

Part I

Main author: Chris Carter

Executive Member: Councillor S.Boulton

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 31 JANUARY 2019
REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR (PUBLIC PROTECTION, PLANNING AND
GOVERNANCE)

PLANNING UPDATE – FUTURE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1 **Introduction**

- 1.1 This report is for the Development Management Committee to provide a summary of applications that might be presented to Committee over the coming months. If the call-in or application is withdrawn, the item will not be presented.
- 1.2 The applications should not be debated as part of this agenda, however any Councillor wishing to raise specific points about the proposal – such as a need for planning obligations or issue(s) that might not readily be apparent from the proposal or any other matter, may do so and the case officer will consider, where they are planning considerations, these matters raised as part of the future Committee report.
- 1.3 Appendix 1 comprises all applications that have been called-in or objected to by Town or Parish Councils. Appendix 2 comprises those that are a departure from the Local Plan, Officers consider should be determined by Development Management Committee, the applicant is the Borough Council or it has an interest in the land and an objection has been received.

2 **Recommendation**

- 2.1 That members note this report.

Name of author	Chris Carter
Title	Development Management Service Manager

Appendix 1 - Applications called-in or objected to

6/2016/0270/VAR

Address	Four Oaks 1-4 Great North Road Welwyn AL6 0PL
Proposal	Variation of conditions 1 (occupants) and 2 (number of caravans) of Planning Permission N6/2010/0211/S73B to increase the number of caravans from 10 to 20 of which no more than 5 shall be static caravans or mobile homes.
Applicant	Mr J Connors
Ward	Welwyn West
Agent	Mr M Green
Call-In/Objection from	Councillor Julie Cragg, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Reason for Committee Decision	<p>Please can we call this in due to the fact that this raises a lot of issues of concern for the residents.</p> <p>There is uneasiness about the fact that the number of caravans fluctuates wildly and that they residents do not appear to adhere to the planing that they do have.</p> <p>The restrictions regarding children is there as this was not intended to be a permanent site but only to give stability to the children to enable them to attend school.</p> <p>Are they planning to use caravans as an office sutie and run business's from there? [sic]</p>
Call-In/Objection from	Caroline Williams, Welwyn Parish Council
Reason for Committee Decision	<p>15/03/2016 21:43 - Welwyn Parish Council at its Planning & Licensing Committee of the 15 March 2016 agreed to submit Major Objection. We are unclear why the existing conditions have not been enforced. We understand that the site was permitted as a temporary location linked to the schooling of the children which have now grown up and not as a permanent site. We are concerned that the number of caravans has continued to increase overtime both with, and without, permission and Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council have previously stated that 10 is the maximum that can be accommodated. The existing conditions include that the land should be restored in accordance with the scheme previously submitted and approved by the planning authority as the residents may have already changed.</p>
Case Officer	Mrs June Pagdin
Summary	This application has not yet been presented to DMC as it is related to the adoption of the Local Plan.

6/2016/1493/VAR

Address Thunderbridge Yard Bulls Lane Hatfield AL9 7BB

Proposal Variation of condition 1 to extend the temporary permission; condition 3 to permit eight caravans of which no more than five would be static caravans; condition 4 to vary the approved drawings; and condition 5 to vary the site development scheme; of planning permission S6/2011/0116/FP

Applicant Mr J Robb

Ward Welham Green & Hatfield South

Agent Mrs A Heine

Call-In/Objection from Councillor Paul Zukowskyj, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council

Reason for Committee Decision I would like to formally 'call in ' this applicaiton as it meets at least two of the key criteria for a call in, namely 1. The application is of an unusually sensitive nature as the current use of the site has led to significant adverse impact on neighbours amenity and that development beyond that permitted had occurred at the site. 2. The wider ramifications are the potential impact of permitting this development may have on setting precedent for permitting neighbouring sites in the forthcoming local plan examination in public. There is also the precedent that would be set of permitting such developments, even for a limited period, in flood zones.

Call-In/Objection from Sue Chudleigh, North Mymms Parish Council

Reason for Committee Decision NMPC OBJECT as this is clearly a new application. The name of the applicants is not the name to whom the extant Permission was originally given.

