WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 1 DECEMBER 2022 REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (PLANNING)

Appeal Decisions 07/10/2022 to 18/11/2022

6/2022/0810/HOUSE		
DCLG No:	3302251	
Appeal By:	Mr & Mrs Cox	
Site:	36 Oaklands Avenue Hatfield AL9 7UJ	
Proposal:	Hip to gable roof conversion with installation of front facing rooflights and rear dormer.	
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed	
Decision Date:	07/10/2022	
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated	
Summary:	This appeal relates to refused planning application 6/2022/0810/HOUSE for a hip to gable roof conversion with installation of front facing rooflights and rear dormer. The hip to gable roof conversion and installation of rooflights were considered acceptable. The proposed dormer however was not considered acceptable due to the size, scale and positioning of the dormer, with the glazing of the dormer also considered out of keeping with the fenestration of the dwelling. The Inspector stated that the proposed hip to gable roof conversion would not appear out of place and that the proposed rooflights would be modest and unobtrusive. In consideration of the dormer, the Inspector stated that the dormer would have a very considerable scale and rectilinear bulk which would entirely dominate the host's sloping roof and result in a top heavy appearance. The impact of this would be exacerbated by the proposed glazing which would be out of proportion with the glazing in the floors below. The Inspector therefore concluded that the dormer would not represent good design and would therefore be in conflict with District Plan Policies D1 and D2, the Supplementary Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework. The appeal was dismissed.	
6/2021/2042/FULL		
DCLG No:	APP/C1950/W/22/3296508	
Appeal By:	Mr Mohammad Choudhry	

