

Part I

Main author: Chris Carter

Executive Member: Councillor S.Boulton

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 21 MAY 2019
REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR (PUBLIC PROTECTION, PLANNING AND
GOVERNANCE)

PLANNING UPDATE – FUTURE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1 **Introduction**

- 1.1 This report is for the Development Management Committee to provide a summary of applications that might be presented to Committee over the coming months. If the call-in or application is withdrawn, the item will not be presented.
- 1.2 The applications should not be debated as part of this agenda, however any Councillor wishing to raise specific points about the proposal – such as a need for planning obligations or issue(s) that might not readily be apparent from the proposal or any other matter, may do so and the case officer will consider, where they are planning considerations, these matters raised as part of the future Committee report.
- 1.3 Appendix 1 comprises all applications that have been called-in or objected to by Town or Parish Councils. Appendix 2 comprises those that are a departure from the Local Plan, Officers consider should be determined by Development Management Committee, the applicant is the Borough Council or it has an interest in the land and an objection has been received.

2 **Recommendation**

- 2.1 That members note this report.

Name of author	Chris Carter
Title	Development Management Service Manager

Appendix 1 - Applications called-in or objected to

6/2016/0270/VAR

Address	Four Oaks 1-4 Great North Road Welwyn AL6 0PL
Proposal	Variation of conditions 1 (occupants) and 2 (number of caravans) of Planning Permission N6/2010/0211/S73B to increase the number of caravans from 10 to 20 of which no more than 5 shall be static caravans or mobile homes.
Applicant	Mr J Connors
Ward	Welwyn West
Agent	Mr M Green
Call-In/Objection from	Councillor Julie Cragg, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Reason for Committee Decision	<p>Please can we call this in due to the fact that this raises a lot of issues of concern for the residents.</p> <p>There is uneasiness about the fact that the number of caravans fluctuates wildly and that they residents do not appear to adhere to the planing that they do have.</p> <p>The restrictions regarding children is there as this was not intended to be a permanent site but only to give stability to the children to enable them to attend school.</p> <p>Are they planning to use caravans as an office sutie and run business's from there? [sic]</p>
Call-In/Objection from	Caroline Williams, Welwyn Parish Council
Reason for Committee Decision	<p>15/03/2016 21:43 - Welwyn Parish Council at its Planning & Licensing Committee of the 15 March 2016 agreed to submit Major Objection. We are unclear why the existing conditions have not been enforced. We understand that the site was permitted as a temporary location linked to the schooling of the children which have now grown up and not as a permanent site. We are concerned that the number of caravans has continued to increase overtime both with, and without, permission and Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council have previously stated that 10 is the maximum that can be accommodated. The existing conditions include that the land should be restored in accordance with the scheme previously submitted and approved by the planning authority as the residents may have already changed.</p>
Case Officer	Mrs Sarah Smith
Summary	This application had been delayed due to the progress of the Local Plan, however officers are now working on bringing this application to the committee in the next few months.

6/2016/1493/VAR

Address	Thunderbridge Yard Bulls Lane Hatfield AL9 7BB
Proposal	Variation of condition 1 to extend the temporary permission; condition 3 to permit eight caravans of which no more than five would be static caravans; condition 4 to vary the approved drawings; and condition 5 to vary the site development scheme; of planning permission S6/2011/0116/FP
Applicant	Mr J Robb
Ward	Welham Green & Hatfield South
Agent	Mrs A Heine
Call-In/Objection from	Councillor Paul Zukowskyj, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Reason for Committee Decision	<p>I would like to formally 'call in ' this applicaiton as it meets at least two of the key criteria for a call in, namely 1. The application is of an unusually sensitive nature as the current use of the site has led to significant adverse impact on neighbours amenity and that development beyond that permitted had occurred at the site. 2. The wider ramifications are the potential impact of permitting this development may have on setting precedent for permitting neighbouring sites in the forthcoming local plan examination in public. There is also the precedent that would be set of permitting such developments, even for a limited period, in flood zones.</p>
Call-In/Objection from	Sue Chudleigh, North Mymms Parish Council
Reason for Committee Decision	<p>NMPC OBJECT as this is clearly a new application. The name of the applicants is not the name to whom the extant Permission was originally given.</p> <p>The Government Planning Policy for traveller sites Policy E, in its introduction, states that making and decision taking should protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development - Item 4d and Item 16 state that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt except in exceptional circumstances. None have been indicated.</p> <p>Item 4f - further states the local planning authority should aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments. This site has consistently exceeded the numbers stated in the original Permission and it is too small a site to be abused in this way.</p> <p>Item 4k - states the local planning authority have to have due regard to the protection of local amenities and local environment. There have also been sanitary issues arising from the over-use of the site.</p>