The Government Planning Policy for traveller sites Policy E, in its introduction, states that making and decision taking should protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development - Item 4d and Item 16 state that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt except in exceptional circumstances. None have been indicated.

Item 4f - further states the local planning authority should aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments. This site has consistently exceeded the numbers stated in the original Permission and it is too small a site to be abused in this way.

Item 4k - states the local planning authority have to have due regard to the protection of local amenities and local environment. There have also been sanitary issues arising from the over-use of the site. One or more travelling caravans have also been let to itinerant workers in contravention to the terms of the licence. This has caused considerable problems to the neighbourhood.

Item 13 of the Planning Policy for traveller sites states the local planning authority should ensure that their policies:

a) promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the

local community

f) avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services

g) do not locate sites in areas at high risk of flooding, including functional floodplains, given the particular vulnerability of caravans

Policy E, Item 24 addresses local provision and it is the case that WHBC do not have a firm policy on Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Borough but there are existing sites in Welham Green – including a long term Showmans site which causes no trouble – however the Foxes Lane site also is also over used as the numbers of caravans exceeds the permitted numbers.

Item 27 states that if a local planning authority cannot demonstrate an up to date 5 year supply of deliverable sites this should be a material consideration and in this case the existing sites result in over supply in Welham Green therefore any expansion is unwarranted.

Item 25 states that the local planning authority should very strictly limit traveller site development in the Green Belt and further”sites in rural areas do not dominate the nearest settled community.” Expansion of this site would cause stress on services and neighbours.

Item 16 Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. Subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances, none of which have been indicated in this case.

Item 24(a) The Local Planning Authority has to take into account the existing level of local provision and Welham Green currently has provision. Indeed, even this is exceeded unlawfully – see report from Dennis Pennyfather, Licensing Technical Officer, dated 24 August 2016.

Item 25 This further states the Local Planning Authority should very strictly limit sites in rural areas should not dominate the nearest settled community. Of late the activities at Thunderbridge Yard have caused extreme concern and disturbance to the neighbourhood. Police and other authorities are aware of this, which seems to arise from the subletting of the excessive on-site accommodation to persons other than gypsies or travellers.

Footnote 9 States there is no presumption that a temporary grant of Planning Permission should be granted permanently, therefore North Mymms Parish Council consider, taking into account comments by Licensing Technical Officer that the site is not big enough, there are fire safety issues and this is a known flood plain with previous flooding issues, caravans on this Green Belt site are inappropriate development.

Case Officer

Mrs June Pagdin

Summary This application has not yet been presented to DMC as it is related to the adoption of the Local Plan.

6/2017/0606/MAJ

Address 1-9 Town Centre Hatfield AL10 0JZ

Proposal Erection of 2 buildings to provide 1,194m² (GEA) commercial floor space (A1 & A3), 70 flats (15 x 1 bedroom, 7 x 2 bedroom, three person and 48 x 2 bedroom, four person) with associated car/bicycle parking, plant and refuse storage and including the improvement of public realm, following the demolition of existing buildings.

Applicant Mr P Brimley

Ward Hatfield Cent.

Agent Mr P Wellings-Longmore

Call-In/Objection from Carrie Lloyd, Hatfield Town Council

Reason for Committee Decision Object: The Town Council is concerned at the impact of parking from new residential units on the retail parking spaces available. The Council has repeatedly asked that design of new structures in the Town is sympathetic to existing Hatfield designs but again we see another architect imposing their design on our Town making it an uncoordinated mismatch of urban design from different decades with no empathy to the historic nature of the Town. Members are concerned at the impact of the level 7 building on the Grade 1 listed building of Hatfield House. Members consider that a community facility needs to be included within the design.

Case Officer Mr Mark Peacock

Summary This application has been held in abeyance pending further work on the wider Hatfield town centre regeneration project.

6/2018/1354/OUTLINE

Address Land South of Cromer Hyde Welwyn Garden City

Proposal Outline permission for the change of use of land to airfield with runway and support facilities including a clubhouse, hangar and car park with all matters except access and layout reserved

Applicant Mr C Fitch

Ward Hatfield Villages

Agent Mr A Bardett

Call-In/Objection from Councillor Duncan Bell, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council

Reason for Committee Decision As one of the ward councillors for Hatfield Villages, I would like to conditionally call-in the above application.

