the building would exceed 2.5 metres;

The proposed development is compliant with this criterion.

(g) the building, enclosure, pool or container would be situated within the curtilage of a listed building;

The proposed development is compliant with this criterion.

(h) it would include the construction or provision of a verandah, balcony or raised platform;

The proposed development is compliant with this criterion.

(i) it relates to a dwelling or a microwave antenna; or

The proposed development is compliant with this criterion.

(j) the capacity of the container would exceed 3,500 litres.

The proposed development is compliant with this criterion.

E.3 In the case of any land within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse which is article 2(3) land, development is not permitted by Class E if any part of the building, enclosure, pool or container would be situated on land between a wall forming a side elevation of the dwellinghouse and the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse.

The proposed development is compliant with this criterion.

4.4 **Conclusion**

- 4.4.1 A Certificate of Lawfulness (proposed) cannot be issued on the basis that the proposal does not comply with the following criterion: E.(a), Class E, Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended.

Signed  Anne McDonald	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Determining Officer Date: 12 March 2026	