One or more travelling caravans have also been let to itinerant workers in contravention to the terms of the licence. This has caused considerable problems to the neighbourhood.

Item 13 of the Planning Policy for traveller sites states the local planning authority should ensure that their policies:

- a) promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community
- f) avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services
- g) do not locate sites in areas at high risk of flooding, including functional floodplains, given the particular vulnerability of caravans

Policy E, Item 24 addresses local provision and it is the case that WHBC do not have a firm policy on Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Borough but there are existing sites in Welham Green – including a long term Showmans site which causes no trouble – however the Foxes Lane site also is also over used as the numbers of caravans exceeds the permitted numbers. Item 27 states that if a local planning authority cannot demonstrate an up to date 5 year supply of deliverable sites this should be a material consideration and in this case the existing sites result in over supply in Welham Green therefore any expansion is unwarranted.

Item 25 states that the local planning authority should very strictly limit traveller site development in the Green Belt and further”sites in rural areas do not dominate the nearest settled community.” Expansion of this site would cause stress on services and neighbours.

Item 16 Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances, none of which have been indicated in this case.

Item 24(a) The Local Planning Authority has to take into account the existing level of local provision and Welham Green currently has provision. Indeed, even this is exceeded unlawfully – see report from Dennis Pennyfather, Licensing Technical Officer, dated 24 August 2016.

Item 25 This further states the Local Planning Authority should very strictly limit sites in rural areas should not dominate the nearest settled community. Of late the activities at Thunderbridge Yard have caused extreme concern and disturbance to the neighbourhood. Police and other authorities are aware of this, which seems to arise from the subletting of the excessive on-site accommodation to persons other than gypsies or travellers.

Footnote 9 States there is no presumption that a temporary grant of Planning Permission should be granted permanently, therefore North Mymms Parish Council consider, taking into account comments by Licensing Technical Officer that the site is not big enough, there are fire safety issues and this is a known flood plain with previous flooding issues, caravans on this Green Belt site are inappropriate development.

Case Officer

Mr Mark Peacock

Summary

This application had been delayed due to the progress of the Local Plan, however officers are now working on bringing this application to the committee in the next few months.

6/2017/0606/MAJ

Address	1-9 Town Centre Hatfield AL10 0JZ
Proposal	Erection of 2 buildings to provide 1,194m ² (GEA) commercial floor space (A1 & A3), 70 flats (15 x 1 bedroom, 7 x 2 bedroom, three person and 48 x 2 bedroom, four person) with associated car/bicycle parking, plant and refuse storage and including the improvement of public realm, following the demolition of existing buildings.
Applicant	Mr P Brimley
Ward	Hatfield Cent.
Agent	Mr P Wellings-Longmore
Call-In/Objection from	Carrie Lloyd, Hatfield Town Council
Reason for Committee Decision	Object: The Town Council is concerned at the impact of parking from new residential units on the retail parking spaces available. The Council has repeatedly asked that design of new structures in the Town is sympathetic to existing Hatfield designs but again we see another architect imposing their design on our Town making it an uncoordinated mismatch of urban design from different decades with no empathy to the historic nature of the Town. Members are concerned at the impact of the level 7 building on the Grade 1 listed building of Hatfield House. Members consider that a community facility needs to be included within the design.
Case Officer	Mr Mark Peacock
Summary	This application has been held in abeyance pending further work on the wider Hatfield Town Centre regeneration project.

