

**PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**DATE: 21 July 2016**

**PLANNING APPEALS DECISION**

<b>APPELLANT</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>SITE ADDRESS</b>	<b>REFERENCE</b>	<b>APPEAL DECISION</b>	<b>COMMITTEE/ DELEGATED</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
Mr Muller	Retention of self contained use of first floor two bedroom flat above detached garage.	Detached garage, St Hughes Cottage, Cockernhoe, Luton, LU2 8PY	15/00776/1	Appeal Dismissed on 21 June 2016	Delegated	The Inspector stated that occupation of the Annexe separately from the main dwelling would therefore create a poor standard of living environment for any future occupiers. As a result, the proposal would fail to accord with saved Policy 57 (Residential Guidelines and standards) of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No 2 with Alterations as it would not reduce the disturbing effects of noise. The failure to provide a good standard of amenity for future occupants would also not be consistent with paragraph 17 of the Framework.
Mr M Powell	6 x 3-bed dwellings (as three semi-detached pairs) together with associated parking	Land at Rose Farm, Codicote Road, Whitwell, Hitchin, SG4 8AB	15/02666/1	Appeal Dismissed on 22 June 2016	Delegated	The Inspector concluded that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the open countryside. The proposal would, as a result, conflict with Policy 57 (Residential Guidelines and standards) of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No 2 with Alterations which seeks to ensure new development relates to the character of its surroundings. It would also conflict with paragraphs 17, 64 and Section 7 of the Framework which seek to resist poor design.

						<p>Furthermore the Inspector concluded that the overall impact on the significance of heritage assets, in combination with the harm to the character and appearance of the open countryside and the likely harmful effect upon ecology and biodiversity, weigh heavily on the negative side of the balance of the assessment of the environmental role of the proposal in sustainability terms. So consequently the proposal cannot, be considered as sustainable development to which the presumption in favour set out in the Framework would apply.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> The associated application for an award of costs was also refused.</p>
Mr & Mrs K Smith	Agricultural building and extension of existing bund, relocation of Barn A of planning permission 96/0318/1.	Fairhaven Farm, Slip Lane, Old Knebworth, Knebworth	15/02186/1	Appeal Withdrawn on 24 June 2016	Committee	

Note: No appeals lodged this month.