

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 09 NOVEMBER 2017
REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (PUBLIC PROTECTION, PLANNING AND
GOVERNANCE)

Appeal Decisions 30/09/2017 to 30/10/2017

6/2016/1068/FULL	
DCLG No:	APP/C1950/W/17/3176691
Appeal By:	Mr A Barham
Site:	Barham Court 80 Station Road Cuffley Potters Bar EN6 4HY
Proposal:	Addition of A3 (Restaurant and Cafe) use alongside previously granted uses A1 (Retail), A2 (Financial and Professional Services) and B1 (Business) to the commercial unit to ground floor
Decision:	Appeal Allowed with Conditions
Decision Date:	25/10/2017
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	The main issue was the availability of parking, for which the Inspector accepted that a restaurant use would be likely to result in much greater demand for parking than the approved uses for the site, and for which the parking provision on site can accommodate. However, they noted the significant availability of local car parks during the evening in particular – and whilst recognising that some restaurant users might choose to park on nearby residential roads instead, they also noted that the available car parks are much closer to the site. With respect of potential noise and odour concerns, the Inspector considered that these could be acceptably mitigated.
6/2017/0778/HOUSE	
DCLG No:	APP/C1950/D/17/3181281
Appeal By:	Mrs S Stokes
Site:	97 The Ridgeway, Cuffley, Potters Bar, EN6 4BG
Proposal:	Installation of two side dormers following removal of existing two chimney stacks, juliet balcony, formation of vehicular hardstanding to front garden, front boundary wall and gates to entrance.
Decision:	Appeal Allowed with Conditions
Decision Date:	25/10/2017
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	The site is located in the Green Belt. However, the Inspector considered that the additions to the existing dwelling would be proportionate, and therefore

	appropriate. In respect of local character, the roof alterations were considered to be comparable in size to those found elsewhere locally – in what is in any case an area with mixed character. Whilst the rear dormer would not meet the 1 metre level of inset required in the Supplementary Design Guidance, the Inspector did not find that to be harmful given that the dormer would not be visible from the street scene.
6/2017/0689/HOUSE	
DCLG No:	APP/C1950/D/17/3179336
Appeal By:	Mr S Photiou
Site:	48 Pine Grove Brookmans Park AL9 7BW
Proposal:	Erection of two storey rear and single storey rear extensions
Decision:	Appeal Allowed with Conditions
Decision Date:	27/10/2017
Delegated or DMC Decision:	Delegated
Summary:	The Inspector noted that there is great variation in the size and design of houses nearby, and that others have been extended by a similar extent to the appeal property. The extension would not be visible from the street scene, and as such the Inspector considered that there would be no adverse effects on the character of the area.

Author: Baras Mast-Ingle