6/2018/2129/FULL

Address	111 The Ryde Hatfield AL9 5DP
Proposal	Retrospective change of use from single dwelling (Use Class C3) to small HMO for up to three to six persons (Use Class C4)
Applicant	Mr I Kabala
Ward	Hatfield East
Agent	Mr A Huseyin
Call-In/Objection from	Councillor Caroline Gillett, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Reason for Committee Decision	I wish to call in the application 6/2018/2129 Full in respect of the retrospective change of use from single dwelling (Use Class C3) to small HMO for up to three to six persons (Use Class C4). 111 The Ryde.

The main reason for calling in is the lack of parking in lines with policy and I draw the officers' attention to the actual crossover and depth of in-curtilage as opposed to that drawn on the architect's submission. Parking of 5.25 cars would be required as a minimum and using the cross over only space for

3. Also, the depth of the in-curtilage is 5.3m and not 6m as stated.

Whilst calling this in I would like to draw your attention to the following in connection with the submission (1325/PL/AH)

In

Section 2 – The Proposal reference is made to the conversion of the garage into a store for bins. This was advised to be happening by March 2018 in a previous application, and I am presuming the garage was built under previous planning granted in 2008 with a 3 year time frame, as this garage was refused in January this year.

Section 4.2 – the submission has failed to highlight bedroom 3

I note the kitchen is 6.7 sqm which is within HMO requirements for up to 5 rooms. I question why 2 kitchens are needed to share between 3 rooms when only one shower/bathroom between 3 rooms. The additional kitchen is shown as in the lounge/diner/kitchen which is currently used as a bedsit.

Section 4.4 – advises that the front door is the main entrance for all occupants. It is know that the garage door is an entrance currently used by at least one occupant.

The garage is “being converted to a storage facility” – this has been on-

going for 8 months.

Section 6 – parking

6.1 refers to 3 bedsits at 1.25 spaces equating to 4 and 3 HMO bedrooms giving rise to 1 space which does not comply with 0.5 per room. Parking should therefore be 5.25 spaces which equates to 6 rounded up.

6.2 The depth of the property is advised as 6m when in fact 2/3 of the frontage is 5.3 up to the front brickwork. This means that cars would be parking directly under the window of bedsit 3

Section 7 – refuse.

The existing bins 3 in total and capacity within the garage. There are at least 4 bins, often overflowing (photographic evidence from residents) and are stored on the front left of the property.

Section 8 – landscaping

The statement in the submission is misleading. The frontage had indeed been altered to increase the hard standing across the width of the site. The property has 100% hard standing and the trees that were at the side of the property have been removed.

The house has been extended to the maximum at each boundary and is not typical of The Ryde where other houses have at least one side access and all have a fair proportion of soft landscaping as well as open carparking. I am not aware of any that have parking across the full width or the full depth of the property.

It is also worth noting that the tree on the left of the property has had the right side branches removed to allow parking to the left of the property accessed over the grass verge.

Case Officer

Mr Mark Peacock

Summary

It is anticipated that this application will be presented to the June DMC meeting.

6/2018/2768/OUTLINE

Address

Hatfield Business Park Hatfield AL10 9SL

Proposal

Outline application for a large-scale mixed use development including 1,100 new homes and supporting infrastructure including a primary school, local centre and open space with all matters reserved

Applicant	Arlington Business Parks
Ward	Hatfield Villages
Agent	Mr M Hill
Call-In/Objection from	Councillor Duncan Bell, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Reason for Committee Decision	I would like to conditionally call-in the above application. Conditional in the sense that i would only ask for it to be brought before DMC if Planning Department is minded to recommend approval.

My grounds for calling this in are:

- The size and scale of the proposed development make it a matter of significant public interest.
- The proposal is on Green Belt land, and would risk coalescence with the eastern outskirts of St Albans.
- The site is not one of those accepted for development as part of our current Local Plan submission.

I will be making a more detailed set of representations once i have studied the plans in more detail, but i would be grateful if you could log my call-in on to the system as soon as possible.

Thank you for your assistance.

Case Officer	Ms Gill Claxton
Summary	This major application is anticipated to be presented to DMC later in 2019.

6/2018/3170/HOUSE

Address	16 Roe Green Close Hatfield AL10 9PE
Proposal	Erection of single storey front and side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension
Applicant	Mr & Mrs E Lamuren
Ward	Hatfield South West
Agent	Mr S Cook
Call-In/Objection from	Carrie Lloyd, Hatfield Town Council
Reason for Committee Decision	10/01/2019 08:24 - The size and bulk of the cumulative effect of all the extensions is not acceptable as it doubles the footprint of the property. Members acknowledge the concerns of neighbouring properties.

