

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 20 JANUARY 2022
REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING

Appeal Decisions 26/11/2021 to 07/01/2022

6/2021/0163/FULL	
DCLG No:	APP/C1950/W/21/3274793
Appeal By:	Mr R Nicholas
Site:	Unit 1-3 51 Welham Manor Welham Green Hatfield AL9 7EL
Proposal:	Erection of 7 dwellinghouses
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Decision Date:	26/11/2021
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	<p>This appeal was for the erection of seven dwellings located within the Metropolitan Green Belt in Welham Manor in Welham Green. It is currently an used industrial plot well screened at the end of a residential cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Green Belt</p> <p>The Planning Inspector agreed that the application was to be assessed under part g of paragraph 149 of the NPPF for limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector also agreed that the application site was PDL as per the previous appeal on the site.</p> <p>The principal dispute between the parties on this main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the openness of the Green Belt, which is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. In this regard, the parties disagree regarding the exact extent of the proposed increase in footprint when compared to the existing buildings on site, and in relation to the scale of the reduction in the amount of hardstanding that would occur.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector said that on the evidence before him, it is not possible to determine which figures were correct. However, it was clear that the increase in footprint would not be excessive, and that the</p>

proposal would materially, and potentially significantly, reduce the amount of hardstanding on site. Furthermore, the proposal would consolidate built development close to the existing residential area, and would provide an area of landscaping, close to the wider Green Belt. Consequently, the proposal would have a limited effect on the openness of the Green Belt in purely spatial terms. This was interesting point as the information provided within the planning application did not allow for these assessments to be undertaken due to its inaccurate nature.

Nevertheless, currently the site is largely shielded from view from Welham Manor. The proposal would open up views into the site. Several proposed dwellings, all of which would be much taller than the existing buildings on site, would be visible. When considered collectively, the proposed dwellings would involve development of a much greater scale and massing than that which exists.

Additionally, the rustic and fairly unobtrusive buildings currently on site would be replaced by buildings of a far more substantial and imposing nature, in an essentially suburban layout with associated car parking and domestic paraphernalia. As such, the proposal would have a greater visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. For the same reasons, the proposal would conflict with the purpose of including land in the Green Belt in terms of its assistance in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with paragraph 149 g) of the Framework. Therefore, the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of the Framework and emerging Policy SADM 34 of the Draft Local Plan. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.

Character and appearance

The proposal involves the felling of a number of trees, including 'T2', a tall Lombardy poplar which is prominent in views along Welham Manor and which positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area. 'T2' is of dubious structural condition with a limited safe useful life expectancy. However, has a Useful Life Expectancy of 20+ years. Therefore, if it were not felled, it is reasonable to conclude that its positive contribution to the character of the area would likely persist for some time

A new orchard and a significant amount of planting would be introduced on the southern part of the site. However, all this would take time to establish and mature. In the meantime, tree 'T2' and several of the trees to the northern part of the site would be lost. As these trees serve as a pleasing counterpoint to the urban context of Welham Manor and are all part of the Community Forest, this would materially undermine the character and appearance of the surrounding area

The frontages of the new houses were dominated by car parking and

hardstanding, with little relief provided via soft landscaping. Conditions could be imposed to ensure that permeable and contrasting materials are used. However, due to the extent of the proposed hardstanding in this location, this would not adequately mitigate the harm caused to the appearance of the area. Therefore this point conflicted with the SPD.

The proposed placement of the refuse storage units in front of all of the proposed new houses would have a harmful impact on the appearance of the streetscene. The Planning Inspectorate said that the appearance and size of these could be conditioned. However a condition requiring details of alternative locations for refuse storage would not be appropriate, as this would conflict with the details shown on the submitted plans. This is a useful point for use all following discussions on material details on the plans.

There Planning Inspector concluded that the design approach was poor and conflicted with National and Local Planning policies.

Live/Work Unit

The site is currently used for commercial purposes, including vehicle repair and maintenance. There is conflicting evidence before me regarding the number of persons employed on site, but the appellant's figure of approximately 6 employees appears reasonable considering the current use and size of the site. Little evidence has been provided to substantiate the appellant's assertions that the employment floorspace is of poor quality or that the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties are negatively impacted by the ongoing commercial activity on site.

Indeed, the activities on site are almost completely screened from Welham Manor by mature vegetation and trees. Moreover, I have no reason to doubt the representations of interested parties that the businesses provide valuable commercial services to the local community and provide support for young people via work experience and apprenticeships. This leads me to the opinion that the continued use of the site for employment purposes would help to maintain the economic conditions of the local area.

