Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2026

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2026

Appeal Ref: 6004649
Glatton Hall, Glatton Ways, Glatton, England PE28 5RS

- 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 Miles Stephenson against the decision of Huntingdonshire District Council.
- The application Ref is 25/00787/HHFUL.
- The development proposed is installation of solar panels to roof; erection of new boundary fence; erection of garden shed; erection of entrance gate posts.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for a partial award of costs was made by Mr Miles Stephenson against Huntingdonshire District Council.

Background and Main Issues

3. The Council's decision notice dated 28 November 2025 listed the plans on which the Council made its decision. The Council's reasons for refusal state "Insufficient and accurate information has been provided to enable a full assessment of the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and the CA" and that there was "insufficient information to fully assess the arboricultural implications of the proposal".

4. The appeals procedure guide makes clear that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and that there are no provisions within the rules for amendments to be submitted. It is important that what is considered by the Inspector at appeal is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the local planning authority and by interested parties at the application stage. Furthermore, this is a householder appeal and the householder appeal process does not allow the Council to submit an appeal statement.

5. The appellant's statement states at 5.1 that "a further revised elevation drawing is provided in appendix 5". Furthermore, a report concerning protected trees dated January 2026 was also submitted with the appeal. The Council has therefore not had the opportunity to comment on this material. However, for the reasons that follow, even if I were to accept the additional information submitted at the appeal stage, I still cannot be certain of the method of foundation construction or the precise location of the shed based on the drawings before me. I also could not grant planning permission for other elements of the scheme because the appeal

drawings are not sufficiently detailed to allow me to reach definitive conclusions. Thus, as I am dismissing the appeal largely for these reasons, I have not considered the effect of the proposal on trees. In any event, the shed is of modest construction and, had I been minded to allow the appeal, I am satisfied that an acceptable solution could be found.

6. Thus, against this background, the main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the area, bearing in mind that Glatton Hall is a non-designated heritage asset and that the proposal would be within the Glatton Conservation Area and within the setting of the grade I listed Church of St Nicholas.

Reasons

Significance

7. Glatton Hall is a large detached dwelling in the Glatton Conservation Area (CA) and close to the grade I listed Church of St Nicholas (the Church). It appears to have had a variety of uses over its lifetime, including as a residential care home, and has therefore been extensively altered and extended. However, it sits within substantial grounds and retains many traditional architectural features. Through its estate setting, it retains its character as a notable historic building within the settlement of Glatton. Consequently, insofar as is relevant to this case, its significance derives from its architectural and historic interest and its association with the historic development of Glatton.

8. The CA covers the historic core of the village. It contains a number of traditional buildings, including the Church, historic dwellings, farmsteads and other traditional structures arranged in an intact historic street pattern. The historic buildings are finished in traditional materials and display high quality architectural detailing. Thus, insofar as is relevant to this appeal, the significance of the CA derives from the historic settlement pattern and traditional architectural detailing of the buildings within it.

9. The Church contains fabric dating from the early thirteenth century, together with subsequent alterations and additions. Its landmark prominence provides evidence of the historic and ecclesiastical development of Glatton. Consequently, insofar as is relevant to this scheme, its significance derives from its special architectural and historic interest, its historic fabric, and its visual and historic prominence within the village.

Effect on significance

10. I acknowledge the appellant's comments with regard to extensive relevant experience, including the preparation of conservation reports, lecturing on heritage conversions and involvement in a number of heritage restoration projects. I also note that the proposals are intended to be conservation-led and that, on my site visit, the appeal property appeared well maintained and generally in good order.

11. However, paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires applicants to provide sufficient information to enable the significance of any affected heritage assets, and the potential effects of the proposal upon that significance, to be properly understood. Whilst I note that the existing steel gates would be replaced with traditional brick piers constructed from

materials matching those used elsewhere within the Glatton Hall estate, and that a post and rail boundary fence in poor condition would be replaced with estate fencing, the details submitted are insufficient for me to fully understand and potentially approve exactly where the fencing would be located. Furthermore, whilst I note the appellant's assurances that the boundary treatment would tastefully replicate other examples nearby, I cannot be certain of its height or exactly what it would look like. There are also no substantive details of any proposed gates referred to in the statement, and it is not entirely clear to me whether or not the scheme proposes new gates.

12. I have noted the comments with regard to the 33 square metre outbuilding approved by the Council. However, the full details of that case are not before me, it is a completely different scheme which has not been implemented and the permission has now lapsed. I find the shed already in place to be discreetly positioned, partly screened from the road and Glatton Hall by vegetation, and finished sympathetically to Glatton Hall and other buildings in the CA. However, its precise location and footprint are only shown on the site location plan as a sketched outline shaded blue, at what appears to be a scale of 1:1250. Thus, even though I find it to be sympathetic to the heritage assets, I cannot be certain that its precise size and positioning on the plans matches that which has been built.

13. The proposed solar panels would be discreetly located on a modern roof slope and they would not be widely visible or particularly noticeable when viewed against the background of other built form. Indeed, there are other solar panels installed on traditional buildings nearby which do not look out of place. However, again, their precise location is only shown on the site location plan as a sketched outline shaded blue at what appears to be a scale of 1:1250. At this scale, I am unable to determine the exact number of panels or the accurate extent to which they would cover the roof slope. Furthermore, solar panels can vary significantly in their visual appearance and can be fixed in a variety of ways which affect the appearance of any installation. This is important in this sensitive context. Thus, whilst I find the installation of solar panels on the proposed roof slope could clearly be achieved sympathetically, without definitive details of the actual appearance of the proposed panels or their fixing method, I cannot conclude that there would be no harm.

14. Thus overall, I must take a precautionary approach and find that the proposals would harm the character and appearance of the area, and the setting and significance of Glatton Hall. However, the Church is some distance away, with limited intervisibility between it and what would be relatively modest proposals. As such, even based on the limited details before me, I am able to conclude there would be no harm to the Church. However, the harm to the CA as a whole would be less than substantial and towards the lower end of the range. I will return to this below.

Other Matters

15. I have noted the comments with regard to the Council's handling of the proposal, particularly those related to communication and its approach to enforcement. I have also noted the comments in support of the scheme, particularly from people living nearby and Glatton Parish Council. However, I confirm that I have determined the appeal on its planning merits only.

Planning balance and conclusion

16. The proposed solar panels would improve the sustainability of the property, with associated environmental benefits. The proposal would also improve the living conditions of the occupiers. However, any public benefits there may be are modest and insufficient to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area, Glatton Hall and the CA.

17. Thus, the proposal is in conflict with Policies LP11, LP12, LP34 and LP31 of the LP insofar as they seek to achieve good design and avoid harm to heritage assets and trees. For the same reasons, it is also in conflict with paragraphs 212 and 215 of the Framework.

18. The proposal therefore fails to accord with the development plan as a whole, and there are no other material considerations which indicate a decision should be taken other than in accordance with it. Consequently, having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR