

From:
To: [Planning](#)
Cc: [Kerrie Charles](#); [Jamie Nicholas](#)
Subject: Fw: Planning Application 6/2019/2122/EM - 6 Broadfield Place Welwyn Garden City AL8 6LJ
Date: 26 December 2019 12:24:10

Dear Planning,

Further to my correspondence with the planning case officers I would like to submit an appeal for the above refusal of application.

I understand the application was refused due to less than 50% of the front garden edges and frontages being maintained as soft landscaping.

To this point I would like to make the following responses:

1. Broadfield Place is a cul-de-sac and as such has pressure on the increasing numbers of vehicles requiring parking spaces. My own property being positioned partly in the corner and angled has a relatively small frontage onto the street area compared with other properties.

2. My own plans for Number 6 seek to minimise the effect of the small increase in hard standing area on the character and appearance of the street scene. To this end it retains a large proportion of the existing front hedgerow to screen vehicles. It also looks to retain as much as possible of the small grass area to one side. It also retains all the remaining boundary hedges and the shrub and bush planting at the front of the house itself.

3. I have submitted the photos of adjoining properties to mine in Broadfield Place which are referred to below and have had permission granted for their alterations.

- No 3 opposite my house and the only other detached property in Broadfield Place. Full hard standing on frontal area

- No 7 next door to my property. Full hard standing

- No 8. Full hard standing

- No 10 Full hard standing, small area of shrubs

- No 12 Full hard standing small shrub area

All the above have considerably exceeding my suggested area of hard standing.

Precedent of course may, or may not, take a role in granting or refusing a planning application . However, consistency is a material planning consideration

I do not wish to emulate these properties but taking into account my relatively limited change to the hard standing area, along with the precedents already set and the consistency of decision as a material planning consideration, I would ask for this to be reviewed.

Kind Regards,

Andrew Turnbull