Call-In/Objection from Carrie Lloyd, Hatfield Town Council

Reason for Committee Decision 1/02/2019 12:50 - Our previous comments on this application still stand

Case Officer Ms Lucy Hale

Summary This application is likely to be presented to June DMC.

6/2019/0020/MAJ

Address 169 Knightsfield Welwyn Garden City AL8 7QG

Proposal Erection of a two-storey building 10 x dwellings and dance studio with underground parking space following demolition of existing building

Applicant Nationco Ltd

Ward Sherrards

Agent Mrs KILIC

Call-In/Objection from Councillor Jean-Paul Skoczylas, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council

Reason for Committee Decision 18/02/19 - I would like to call this planning application into DMC if it is going to be approved.

18/02/19 - As it is against council policy of development on Green Belt and SSSI land.

Case Officer Mr Michael Robinson

Summary Should this application need to be presented to DMC it is anticipated that this may be in June or July.

6/2019/0085/MAJ

Address Chancellors School, Pine Grove, Brookmans Park, Hatfield, AL9 7BN

Proposal Erection of building comprising sports hall with associated changing facilities and 7 x classrooms built on existing hard play tennis courts; 4 x hard play sports pitches to be provided to replace existing; provision of 33 x parking spaces; and two mobile classrooms to be provided for the duration of the project

Applicant Mr J Buoy

Ward Brookmans Park & Little Heath

Agent Mr D Carmichael
Call-In/Objection from Sue Chudleigh, North Mymms Parish Council
Reason for Committee Decision 12/02/2019 10:18 - NMPC: North Mymms Parish Council maintain their MAJOR OBJECTION for all previous reasons given in respect of application reference 6/2018/2178/FULL as follows:

“North Mymms Parish Council has a MAJOR OBJECTION to this application. It must be a Condition that the temporary classrooms be removed before occupation of the new classrooms occur (otherwise they will never go). The design is unimaginative and the materials proposed industrial, which for a Green Belt site show a lack of sympathy from the designers for the natural surroundings. The constant use of grey in colour schemes will date the building in the short term. The proposed building will be visible to users of The Drive, Ash Close and Golf Course Road. The Wow factor alluded to in the Design and Access Statement will be of no consequence to this assault on the Green Belt which does not meet high quality design as required by NPPF. It is recognised that additional teaching space and sports facilities are needed at the School, however the proposal will have an impact on the openness and character of the area beyond the School boundary. The additional car parking required to accommodate extra staff and the expansion of the pupil numbers is of concern as traffic flow at the junction of Pine Grove, Georges Wood Road and the A1000 are not reflected accurately in the Transport Assessment which states that traffic conditions at peak times (2.2.1) on both Brookmans Avenue/Georges Wood Road and the A1000 is low. This is nonsense. The local bus service is poor and the train station some distance away so travel for those coming on these will be precarious. The likelihood is that more car journeys will result from additional numbers and this will impact on the village and main highway. The Assessment does not accurately the dreadful parking in Pine Grove around the School. A Green Travel Plan as outlined in the Travel Assessment and referencing HCC’s Local Transport Plan, is theoretically good but must form a Condition of the Planning Approval. There is scant mention of Sustainability in the Design and Access Statement which causes concern. We mention this because it is an element of the NPPF and the materials chosen are not particularly sustainable because of the manufacturing processes needed to produce them. There is no mention of heating and how this will be achieved - although there is one paragraph under the heading Sustainability, which refers to ventilation and insulation, all of which is covered by Building Regulations. Heating a huge void in a sports hall is a serious business and the environmental impact should not be ignored in a major application such as this.”

In addition, although the special circumstance proposed is the increase in school places, the poor design, lack of consideration for the Green Belt location and effect on the openness of the site, will cause detrimental impact and harm.

It is disingenuous (Page 17, Paragraph 3) of the school to state they do not

intend to increase staff numbers with the increase in pupils. An additional 210 pupils will surely require at the very least additional ancillary staff.