1 bike store to hold 6 cycles and Decision: Appeal Dismissed Decision Date: 17/10/2022 Delegated or DMC Delegated Decision: Summary: This was an application for a retr dwelling to a 6-bedroom House in store and a bin store. The applicate concentration of HMO's excee Multiple Occupancy Supplement: because there would be an inade applicant proposed 3 parking spathe parking spaces were opposite owned garage and the second w owned garage (see site plan attaled applicant proposed 3 parking spathe parking spaces were opposite owned garage (see site plan attaled applicant proposed 3 parking spathe parking spaces were opposite owned garage and the second w owned garage and the second w owned garage (see site plan attaled applicant proposed 3 parking, the hyperbalant of the sound garage (see site plan attaled applicant proposed 3 parking, spathe parking spaces were opposite owned garage (see site plan attaled to degradation in garden, which in turn could have surrounding area. As such, the alean development to take account of the and add to the overall character. In terms of parking, the Inspector short of the minimum dimensions Standards 2014 and the space in the use of that garage for parking useable for the majority of vehicle site is in a sustainable location at users, the nature of occupancy is demand for on-street parking in a pressures. For these reasons the street parking. The appeal was dismissed Metappeal was dismissed	nto a 6-bedroom HMO with 3 parking spaces and
1 bike store to hold 6 cycles and Decision: Appeal Dismissed Decision Date: 17/10/2022 Delegated or DMC Delegated Decision: Summary: This was an application for a retr dwelling to a 6-bedroom House in store and a bin store. The application for a retr dwelling to a 6-bedroom House in store and a bin store. The application for sexce Multiple Occupancy Supplement because there would be an inade applicant proposed 3 parking spathe parking spaces were opposition owned garage and the second wo owned garage (see site plan atta The Inspector agreed that the ch under Criteria HMO1 of the HMC0 intensively used property than th this could lead to degradation in garden, which in turn could have surrounding area. As such, the a and add to the overall character. In terms of parking, the Inspector short of the minimum dimensions Standards 2014 and the space in the use of that garage for parking useable for the majority of vehiclion site is in a sustainable location an users, the nature of occupancy is </th <th></th>	
Decision Date: 17/10/2022 Delegated or DMC Delegated Delegated Summary: This was an application for a retr dwelling to a 6-bedroom House in store and a bin store. The application concentration of HMO's excee Multiple Occupancy Supplements because there would be an inade applicant proposed 3 parking spathe parking spaces were opposition owned garage and the second wowned garage (see site plan attal The Inspector agreed that the chunder Criteria HMO1 of the HMC0 intensively used property than this could lead to degradation in garden, which in turn could have surrounding area. As such, the a and context of the local area and development to take account of t and add to the overall character. In terms of parking, the Inspector standards 2014 and the space in the use of that garage for parking useable for the majority of vehiclisite is in a sustainable location are users, the nature of occupancy is demand for on-street parking in a pressures. For these reasons the street parking. The appeal was dismissed Magnetic parking.	
Delegated or DMC Decision: Delegated Summary: This was an application for a retr dwelling to a 6-bedroom House in store and a bin store. The applica- the concentration of HMO's exce Multiple Occupancy Supplements because there would be an inade applicant proposed 3 parking spa- the parking spaces were opposite owned garage and the second w owned garage (see site plan atta The Inspector agreed that the ch under Criteria HMO1 of the HMC intensively used property than the this could lead to degradation in garden, which in turn could have surrounding area. As such, the a and context of the local area and development to take account of t and add to the overall character. In terms of parking, the Inspector short of the minimum dimensions Standards 2014 and the space in the use of that garage for parking useable for the majority of vehicle site is in a sustainable location at users, the nature of occupancy is demand for on-street parking in a pressures. For these reasons the street parking. The appeal was dismissed	
Decision: This was an application for a retridevelling to a 6-bedroom House in store and a bin store. The application for a retridevelling to a 6-bedroom House in store and a bin store. The application of HMO's excernation of HMO's excernation of HMO's excernation of HMO's excernation and a pilorant proposed 3 parking spathe parking spaces were opposite owned garage and the second work owned garage and the second work owned garage (see site plan attaled to degrade the the parking spaces were opposite owned garage (see site plan attaled to degrade the this could lead to degradation in garden, which in turn could have surrounding area. As such, the a and context of the local area and development to take account of the and add to the overall character. In terms of parking, the Inspector short of the minimum dimensiones Standards 2014 and the space in the use of that garage for parking useable for the majority of vehicle site is in a sustainable location an users, the nature of occupancy is demand for on-street parking in a pressures. For these reasons the street parking. The appeal was dismissed	
dwelling to a 6-bedroom House in store and a bin store. The applica- the concentration of HMO's exce Multiple Occupancy Supplementa- because there would be an inade applicant proposed 3 parking spa- the parking spaces were opposite owned garage and the second w owned garage (see site plan atta The Inspector agreed that the ch under Criteria HMO1 of the HMC intensively used property than the this could lead to degradation in garden, which in turn could have surrounding area. As such, the a and context of the local area and development to take account of t and add to the overall character. In terms of parking, the Inspector short of the minimum dimensiones Standards 2014 and the space in the use of that garage for parking useable for the majority of vehiclu- site is in a sustainable location an users, the nature of occupancy is demand for on-street parking in a pressures. For these reasons the street parking. The appeal was dismissed	
under Criteria HMO1 of the HMO intensively used property than the this could lead to degradation in garden, which in turn could have surrounding area. As such, the a and context of the local area and development to take account of t and add to the overall character. In terms of parking, the Inspector short of the minimum dimensions Standards 2014 and the space ir the use of that garage for parking useable for the majority of vehicle site is in a sustainable location at users, the nature of occupancy is demand for on-street parking in a pressures. For these reasons the street parking. The appeal was dismissed	ospective change of use from a residential Multiple Occupation (HMO) with parking, a bike tion was refused as the development resulted in eding the 20% threshold in the WHBC Houses in ry Planning Document 2012 (HMO SPD) and quate level of car parking provision. The ces as part of the application. However, two of the property, one of which was inside a council as located to the front of a separate council ched).
short of the minimum dimensions Standards 2014 and the space in the use of that garage for parking useable for the majority of vehicle site is in a sustainable location an users, the nature of occupancy is demand for on-street parking in a pressures. For these reasons the street parking. The appeal was dismissed 6/2022/0893	ange of use would exceed the 20% threshold SPD which would potentially lead to a more e original residential house. It was considered that the external appearance of the property and its an adverse impact on the street scene and opeal scheme would fail to respect the character would be at odds with the NPPF which requires the different roles and characters of different areas
6/2022/0893	found that the garage parking space would fall in the Council's Interim Policy for Car Parking front of the second garage would likely prevent , therefore these spaces would not realistically be s. The wording also sets out that although the id some of the current occupiers may not be car likely to change in future and this could increase n area which already experiences parking development would not provide adequate off-
	HOUSE
DCLG No: APP/C1950/D/22/3301686	
Appeal By: Mr Bollampally	
Site: 1 Stonecross Road Hatfield AL10	0HR
Proposal: Erection of a single storey, part to	vo storey rear extension
Decision: Appeal Dismissed	

Decision Date:	31/10/2022
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	This appeal relates to refused planning application 6/2022/0893/HOUSE at 1 Stonecross Road for the erection of a single storey, part two storey rear extension. It was considered due to the size, scale and concentration of the development to the rear of the property, the proposal would appear overbearing towards the application dwelling and would detract from the character of the area. Furthermore, it was considered that the design of the development would interrupt the uniformity of the eaves, a form that was replicated at each end of terraced dwellings within the north side of Stonecross Road. The Inspector noted that there were inconsistencies within the plans and stated it was unclear how the distinctive corbel would be retained. The Inspector deduced that the elevations and floor plans were consistent with one another and assumed those to be correct rather than the roof plan. The Inspector stated that the side facing eaves with the prominence of rainwater goods would compete with and detract from the distinctive appearance of the gable parapet and corbel and would therefore represent a poor standard of design. The appeal was therefore dismissed.