

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 27 APRIL 2017
REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (PUBLIC PROTECTION, PLANNING AND
GOVERNANCE)

Appeal Decisions 09/03/2017 to 06/04/2017

1. DCLG No: APP/C1950/W/16/3152025

Application No: 6/2015/1997/MAJ

Appeal By: Fusion Hatfield Hotels Ltd

Site: Ramada Hatfield St Albans Road West Hatfield AL10 9RH

Proposal: Extension and refurbishment of the Grade II listed hotel (Use Class C1) following demolition of existing rear and side extensions. Erection of 9,586sqm student accommodation (Sui Generis), landscaping and associated works

Decision: Appeal Withdrawn

Delegated or DMC Decision: DMC

Summary:
2. DCLG No: APP/C1950/W/16/3161242

Application No: 6/2016/0375/PN10

Appeal By: Mr S Bryant

Site: 29 Newgate Street Village Hertford SG13 8RA

Proposal: Prior approval for the change of use of an agricultural building to a dwellinghouse (Class C3) and for associated operational development

Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Delegated or DMC Decision: Delegated

Summary: The General Permitted Development Order provides permitted development rights for such a change of use, subject to certain exceptions. These include restrictions on the extent to which an existing barn can be altered, and a limitation on extending a barn beyond its existing size. The Inspector agreed with the Council's view that there is considerable doubt around whether the existing barn is structurally able to accommodate the proposed changes, and may therefore require a new external structural wall. The building would also require a new floor and foundations. The Inspector therefore concluded that this amounted to a partial rebuilding of the barn, specifically precluded from being permitted development.

3. DCLG No: APP/C1950/D/16/3166143

Application No: 6/2016/1670/house

Appeal By: Mr A Rob

Site: 16 Daniells, Welwyn Garden City, AL7 1PZ

Proposal: Erection of first floor rear extension and alterations to openings

Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Delegated or
DMC Decision: Delegated

Summary: Whilst accepting that the proposed rear extension would be subordinate to the dwelling, the Inspector considered that this was only being achieved by adopting an unusual and incongruous design. Although this would not generally be visible from the public highway, the Inspector nevertheless considered that the proposal would detract from the uniform and distinct character of surrounding properties. It was also concluded that the extension would have an overbearing impact on the outlook from 19 Hems Lane.

Author: Andrew Windscheffel

Date: 13 April 2017