North Mymms Parish Council note that there is a new Travel Assessment. However, there are inaccuracies in it and other matters of concern. It should be noted that Georges Wood Road is a private road. Therefore whilst access across it is permissible it is a major concern for residents who have to pay to maintain it. Increased numbers will exacerbate the traffic on this route. It is noted that the majority of pupils and staff live more than 3 miles away. Therefore, there will be more journeys when the school expands, which alongside the inconsiderate parking in Pine Grove - the provision of 33 extra car parking spaces, will not improve the parking issues experienced in and around the area.

Staggered arrivals/departures does not allow for cars arriving early and parking whilst waiting for pupils to enter or leave the school via Pine Grove. Referring to Item 3.9 (Bus Timetable) – This clearly indicates that at least 2 buses (200 and 201) are unavailable for travel owing to times of arrival/departure nearest the school.

Referring to Item 3.12 (Rail Services). This information is inaccurate and misleading as Great Northern only operate 2 services out of peak morning rush hour and as Brookmans Park and Welham Green stations are not on the fast line, only, "All Stops" trains allow disembarkation during the morning rush hour and there are only 2 services in either direction in the afternoons, half an hour apart. Both train stations are over a mile from the school and indeed access to Welham Green station by walking is dangerous, particularly in the winter months when the weather can be inclement and it is dark.

The proposed design is a missed opportunity as an industrial box is not fitting for a rural location.

Case Officer

Mr David Elmore

Summary

This application is likely to be presented to DMC in June or July.

6/2019/0217/MAJ

Address

Northaw House Coopers Lane Northaw Potters Bar EN6 4NG

Proposal

Conversion of Northaw House to form 11 apartments (including refurbishment of existing single caretaker's flat) and underground parking area, the Ballroom Wing to form 2 dwellings, the Stable Block to form 1 dwelling, refurbishment of existing dwelling at Oak Cottage, construction of 2 Gate Lodge dwellings, 3 dwellings within the Walled Garden, 7 dwellings within the Settlement Area, refurbishment of the Walled Garden, refurbishment of access routes and reinstatement of old route, provision of hard and soft landscaping, car parking and supporting infrastructure

Applicant Mr L Williamson
Ward Northaw and Cuffley
Agent Mr T Waller
Call-In/Objection from The Clerk, Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council
Reason for Committee Decision 7/03/2019 20:59 - Not sustainable. Remote location. Public transport insufficient. Limited bus service. Village offers limited services and cars would be essential for shopping and employment.

New buildings on Green Belt are unacceptable as it has an adverse impact on openness. This is over development of the site.

Traffic access improvements at west end inadequate (simply narrowing junction and changing road markings & signage) and it is a dangerous bend. At east end, Design Statement is contradictory - is this a pedestrian or vehicular access? If vehicular, there is a dangerous bend and dip in the road.

The Special Circumstances of additional buildings funding work on historic buildings is not justified. This would impact on the Green Belt gap between Northaw and Potters Bar. The development is socially unsustainable as it is not mixed housing and has no affordable housing included.

22/03/2019 17:06 - The publicly available viability assessment is not sufficiently detailed to enable third parties to be in a position to make a judgement as to whether the extent of enabling development is reasonable. Whilst it is recognised that the parties to that assessment are proven professionals, the global figures in the published document are insufficient to enable third parties to take an informed view. The siting and design of the proposals within the walled garden and the settlement area are incongruous and out of character with existing buildings. Development should be phased such that the renovation should be done first. We expect there should be a S106 contribution.

22.3.19 Due to the number of years since the application was made we feel that this application would not meet the present day requirements for such an application to be approved e.g. No Special Circumstance, Design of Buildings, Infrastructure to support the buildings such as sewage & water supply. Circumstances have changed since the original application and now, the proposal, because of its location and remoteness from existing services and facilities would be an environmentally unsustainable form of development. No ecological survey or bat survey has been carried out (there are large trees on the site) and it is adjacent to a Local Nature Reserve (Fir and Ponds Wood). No environmental impact assessment or groundwater/drainage assessment has been made (the current Hook Lane Cottages are not on mains drainage).

No neighbours or consultees were considered in the original application. The current application is incorrect in that the site CAN BE SEEN from a public road. We have been advised that mature trees on the site have

TPO's.