Each proposed dwelling would have a dedicated homeworking gallery. This may be of particular benefit in light of the ongoing coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. Nevertheless, the type of work that can be undertaken from home is very different from that currently undertaken on site. I consider that it is unlikely to compensate for the loss of the commercial operations which currently operate on site and which benefit the local community. Similarly, the evidence does not demonstrate that any 'live-work' mixed use scheme would not be viable, as required by Policy EMP8 of the District Plan. Therefore again the Planning Inspector agreed with my assessment.

Swept path analysis

	<p>The Planning Inspector accepted the appellant's late submission of a swept path analysis although this was submitted after the delegated report had been passed to the management team as a refusal so we refused to accept it as part of the application process and this formed a reason for refusal.</p> <p>Other matters</p> <p>The Planning Inspector afforded little weight to the appellants argument about housing supply considering the low number of proposed dwellings.</p> <p>The appeal was dismissed.</p>
--	---

6/2021/1134/HOUSE

DCLG No:	APP/C1950/D/21/3279070
Appeal By:	Mr Stuart Carnegie
Site:	9 Codicote Road Welwyn AL6 9ND
Proposal:	Erection of a first floor extension and alterations to ground floor layout
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Decision Date:	29/11/2021
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	<p>This was a proposal for a first floor extension and alterations to the ground floor layout. It was refused as the resultant dwelling, by virtue of its size, design and appearance would be substantially greater in scale and mass and would contrast greatly with that of the existing dwelling in a location which would be likely to appear prominent and potentially exposed to distant views.</p> <p>The Inspector agreed that the proposal would substantially increase the height and scale of the existing dwelling, but said that this alone was not sufficient grounds to refuse the application, particularly as the scale of the dwelling could be increased significantly under PD (Class AA). The proposed materials (off white render, grey composite cladding and an artificial black slate roof) were not considered to result in any harm to the building as it would have a single matching finish. However, the mixture of different styles and designs (in particular the revised roof form, white painted timber columns and two storey front canopy) on the resultant building were found to contrast with the more traditional character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The Inspector disagreed with the appellant that the scheme should be treated as a replacement dwelling, as it should be assessed on the basis it was submitted. Limited weight was also given to a revised PD scheme that was submitted during the time the appeal was being considered as no drawings of that scheme were provided.</p>

The appeal was dismissed.

6/2021/0597/HOUSE

DCLG No:	APP/C1950/D/21/3275604
Appeal By:	Mr Kevin Canning
Site:	7 Georges Wood Road Brookmans Park Hatfield AL9 7BY
Proposal:	Erection of railings and electric gates
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Decision Date:	30/11/2021
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	<p>This appeal was for application 6/2021/0597/HOUSE, 7 Georges Wood Road, for the installation of railings and electric fences to the front of the property.</p> <p>The application was refused on the basis that the siting, height and design of the development would result in an incongruous and unduly dominant addition to the street scene, which would fail to respect the character and appearance of the spacious and open character of the area.</p> <p>The Inspector stated that the size of the front garden of the application site, with the set back of the proposed gates and railings from the road, could potentially be appropriate, subject to suitable siting, scale and substantial landscaping to mitigate the proposal's visual impact. However, the Inspector found the submitted drawings to be inaccurate with the absence of details regarding land levels and landscaping details, and consequently found the height and position of the railings and gates would harmfully detract from the pleasant, soft-landscaped character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The appeal was dismissed.</p>

6/2021/1692/HOUSE

DCLG No:	APP/C1950/D/21/3281268
Appeal By:	Gareth Tongue
Site:	48 Brookside Crescent Cuffley Potters Bar EN6 4QN
Proposal:	Erection of a two storey side extension and alterations to fenestration
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Decision Date:	30/11/2021
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated

Summary:	<p>This appeal relates to application 6/2021/1692/HOUSE, 48 Brookside Crescent EN6 4QN. The proposal was for the erection of a two storey side extension with alterations to fenestration. The application site is located on a corner plot within the residential cul-de-sac of Brookside Crescent.</p> <p>The application was refused on the basis that the scale, bulk and design of the proposal would fail to respect and relate to the application dwelling and wider area, as well as resulting in harm to the living conditions of adjoining neighbours by virtue of appearing overbearing and unduly dominant.</p> <p>The Inspector stated that the development would not complement and reflect the design and character of the dwelling and would not represent visually attractive development. The Inspector did acknowledge that the appellant may have based the design of the proposal on similar development noted within the wider area of Cuffley but stated that the appeal has been determined on its own merits in the context of its surroundings, noting the Supplementary Design Guidance emphasises the importance of taking account of the street context of the development as opposed to the character of the settlement overall.</p> <p>The Inspector continued and stated that while the development would be sizeable and noticeable, the proposal would not be so extensive to materially harm the outlook of neighbouring houses.</p> <p>However, the Inspector concluded that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area, and consequently the appeal was dismissed.</p>
6/2020/3133/HOUSE	
DCLG No:	APP/C1950/D/21/3270018
Appeal By:	Mr & Mrs Pryke
Site:	Green Lodge Ponsbourne Park Newgate Street Hertford SG13 8NH
Proposal:	Erection of single storey extension to link with converted garage
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Decision Date:	30/11/2021
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	<p>This appeal was for applications 6/2020/3133/HOUSE and 6/2021/3134/LB, both relating to Green Lodge, Ponsbourne Park, for the erection of a single storey extension to glazed link with the garage, which was to be converted into a habitable space. Supplementary information submitted with these applications described the development as assisting in meeting the evolving needs of occupants within the address.</p>

The application site is washed over by the Metropolitan Green Belt and the application dwelling is a grade II listed building.

The application was refused on the basis of the development resulting in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling and thereby representing inappropriate development in the Green Belt, with a loss of Green Belt openness. No very special circumstances were considered to exist in this case. The application was also refused on the basis of that the development would materially harm the character and significance of the grade II listed building. While this was considered to result in less than substantial harm, in this case there were no public benefits to outweigh the harm. The application was also refused due to insufficient information submitted to allow the local authority to assess whether a European Protected Species (bats) would be adversely affected as a result of the development.

The Inspector stated that that the development would be around four fifths larger than that of the original building and described the development as a substantially enlarged mass with a more sprawling, approximately L-shaped footprint. The Inspector commented that the same ridge height of the extension to the existing dwelling would draw attention to the side extension's lack of subservience and enlarged building mass. The Inspector stated the development would be a disproportionate addition within the Green Belt and would not fall within the relevant exceptions, and so the proposal would be inappropriate development which would by definition harm the Green Belt.

The Inspector stated that the proposed glazed link would be visible from various viewpoints from the appeal site, Newgate Street and neighbouring land, and would disrupt views to the open lawned garden area and woodland beyond. Furthermore, the Inspector stated the development is likely to result in intensified domestic occupation and paraphernalia at the appeal site, and this with the substantially sized extension would draw further attention to the enlarged dwelling. The Inspector stated that these factors would result in some harm to the openness of the Green Belt, which would be regarded as additional harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness.

The Inspector continued, stating that the L-shaped sprawl of the connected building mass would detract from the buildings distinctive symmetrical character, compactness, modesty of scale and historic primacy, as well as disrupting the historic openness of the lodge's grounds. The Inspector considered that the proposed glazed link would depart from the lodge's historical architectural style and materials palette. The Inspector concluded that the combination of incongruent massing, design and material would distract from the historic form of the listed building, with the overly dominant proposal eroding the historic legibility of the listed building, and consequently the development would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building. The Inspector found the harm to the listed building to be less than substantial, with insufficient public benefits identified to outweigh

	<p>the identified harm to the heritage asset.</p> <p>In regards to the European Protected Species, the Inspector found that the proposal would not harm bats and subject to a biodiversity enhancement being secured by planning condition, the proposal would be acceptable in biodiversity terms.</p> <p>In establishing the development as inappropriate within the Green Belt and by definition harm the Green Belt, the Inspector considered that the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal did not exist in this case.</p> <p>The appeal was dismissed.</p>
6/2021/0972/HOUSE	
DCLG No:	APP/C1950/D/21/3279335
Appeal By:	Ms. G. Haslop
Site:	26 Lower Mardley Hill Welwyn AL6 0UQ
Proposal:	Erection of two storey side and rear extensions and a first floor rear extension, insertion of 6 x side facing dormer windows and 3 x side facing roof lights to facilitate extension of existing first floor plan. Alterations to fenestration on existing front, side and rear elevations and demolition of outbuilding attached to existing garage, to facilitate erection of new detached outbuilding.
Decision:	Appeal Allowed with Conditions
Decision Date:	03/12/2021
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	<p>This appeal relates to the refusal of a householder application for the erection of two storey side and rear extensions and a first floor rear extension, insertion of 6 x side facing dormer windows and 3 x side facing roof lights to facilitate extension of existing first floor plan.</p> <p>The planning application was refused for the following reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By virtue of the substantial width and bulk added at two storey level by the proposed side and rear extensions and the introduction of 4 additional dormers, the development would fail to be subordinate in scale or appearance to the original dwelling resulting in an overly dominant addition which would fail to respect the form, scale and character of the original dwelling and others in the area. <p>The existing dwelling is a gable fronted dormer bungalow with flat roof extensions to either side and to the rear.</p> <p>The application site is situated within the part Lower Mardley Road which slopes downwards from north to south and comprises a row of approximately seven frontage buildings in large spacious plots. It was</p>