This call-in is conditional, in that I would only request it's consideration by the Development Management Committee in the event that Planning Department recommend approval of the application.

My grounds for calling this application in are:

* The flying training circuit indicated within the Feasibility Study raises potential environmental (noise) concerns impacting many properties in Hatfield Garden Village and Salisbury Village, as well as properties within the proposed Local Plan sites of HAT1 and Symondshyde Village. This potential environmental impact goes well beyond the addresses contacted as immediate neighbours.

* The Feasibility Study appears to envisage that construction of the airfield could be at least partly funded by S106 monies generated from the Panshanger site housing development. In reality, S106 or CIL commitments generated from Local Plan developments will be finite, and there will be many competing claims upon their deployment. They will need to be deployed where the infrastructure needs are greatest, as assessed by the public authorities involved. The idea that these essentially public resources could be pre-empted for use on a private proposal for a new airfield seems questionable at best.

Given the above, I believe that this application is of sufficient interest to merit consideration by Development Management Committee if the Planning Officer recommends approval.

I have copied the three town councillors for the ward, as Hatfield Town Council is one of the consultees.

I will almost certainly submit a more detailed representation in a few days time.

Thanks for accepting this call-in.
Kind Regards,
Duncan Bell.

Call-In/Objection from Carrie Lloyd, Hatfield Town Council

Reason for Committee Decision 22/06/2018 15:47 - The application is in the Green Belt and no special circumstances have been shown to divert from Green Belt Policy. Members are concerned at the effect of noise and air pollution on the quality of life on residents of Salisbury Village and the Hatfield Garden Village. HAT1 &

HAT2 (if built) will be very close to this application site causing further distress to residential development. 50 cars will see a great increase in vehicular movements in this area.

Case Officer

Mr Mark Peacock

Summary

This application is held in abeyance pending a decision from the Secretary of State as to the requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment.

6/2018/1635/OUTLINE

Address	Historic De Havilland Grass Runway Ellenbrook fields Hatfield Buisness park Hatfield Herts
Proposal	Outline permission for the change of use of land to airfield with runway and support facilities including a clubhouse, hangar and car park with all matters except layout reserved
Applicant	Mr C Fitch
Ward	Hatfield Villages
Agent	Mr C Fitch
Call-In/Objection from	Councillor Duncan Bell, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Reason for Committee Decision	<p>i would like to conditionally call in the above planning application, which appears to be for an airfield within Ellenbrook Fields.</p> <p>This will, as for 6/2018/1354, be a conditional call-in, in that it will only need to come to DMC if Planning Department recommend approval.</p> <p>My ground for calling this in are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a considerable potential for noise nuisance over a wide area of Ellenbrook, Salisbury Village, and Hatfield Garden Village.• Just as for application 6/2018/1354, the applicant seems to envisage that S106 monies can be used to help finance the project. S106 monies will be a scarce resource in the context of the WHBC Local Plan. They are essentially public resources infrastructure needs associated with Local Plan development. This should not include private flying facilities.• There is no airfield at Panshanger to "replace".• My understanding is that there is an entirely separate S106 commitment associated with a 2017 mineral extraction application to restore Ellenbrook Fields as a country park. It is unclear how this application would fit with this prior commitment.
Case Officer	Mr Mark Peacock

Summary This application is held in abeyance pending a decision from the Secretary of State as to the requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment.

6/2018/2129/FULL

Address	111 The Ryde Hatfield AL9 5DP
Proposal	Retrospective change of use from single dwelling (Use Class C3) to small HMO for up to three to six persons (Use Class C4)
Applicant	Mr I Kabala
Ward	Hatfield East
Agent	Mr A Huseyin
Call-In/Objection from	Councillor Caroline Gillett, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Reason for Committee Decision	I wish to call in the application 6/2018/2129 Full in respect of the retrospective change of use from single dwelling (Use Class C3) to small HMO for up to three to six persons (Use Class C4). 111 The Ryde.