Was the law in 1974 the same as it is today (work should be started within 5 years)? Was this development included in later applications when the site was sold off and developed, e.g. for the Oshwal Centre, Firs Wood Close We are curious to know why the site wasn't sold on to others with planning permissions when there was apparently no money to carry out the development originally. Also why didn't the development company who bought the site build the new properties? Was this because the planning permission had lapsed?

As this application could revolve around a point of law as to whether the planning application is still valid, we think that Planning should instruct Counsel for an opinion.

We trust that WHBC will take legal advice as to whether this planning application is still valid, is there a Statute of Limitation which would apply here and whether the original 1974 planning application can be overturned.

Case Officer

Mr William Myers

Summary

This application is likely to be presented to DMC in June.

6/2019/0218/LB

Address	Northaw House Coopers Lane Northaw Potters Bar EN6 4NG
Proposal	Conversion of Northaw House to form 11 apartments (including refurbishment of existing single caretaker's flat) and underground parking area, the Ballroom Wing to form 2 dwellings, the Stable Block to form 1 dwelling, refurbishment of existing dwelling at Oak Cottage, construction of 2 Gate Lodge dwellings, 3 dwellings within the Walled Garden, 7 dwellings within the Settlement Area, refurbishment of the Walled Garden, refurbishment of access routes and reinstatement of old route, provision of hard and soft landscaping, car parking and supporting infrastructure
Applicant	Mr L Williamson
Ward	Northaw and Cuffley
Agent	Mr T Waller
Call-In/Objection from	The Clerk, Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council
Reason for Committee Decision	7/03/2019 21:00 - Not sustainable. Remote location. Public transport insufficient. Limited bus service. Village offers limited services and cars would be essential for shopping and employment.

New buildings on Green Belt are unacceptable as it has an adverse impact on openness. This is over development of the site.

Traffic access improvements at west end inadequate (simply narrowing junction and changing road markings & signage) and it is a dangerous bend. At east end, Design Statement is contradictory - is this a pedestrian or vehicular access? If vehicular, there is a dangerous bend and dip in the road.

The Special Circumstances of additional buildings funding work on historic buildings is not justified. This would impact on the Green Belt gap between Northaw and Potters Bar. The development is socially unsustainable as it is not mixed housing and has no affordable housing included.

Case Officer

Mr William Myers

Summary

This application is likely to be presented to DMC in June.

6/2019/0455/FULL

Address 151 Campion Road Hatfield AL10 9FL
Proposal Change of use from class C3 dwelling house to class C4 HMO
Applicant Miss S Wood
Ward Hatfield Villages
Agent Mr P Pulzer
Call-In/Objection from Carrie Lloyd, Hatfield Town Council
Reason for Committee Decision 14/03/2019 10:43 - In accordance with the Amenity Standards for Licensable and Non-licensable Houses in Multiple Occupation (December 2015) the proposed kitchen will not meet the required standard as it fails to provide sufficient work space, indicates only on a single sink bowl, provides insufficient fridge/freezer space and does not have sufficient oven and hob provision.
The plans show a toilet without hand washing facilities.
Members question the means of escape from the loft room in case of fire.

Case Officer

Mr William Myers

Summary

This application is likely to be presented to DMC in June.

6/2019/0457/FULL

Address Land north of Harmer Green Lane Welwyn AL6 0ET
Proposal Erection of a 1 x eco house dwelling following demolition of existing stables

Applicant	Mr C Malcolm
Ward	Welwyn East
Agent	Ms A Idris-Town
Call-In/Objection from	Caroline Williams, Welwyn Parish Council
Reason for Committee Decision	26/03/2019 21:58 - Welwyn Parish Council at its Planning and Licensing committee meeting of the 26th March 2019 agreed to submit: MAJOR OBJECTION Welwyn Parish Council view the statement in 3.15 within the Planning Statement "the property remains affordable following construction" with skepticism and puzzlement as to how the property will remain affordable in the future. We do not recognise this development as an eco-house and therefore it does not form a special circumstance for development in the Green Belt.
Case Officer	Mr Tom Gabriel
Summary	This application is likely to be presented to DMC in June.