noted that the properties vary significantly in terms design, scale and materials, and dormers, of varying styles and numbers, are present on the existing dwelling as well as elsewhere within the immediate surrounding area.

The Inspector highlights that whilst the proposed extension would add bulk to the dwelling at first floor level, the proposal would not increase the maximum width, depth, eaves or ridge height of the existing dwelling. It was also noted that whilst the number of dormers would increase, these would be smaller than the existing dormer windows and would be symmetrical in terms of their size and their spacing across each side of the roof. The Inspector therefore took the view that the proposed replacement of the existing and varied mix of incongruous flat roof extensions, dormer windows and materials with a single coherent and well balanced design would enhance the appearance of the dwelling and its immediate surroundings.

Consequently the appeal was allowed with conditions, one of which requiring the submission of material samples.

6/2020/1873/FULL

DCLG No:	APP/C1950/W/20/3260692
Appeal By:	A. Akintayo
Site:	Land Opposite No. 9 Rollswood Road Welwyn AL6 9TX
Proposal:	Erection of a Three-bedroom dwelling with associated works.
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Decision Date:	08/12/2021
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	<p>This was an appeal following the refusal of a full application for the erection of a three-bedroom dwelling with associated works. The planning application was refused for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• By virtue of the size, scale, bulk, massing and visual prominence of the proposed dwelling, and its siting in an undeveloped parcel of land in the Green Belt, the proposal would result in substantial harm to the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt, while also failing to serve the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.• By virtue of its location and its remoteness from existing services and facilities and, in particular, from existing infrastructure in the area, the proposal is contrary to the settlement strategy of the Council and represents an environmentally unsustainable form of development.• By virtue of its size and siting on this well- wooded plot, the proposed development would result in loss of the many of the trees on the site and a corresponding loss of wildlife habitat and biodiversity, which could not be mitigated through planting due to the size of the proposed dwelling on the site and its proximity to the site's boundaries with a corresponding impact upon the character and amenity of the area.

The Inspector stated that the loss of the group of trees onsite would significantly diminish the contribution the appeal site makes to the character and appearance of the area and also result in the loss of wildlife habitat and biodiversity. There would also be insufficient remaining space within the site following development to plant a sufficient number of local species of trees to compensate for the loss of those existing. The Inspector also notes that no ecological study has been provided to demonstrate that the loss of wildlife habitat and biodiversity would not be harmful or that it could be adequately mitigated for.

Furthermore, the Inspector states that the 3 storey height, contemporary form and large footprint of the proposal dwelling would dominate the plot and this harm was also considered to be compounded by the dwelling not falling within a continuous built-up frontage. Therefore it would result in the encroachment of built-form into an established woodland, incongruous with the prevailing pattern of development on the road which is highly visible from public vantage points.

Lastly, the Inspector stated that the scheme does not fall within the limited infilling exception in Policy SADM34 as it is not located within a village in the Green Belt, nor does the development fall within any other exceptions. The proposal therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Moderate harm was also identified to its character, openness and permanence. The Inspector states that there were no very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the scheme's harm to the Green Belt. No weight was given to the absence of a 5 year housing land supply as the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where policies in the Framework protect areas of particular importance, such as Green Belt, and provide a clear reason for refusal. Furthermore, the dwelling was not considered to be of an outstanding and innovative design in the Green Belt.

The appeal was therefore dismissed.