The main reason for calling in is the lack of parking in lines with policy and I draw the officers' attention to the actual crossover and depth of in-curtilage as opposed to that drawn on the architect's submission. Parking of 5.25 cars would be required as a minimum and using the cross over only space for

3. Also, the depth of the in-curtilage is 5.3m and not 6m as stated.

Whilst calling this in I would like to draw your attention to the following in connection with the submission (1325/PL/AH)

In
Section 2 – The Proposal reference is made to the conversion of the garage into a store for bins. This was advised to be happening by March 2018 in a previous application, and I am presuming the garage was built under previous planning granted in 2008 with a 3 year time frame, as this garage was refused in January this year.

Section 4.2 – the submission has failed to highlight bedroom 3

I note the kitchen is 6.7 sqm which is within HMO requirements for up to 5 rooms. I question why 2 kitchens are needed to share between 3 rooms when only one shower/bathroom between 3 rooms. The additional kitchen is shown as in the lounge/diner/kitchen which is currently used as a bedsit.

Section 4.4 – advises that the front door is the main entrance for all occupants. It is know that the garage door is an entrance currently used by at least one occupant.

The garage is “being converted to a storage facility” – this has been on-going for 8 months.

Section 6 – parking

6.1 refers to 3 bedsits at 1.25 spaces equating to 4 and 3 HMO bedrooms giving rise to 1 space which does not comply with 0.5 per room. Parking should therefore be 5.25 spaces which equates to 6 rounded up.

6.2 The depth of the property is advised as 6m when in fact 2/3 of the frontage is 5.3 up to the front brickwork. This means that cars would be parking directly under the window of bedsit 3

Section 7 – refuse.

The existing bins 3 in total and capacity within the garage. There are at least 4 bins, often overflowing (photographic evidence from residents) and are stored on the front left of the property.

Section 8 – landscaping

The statement in the submission is misleading. The frontage had indeed been altered to increase the hard standing across the width of the site. The property has 100% hard standing and the trees that were at the side of the property have been

removed.

The house has been extended to the maximum at each boundary and is not typical of The Ryde where other houses have at least one side access and all have a fair proportion of soft landscaping as well as open carparking. I am not aware of any that have parking across the full width or the full depth of the property.

It is also worth noting that the tree on the left of the property has had the right side branches removed to allow parking to the left of the property accessed over the grass verge.

Case Officer Mrs June Pagdin
Summary It is anticipated that this application will be presented to DMC on 28 February 2019.

6/2018/2497/FULL

Address 1-5 Park Street Hatfield AL9 5AT
Proposal Change of use of the existing grade 2 listed building from office (B1) to 4 x residential flats (C3) with associated internal and external alterations
Applicant E Flynn
Ward Hatfield East
Agent Mr A Goodman
Call-In/Objection from Councillor Peter Hebden, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Reason for Committee Decision Comments:
I would like to call in this application as I believe that this is of great local and public interest that requires open discussion to ensure the correct decision is made. This building has been subject to unsuccessful planning applications and remained unused for some years; good use of this property would certainly enhance the local area. Having reviewed the application I believe that clarity is required, prior to any decision being made, regarding - the viability of the project, internal works, disruption caused by building works and parking availability
Case Officer Mrs Sarah Madyausiku

Summary It is anticipated that this application will be presented to DMC on 28 February 2019.

6/2018/2768/OUTLINE

Address Hatfield Business Park Hatfield AL10 9SL
Proposal Outline application for a large-scale mixed use development including 1,100 new homes and supporting infrastructure including a primary school, local centre and open space with all matters reserved
Applicant Mr M Hill
Ward Hatfield Villages
Agent Mr M Hill
Call-In/Objection from Councillor Duncan Bell, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Reason for Committee Decision I would like to conditionally call-in the above application. Conditional in the sense that i would only ask for it to be brought before DMC if Planning Department is minded to recommend approval.

My grounds for calling this in are:

- The size and scale of the proposed development make it a matter of significant public interest.
- The proposal is on Green Belt land, and would risk coalescence with the eastern outskirts of St Albans.
- The site is not one of those accepted for development as part of our current Local Plan submission.

I will be making a more detailed set of representations once i have studied the plans in more detail, but i would be grateful if you could log my call-in on to the system as soon as possible.

Thank you for your assistance.

Case Officer Ms Gill Claxton
Summary This large and complex planning application is unlikely to be presented to DMC until mid 2019.