6/2019/0564/RM

Address	Land at Waterbeach Bericot Way and Shackleton Way Welwyn Garden City AL7 2PT
Proposal	Approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the erection of 21 dwellings on approved outline planning permission 6/2017/2202/OUTLINE dated 04/01/2018
Applicant	Chalkdene Developments
Ward	Panshanger
Agent	Mrs R Gray
Call-In/Objection from	Councillor Terry Mitchinson, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Reason for Committee Decision	I have been contacted by various people living nearby with regards the design and especially the placing of the affordable homes directly next to existing properties. There is also no mention of an entrance onto the main road (bericot way) rather than off waterbeach. Something I originally asked to be considered. I need to ensure people's views are represented; they already feel they are being ridden roughshod over with two of the strategic sites being in that part of WGC. They claim the 'consultation' by developers was cursory and aimed at disguising the final layout. I have tried the link and cannot get to the application itself to check details more carefully; it only links me to the calling in form.

Case Officer Ms A Christophi
Summary This application is likely to be presented to DMC in June or July.

6/2019/0616/HOUSE

Address 16 The Holdings Hatfield AL9 5HQ

Proposal Erection of single storey front and side extension, two storey side extension and part single part two storey rear extension to include rear Juliet balcony and glass feature to front elevation

Applicant Mr U Patel

Ward Hatfield East

Agent Mr S Cook

Call-In/Objection from Carrie Lloyd, Hatfield Town Council

Reason for Committee Decision 4/04/2019 14:59 - Members consider the extensions over development of the site , out of character with neighbouring properties and having an adverse impact on those neighbours. The mass and bulk of the extensions taken together are too big and contrary to NNPF and supplementary guidance.

Call-In/Objection from Councillor Peter Hebden, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council

Reason for Committee Decision
Comments:
I would like to call in this application if the planning officers are minded to support the application.
Although improved upon the previous application, the scale and design of the proposed changes fail to address the issue of any development being sympathetic to the streetscene and the development would be overbearing and out of character to neighbouring properties.
This application is contrary to Policies D1 and D2of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

Case Officer Mr William Myers
Summary This application is likely to be presented to DMC in June or July.

Address	55 Bishops Rise Hatfield AL10 9BX
Proposal	Erection of new dwelling
Applicant	Mr A Shah
Ward	Hatfield South West
Agent	Mr S Cook
Call-In/Objection from	Councillor James Broach, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Reason for Committee Decision	<p>23/04/2019 10:04 - Please see attached Word file for details of my reasons for call in.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I would like to call this application in to DMC, however I am happy for this to be refused under delegated powers if applicable. My reasons for the call in are as follows:</p> <p>The proposed development would result in an overdevelopment of the site, given the footprint of the proposed bungalow when compared to the existing HMO.</p> <p>The plans note 4 existing car parking spaces for the HMO – however no new parking spaces are proposed to accommodate the needs of this new site. Instead, the existing spaces for the HMO have been allocated to the annex. The applicant has failed in his duty to provide new parking spaces for this new development.</p> <p>I would therefore question whether the existing HMO will remain compliant with criterion HMO2 of the - Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document due to the loss of parking provision? I would also argue that the expectations of the WHBC Supplementary planning guidance have not been met, in particular section 4.1, which states “Residential development will generally be expected to accommodate all parking demand on site”. 4 spaces for the HMO plus this annex is woefully insufficient. The loss of the existing garage space would further exacerbate this.</p> <p>I also note that there is no access into the HMO from this annex. If this is the case, should this not be considered a separate dwelling as opposed to an annex?</p> <p>A neighbour on Lark Rise has shared some serious concerns with me in regards to this proposal, which I fully support. I particular note the point that this proposal would be out of keeping with the immediate surrounding area, raising concerns about whether this proposal would be compliant with Section 5.2 of the WHBC Supplementary Design Guidance (2005).</p> <p>I also have concerns that this proposal poses a severe risk to the enjoyment of outdoor amenity space to the occupants of No. 2 Lark Rise – which raises concerns around Section 5.7 of the SDG.</p> <p>In summary – this is a wholly inappropriate development for this area, and I urge you to refuse it based on the planning policies referenced above.</p>
Case Officer	Ms Lucy Hale

Summary

This application is likely to be presented to DMC in June or July.