ENF/2017/0173

DCLG No:	APP/C1950/C/21/3271233
Appeal By:	Mr Ramos
Site:	22 Selwyn Drive Hatfield AL10 9NJ
Proposal:	Erection of two storey rear extension
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Decision Date:	10/12/2021
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated

Summary:

This appeal was against an Enforcement Notice served under reference ENF/2017/0173 on 03 March 2021 for the unauthorised erection of a two-storey rear extension to a semi-detached dwelling.

6 Months were given to either:

- i) Demolish and remove the two-storey extension OR
- ii) Modify the two-storey rear extension to comply with the terms of Planning Permission reference 6/2019/2941/HOUSE dated 20 April 2020

Then subsequently:

- iii) Remove from the Land all materials, debris, waste, plant and equipment associated with requirements i) or ii) as detailed above.

The appeal was made on grounds (a) and grounds (f) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. The appeal was dismissed on both grounds and the Enforcement Notice upheld in a decision dated 10 December 2021 meaning the appellants now have until the 10 June 2022 to comply with the requirements of the notice.

In considering the appeal under ground (a), that Planning Permission should be granted the Inspector, considered the difference between the approved scheme 6/2019/2941/HOUSE and the development as built. The inspector considered that the noticeably higher eaves height compared to the main dwelling (and the previous approval) resulted in an awkward and contrived connection to the main roof furthermore the contrasting brickwork was inharmonious with the main dwelling. It was considered to be clearly visible and harmful to the appreciation of the host property within the streetscene and the immediate locality.

It was not felt that staining the brickwork or other minor alterations would overcome the harm caused by the overall poor standard of design particularly relating to the eaves and roof issues. It was also considered to be unacceptably dominant and oppressive for the amenity of the neighbouring property at 24 Selwyn Drive.

The Inspector also noted that whilst the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan (2005) was relatively old the policies should not be considered out of date as there were no substantive conflicts or inconsistencies with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 nor was it clear that any policies within the Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council Draft Local Plan as submitted for examination would change the overall assessment.

The extension as built was considered to conflict with policies D1 and D2 and the Councils Supplementary Design Guidance 2005. It would also conflict with the design principles of the Framework with no mitigating circumstances to warrant deviation from the overall Development Plan.

The appeal under ground (a) was therefore dismissed.

In terms of the appeal under ground (f), there was found to be no substantive case put forward as to why the notice requirements would be considered excessive. As such the appeal under ground (f) was also dismissed.

The Enforcement Notice was upheld, and Planning Permission was refused for the deemed application.

6/2020/1919/FULL

DCLG No: APP/C1950/W/21/3273797

Appeal By: Mr & Mrs A Leake

Site: 3 Hangmans Lane Welwyn AL6 0TJ

Proposal: Erection of new dwelling to include replacement garage for donor property.

Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Decision Date: 16/12/2021

Delegated or DMC Decision: Delegated

Summary: This was an appeal against a refusal of planning permission for the erection of a new dwelling and a replacement garage for the donor property.

The application which this appeal relates to was refused as the proposed dwelling would detract from the character of development in the area resulting in a cramped form of development that would be contrary to the existing street layout and be out of keeping with the established character and more spacious qualities of the immediate surroundings. There were a number of applications at this site in the past for a new dwelling, all of which were refused.

In assessing the overall sense of place in the area, the planning inspector highlighted that the overriding character was individual suburban houses with well landscaped plots and generous gardens. Potential benefits of the proposed development were considered to be diluted by the additional built form that would be created (new bungalow, detached garage and separate driveway), which would adversely alter and further suburbanise the relatively undeveloped garden space and landscape. As such, the proposal was viewed to represent overdevelopment of the site which would be cramped and would allow construction over a significant area of garden.

In addition, the Inspector found the proposed cupola feature and flat roof dormers to be uncharacteristic of the area as they would visibly increase the massing and scale of the roof of the proposed bungalow, compared to the more slender design of dormers nearby with pitched roofs.

The appeal was dismissed.