6/2018/2850/HOUSE

Address 84 High Dells Hatfield AL10 9HU

Proposal	Retention of erection of outbuilding storage
Applicant	Mr M Dur
Ward	Hatfield South West
Agent	Mr M Moon
Call-In/Objection from	Carrie Lloyd, Hatfield Town Council
Reason for Committee Decision	20/12/2018 09:46 - Members are concerned that the location plan fails to show Chantry Lane Hatfield which is most affected by this development. We object to this development as it overdevelops the site, is overdevelopment in its own right being over bearing in its placement and location right up to the boundary fence and therefore has an adverse impact on neighbouring properties.
Case Officer	Ms Emily Stainer
Summary	It is anticipated that this application will be presented to DMC on 28 February 2019.

6/2018/2863/FULL

Address	36 The Ridgeway Cuffley Potters Bar EN6 4AX
Proposal	Erection of 6 residential units following demolition of existing dwelling, supporting structures and associated ancillary buildings
Applicant	Cuffley Property Developments Ltd
Ward	Northaw and Cuffley
Agent	Ms L Shannon
Call-In/Objection from	Jason Grocock, Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council
Reason for Committee Decision	21/11/2018 20:04 - The Parish Council objects to this application because the development would have an urbanising impact which does not respect the semi-rural character of The Ridgeway. Since the previous application, the number of houses has been reduced from 8 to 6 but the mass and bulk is similar. This location is realistically only accessible to services by private transport. The only bus service is extremely limited in frequency. Consequently as walking or cycling to the village centre is also not feasible for most, the site is environmentally unsustainable.
	23/11/2018 Re 36 The Ridgeway we would like to confirm that this is a MAJOR OBJECTION and add that,' This development would set a precedent for other properties with large gardens along the road'
Case Officer	Mr Tom Gabriel

Summary It is anticipated that this application will be presented to DMC on 28 February 2019.

6/2018/2968/FULL

Address 11 & 11a Holly Close Hatfield AL10 9JB
Proposal Conversion of existing 6-bedroom dwelling at 11 Holly Close into two self-contained 2-bedroom flats
Applicant Dr F Mahmmud
Ward Hatfield South West
Agent Sir/Madam
Call-In/Objection from Councillor James Broach, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Reason for Committee Decision 5/12/2018 11:39 - As the applicant's letter states that this application is identical to the one that was refused recently, my call in will be very similar to the last one:

I wish to call this application in for consideration at DMC. This application has an unusually long planning history - the applicant has been told numerous times that his house should be returned to C3 use. By converting it into 2x2 bed flats, the proposal could potentially house up to eight occupants - which is completely out of keeping with the local area, both in terms of numbers, and the fact this site is surrounded by houses, not by flats.

Looking at the reason for the refusal of the last application which was as follows:

The proposed subdivision of the family dwelling into flats would result in harm to the character of the area by virtue of the change in intensity of use of this narrow cul-de-sac as well as detrimentally impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

Given that no material changes have been made to this proposal, I feel that it is still contrary to sections D1 & 2 of our district plan.

From the plans, it is not clear what outdoor amenity space has been afforded to residents of the first floor flat. Item 127f of the NPPF states that a high standard of amenity must be provided to users, and if the applicant has failed to provide outdoor green space to the first floor occupants, then this application should be refused.

I have concerns about the potential welfare of this many residents being

crammed into a family home, and feel this needs particularly close attention. Parking is already a nightmare in this part of Hatfield - which was best documented by an ambulance being unable to reach a patient due to the chaotic parking in this area. Any further traffic, including construction traffic, could exacerbate this. I am concerned about the precedent that turning a family home into flats would set, especially in this area of Hatfield. Our family homes need to be kept as such - would you allow the whole of this area to potentially be converted into flats? I cannot believe that yet another application has gone on for this site.

As with previous applications, I am happy for you to refuse planning permission under delegated authority if that is the recommendation of officers.

5/12/2018 11:40 - As the applicant's letter states that this application is identical to the one that was refused recently, my call in will be very similar to the last one:

I wish to call this application in for consideration at DMC. This application has an unusually long planning history - the applicant has been told numerous times that his house should be returned to C3 use. By converting it into 2x2 bed flats, the proposal could potentially house up to eight occupants - which is completely out of keeping with the local area, both in terms of numbers, and the fact this site is surrounded by houses, not by flats.

