

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – **17 August 2017**
REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (PUBLIC PROTECTION, PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE)

Appeal Decisions 07/07/2017 to 03/08/2017

6/2016/1466/LAWP	
DCLG No:	APP/C1950/X/16/3166163:
Appeal By:	Mr & Mrs Miller
Site:	16 The Firs Park Woodside Lane Hatfield AL9 6DG
Proposal:	Certificate of lawful use or development in respect of the proposed use of land within the existing caravan site boundaries for the siting of static caravans without restriction on the layout of the land or the number of caravans up to a maximum of 8 caravan units on the site at any one time
Decision:	Appeal Allowed
Decision Date:	11/07/2017
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	LDCs have already been granted to confirm that the appeal site is part of the planning unit of The Firs Park, and to confirm that addition of two caravans would be lawful. The main issue was whether six additional caravans would in fact amount to a material change in the use of the site, by virtue of a change in its character and impact on the surroundings. The Inspector considered that the increase in the number of caravans would be modest (from 46 to 52), and did not envisage that this would result in any off-site impacts such as on the highway network. Because of the location of the additional caravans at the rear of the site and proximity of mature trees, the Inspector also judged that public views of the site would not be materially changed. It was therefore concluded that there were no reasons not to grant an LDC.
6/2016/1308/LAWP	
DCLG No:	APP/C1950/X/16/3163136
Appeal By:	Mr & Mrs I Hunt
Site:	The Yolk Hawkshead Lane North Mymms Hatfield AL9 7TE
Proposal:	Certificate of lawfulness for the proposed erection of detached building in garden and loft conversion with rear dormer.
Decision:	Appeal Allowed
Decision Date:	11/07/2017
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	The focus of the appeal was the outbuilding – the LDC had been refused because of a lack of evidence that its use would be incidental to the main house. Whilst noting that the outbuilding would have a larger footprint than the main house, the Inspector judged that this was more or a reflection of the house's compact size and did not find the size of the outbuilding to be unusual. Whilst noting that a wetroom within the building could be viewed as a bathroom, the Inspector was satisfied that this would be related to the use of the home gym and would not be an addition to the primary living accommodation of the house.

6/2017/0087/HOUSE

DCLG No:	APP/C1950/D/17/3172688
Appeal By:	Mr J Michau
Site:	2 Roe Green Close Hatfield AL10 9PE
Proposal:	Erection of single storey front, two storey side and rear extension
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Decision Date:	12/07/2017
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	The appeal property is both offset and higher than its neighbour at 4 Roe Green Close – the Inspector therefore judged that the proposal would have a harmful overbearing impact. Whilst noting the appeal site's prominent location when entering Roe Green Close and the general uniformity of the road, the design of the extensions was considered to be reasonable. Nevertheless, the Inspector considered the harm to the amenity of adjoining residents to be too significant to allow the appeal.

6/2016/1778/FULL

DCLG No:	APP/C1950/W/17/3173234
Appeal By:	Mr & Mrs S Morris
Site:	11 Brookmans Avenue, Brookmans Park, Hatfield, AL9 7QH
Proposal:	Erection of replacement building containing 5 flats with forecourt parking following demolition of existing house
Decision:	Appeal Allowed with Conditions
Decision Date:	17/07/2017
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	Planning permission was previously granted on appeal for the erection of 3 flats on this site – the main issue is therefore the acceptability of the changes to the scheme. Because this scheme would provide 8 parking spaces and is in close proximity to shops and public transport, the Inspector considered that provision would be consistent with the 8.25 space requirement for the scheme derived from the Council's Parking Standards. The Inspector was satisfied that the new building would adequately reflect the character of surrounding detached houses, and judged that the 10% increase on the footprint of the previous approved scheme would have little greater impact. The appeal was therefore allowed.

6/2016/0970/HOUSE

DCLG No:	APP/C1950/D/17/3169419
Appeal By:	Mr A Stewart & Ms R Naylor
Site:	1 Reynards Road Welwyn AL6 9TR
Proposal:	Erection of two storey front extension with side facing dormer windows and front facing dormer window within existing North-West facing roof slope
Decision:	Appeal Dismissed
Decision Date:	17/07/2017
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	Taken together with other previous extensions, the proposal would result in a 215% increase on the size of the original dwelling – the Inspector concluded that this would be disproportionate, and therefore inappropriate in a Green Belt location. Whilst noting that the proposal would be screened by planting, the Inspector further judged that the significant bulk of the proposal would harm the openness of the Green Belt. Whilst consideration was given to a fallback position of existing lawful

development certificates for extensions and outbuildings at the property, the Inspector held that the two storey proposal would be more visually prominent.

6/2016/1468/OUTLINE

DCLG No:	APP/C1950/W/17/3171041
Appeal By:	Mrs L Banham
Site:	85 Hardings Welwyn Garden City AL7 2HA
Proposal:	Outline planning permission for the erection of 1 dwellinghouse, driveway and access with approval sought for access, layout and scale with all other matters reserved
Decision:	Appeal Allowed with Conditions
Decision Date:	21/07/2017
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	Whilst adjacent properties to one side are only single storey, because of their separation by a footpath the Inspector did not consider the insertion of an additional dwelling to be harmful to the character of the area. Whilst noting that the intention might well to be to build a 2-storey dwelling, the Inspector judged that this was unknown at an outline application stage and simply concluded that a dwelling of a suitable design and scale (to be assessed in the future) could be accommodated on the site.