6/2021/1050/HOUSE

DCLG No: APP/C1950/D/21/3280941

Appeal By:	Barry Allport
Site:	41 Selwyn Crescent Hatfield AL10 9NW
Proposal:	Erection of a two storey side extension and installation of rear dormer to facilitate loft conversion
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Decision Date:	16/12/2021
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	<p>This appeal was for the erection of a two storey side extension and installation of rear dormer to facilitate a loft conversion.</p> <p>Due to the positioning of the application dwelling within its plot and the orientation of an adjoining neighbour, the proposed two storey side extension had a complex roof structure to avoid being less than 1m from the adjoining neighbour in line with the Council's Supplementary Design Guidance. As a result however, the complex roof form of the extension appeared discordant with the application dwelling and discordant with the simple roof forms of the area. Furthermore, the design, size and scale of the proposed dormer window would fail to be subservient to the roof of the application dwelling, as well as failing to respect and relate to the character of the area.</p> <p>The Inspector stated that the extension would result in an awkward roof juncture farther into the plot which would present a partial and foreshortened roof form that would in no way reflect the high quality of architectural details and features that would add interest, quality and variety to the streetscene. While it was acknowledged similar roof junctions and complex roof forms were apparent in the area, the Inspector had no information as to the precise reasons why these extensions came to be and as such only gave them limited weight.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Inspector stated the dormer would represent an overly large addition to this property and would dominate the roof of the application dwelling, further stating that this could easily be avoided through a more sensitive design.</p> <p>The appeal was therefore dismissed.</p>
6/2021/1107/HOUSE	
DCLG No:	APP/C1950/D/21/3281042
Appeal By:	Mr & Mrs M Jaufarally
Site:	379 St Albans Road West Hatfield AL10 9RU
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey rear extension, a two storey rear, front and side extension, a roof extension and insertion of a rear box dormer.
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Decision Date:	16/12/2021

Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	<p>This was an appeal following the refusal of a householder application for the erection of a single storey rear extension, a two storey rear, front and side extension, a roof extension and insertion of a rear box dormer which was refused design grounds.</p> <p>The Inspector stated that the proposal represents an overdevelopment of this site and would overwhelm the existing property. It was also considered that the proposals would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the wider streetscene through the introduction of a large extension to the front and side and the subsequent loss of the distinctive hipped roof and replacement with gable. The inspector gave some weight to the needs of the family to extend their accommodation for an expanding family and elderly relatives, however it was considered that the proposals would lead to a substantial increase in the scale, bulk and massing of the existing property to such an extent as to dominate both the existing house and to undermine the wider character of the streetscene.</p> <p>The appeal was therefore dismissed.</p>

6/2021/1026/ADV

DCLG No:	APP/C1950/Z/21/3279520
Appeal By:	Jack Robson
Site:	9 Osborn House Howardsgate Welwyn Garden City AL8 6AT
Proposal:	Installation of 2 sets of internally illuminated fascia text and 1 externally illuminated projection sign
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Decision Date:	31/12/2021
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	<p>This was an appeal for two internally illuminated fascia signs and 1 externally illuminated projection signs at the two willows pub in Welwyn Garden City. These were retrospective signs.</p> <p>The pub is located within a conservation area. The Planning Inspector says the conservation area derives significance in part from buildings that have similar features to the pub. It also gains significance from substantial linear open spaces and a range of commercial uses at ground floor level. These features are evident along Howardsgate. There are also a range of fascia and projecting advertisements in the town centre, many of which are illuminated.</p> <p>The fascia advertisements at the pub are in a highly visible position. The layout and method of illuminating the fascia text gives these advertisements a contemporary appearance that detracts from and contrasts poorly with the architectural and historic interest of the pub and thus harms its contribution to the conservation area. The advertisements are visually intrusive and incongruous additions to the</p>

	<p>pub which harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector says whilst there are projecting advertisements in the area, the projection sign at the pub occupies a highly visible position and is higher above street level and more prominent than many projecting advertisements in the vicinity. In combination with the fascia advertisements and because of the projection sign's prominence, size, circular shape, and the amount of illuminated text and detailing on it, which includes examples of the food and drink served and the site's address, the projection sign results in further harm to the pub and the conservation area.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector didn't agree with the appellant's example of other illuminated signs at Zizzi's, the fact that there were other signs previously in situ at the pub as these were significantly different or that Covid played a part for the need for the signs.</p> <p>The appeal was dismissed.</p>
6/2021/0071/LB	
DCLG No:	APP/C1950/Y/21/3287953
Appeal By:	LW Developments Ltd
Site:	Northaw House Coopers Lane Northaw Potters Bar EN6 4NG
Proposal:	Repair, refurbishment and 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 new Gate Lodge dwellings, 4 new dwellings on the East Drive, 3 new dwellings within the Walled Garden, 7 new 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.
Decision:	Late Appeal turned away
Decision Date:	05/01/2022
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	PINS are unable to accept appeals unless all the essential supporting documents are received before the 6 months deadline expires. As the documents were received after the end of the appeal period, they were unable to take any action on the appeal(s).