Looking at the reason for the refusal of the last application which was as follows:

The proposed subdivision of the family dwelling into flats would result in harm to the character of the area by virtue of the change in intensity of use of this narrow cul-de-sac as well as detrimentally impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

Given that no material changes have been made to this proposal, I feel that it is still contrary to sections D1 & 2 of our district plan.

From the plans, it is not clear what outdoor amenity space has been afforded to residents of the first floor flat. Item 127f of the NPPF states that a high standard of amenity must be provided to users, and if the applicant has failed to provide outdoor green space to the first floor occupants, then this application should be refused.

I have concerns about the potential welfare of this many residents being crammed into a family home, and feel this needs particularly close attention. Parking is already a nightmare in this part of Hatfield - which was best documented by an ambulance being unable to reach a patient due to the chaotic parking in this area. Any further traffic, including construction traffic, could exacerbate this. I am concerned about the precedent that turning a

family home into flats would set, especially in this area of Hatfield. Our family homes need to be kept as such -would you allow the whole of this area to potentially be converted into flats? I cannot believe that yet another application has gone on for this site.

As with previous applications, I am happy for you to refuse planning permission under delegated authority if that is the recommendation of officers.

Call-In/Objection from Carrie Lloyd, Hatfield Town Council

Reason for Committee Decision 20/12/2018 10:12 - It appears that no outdoor amenity space will be given to the upstairs flat which appears to be contrary to NPPF guidelines.

This application is out of keeping with the surrounding properties which are all houses, not flats.

The intensification of the use of the property will cause harm to the cul de sac and amenities of neighbouring properties.

20/12/2018 10:12 - It appears that no outdoor amenity space will be given to the upstairs flat which appears to be contrary to NPPF guidelines.

This application is out of keeping with the surrounding properties which are all housing, not flats.

The intensification of the use of the property will cause harm to the cul de sac and amenities of neighbouring properties.

Case Officer Mr David Elmore

Summary It is anticipated that this application will be presented to DMC on 28 February 2019.

6/2018/3071/HOUSE

Address 1-2 Hill Farm Cottage Hill Farm Lane Welwyn AL6 9BN
Proposal Erection of ancillary outbuilding
Applicant Mr & Mrs Taylor
Ward Welwyn West
Agent Mr F Caldwell
Call-In/Objection from Councillor Tony Kingsbury, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council

Reason for Committee Decision 2/01/2019 12:33 - I would like to call in this application if the officer is minded to refuse it, on the basis that the development is replacing sheds that were in place previously and this needs to be considered fully. The impact from the position when the sheds were in place is therefore less, as is the effective increase in floor area of buildings on the site. The design appears good quality and any impact on the openness of the green belt has been considered and minimised.

Case Officer Ms Clare Howe

Summary It is anticipated that this application will be presented to DMC on 28 February 2019.

6/2018/3125/FULL

Address 12 Tolmers Gardens Cuffley Potters Bar EN6 4JE

Proposal Erection of 8 x apartments following demolition of existing bungalow

Applicant Mr A Sarno

Ward Northaw and Cuffley

Agent Mr A Sarno

Call-In/Objection from Jason Grocock, Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council

Reason for Committee Decision 20/12/2018 19:39 - We object to this application and are grateful that WHBC have agreed to a site notice and extension to the consultation period. This Block would be out of character with Tolmers Gardens. Tolmers Gardens is not all 4 - 5 bedroomed houses as stated. There are some 3 bedroomed homes. This is over development of the site. We recommend that WHBC make a site visit to make a judgement on the proposed mass scale & bulk of the development. A plan for two semi's has already been refused for this site - Ref 0474. Under the draft Neighbourhood Plan, NCPC recommends the retention of Bungalows. The site boundary shown in the proposed site plan 130E does not match the one in the design & access statement - Fig.2. page 5. Mature trees at No. 11 are at potential risk from this development

Case Officer Mrs June Pagdin

Summary It is anticipated that this application will be presented to DMC on 28 February or 28 March 2019.