

Planning Committee recommendation analysis against St Albans District Council determination decision and Planning Inspectorate appeal outcomes for period May to December 2020.

Month	No. application recommendation agreed with SADC determination decision	No. application recommendation differed from SADC determination decision and reason.	Percentage of application recommendations agreed with SADC decision.
May 2020	10	3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTC No objection. SADC Refuse - No bat survey. • HTC Refuse – Tree loss and parking. SADC permit. • HTC Refuse – out of keeping. SADC permit. 	77%
June 2020	18	3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTC Express concern – Tree loss. SADC permit. • HTC Refuse – overdevelopment. SADC permit. • HTC Express concern – overbearing and parking. SADC permit. 	86%
July 2020	4	6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTC Refuse – Noise nuisance. SADC permit. • HTC Express Concern – impact on neighbours. SADC – Permit 	40%

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTC No objection. SADC Refuse – Visual harm to listed building. • HTC Refuse – Overdevelopment. SADC permit. • HTC No objection. SADC Refuse – Visual harm to listed building. • HTC Express Concern – External lighting. SADC permit. 	
August 2020	19	<p>3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTC Express concern – Impact on neighbours. SADC permit. • HTC Refuse – Tree planting. SADC permit • HTC Refuse – affect on conservation area and tree planting. SADC permit. 	86%
September 2020	9	<p>7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTC Refuse - Overdevelopment. SADC permit. • HTC Express concern – reasons for refusal not addressed. SADC permit. 	56%

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTC Refusal – out of keeping/loss of trees. SADC Permit. • HTC Express concern – unbalanced appearance. SADC permit. • HTC no objection. SADC Refuse. Not in keeping with listed building. • HTC no objection. SADC Refuse. Not in keeping with listed building. • HTC Express concern – insufficient parking. SADC Permit. 	
October 2020	24	<p>7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTC Express concern – bulk, size and privacy. SADC Permit. • HTC Refuse – Terracing and affect on CA. SADC Permit, • HTC Refuse – Parking. SADC Permit. • HTC Express concern – previous concerns still stand. SADC Permit. • HTC Express concern – previous concerns still stand. SADC Permit. 	76%

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTC Express concern – overdevelopment. SADC Permit. • HTC No objection. SADC Refuse. Insufficient mitigating information. 	
November 2020	6	4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTC Express concern – loss of amenity. SADC Permit. • HTC Express concern – Parking. SADC Permit. • HTC Refuse – overdevelopment. SADC Permit. • HTC Express concern – parking. SADC Permit. 	60%
December 2020	22	8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTC Refuse – lack of trees. SADC Permit. • HTC Refuse – Parking. SADC Permit. • HTC Refuse – Parking. SADC Permit. • HTC Refuse – Terracing and parking. SADC Permit. • HTC No objection. SADC Refuse – Size and bulk. 	74%

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HTC Refuse - previous concerns still stand. SADC Permit. • HTC Refuse – Parking. SADC Permit. • HTC Concern – Parking. SADC Permit. 	
--	--	---	--

Appeal outcomes during this period

Appeal Decision Date – 16 July 2020

Dor 2 Dor, Unit 6, 40 Coldharbour Lane, Harpenden

5/19/1376 External container (retrospective) HTC recommendation - The Committee **expressed concern** about this application as if approved the storage container would be visible on the street scene on a permanent basis which would have a negative impact. **Appeal Dismissed.**

Appeal Decision Date – 2 September 2020

85 Ox Lane, Harpenden

5/19/2916 Two storey side and single storey rear extensions, partial garage conversion, loft conversion with rear dormer window with juliette balcony and side rooflight. HTC recommendation – **No objection.** **Appeal Allowed.**

Appeal Decision Date – 14 October 2020

The White Horse PH, Hatching Green, Harpenden

5/19/0113 Construction of single storey side extension following demolition of outbuilding and non-original extensions, alterations and refurbishments, construction of two detached buildings for Class C1 (hotels) accommodation and associated landscaping and parking
 HTC recommendation - The Committee are supportive of the introduction of new visitor accommodation in appropriate locations in the town and also support improvements to existing employment sites within the town, as detailed in policies SI10 (visitor accommodation including hotels) and ER1 (supporting Harpenden’s economy) of the Harpenden Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2033. However, the Committee **recommend that this application be refused** for the following reasons: • The bulk, scale and massing of the two storey barn two development is over dominant in the proposed location on the site, which is in close proximity to the Grade II listed public house building, all of which is located in the Harpenden Conservation Area. Therefore, does not meet the objectives of policies ESD1 (design strategy) preamble, viii, ESD2

(local character and heritage) i), ii) and iv) of the Harpenden Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2033. • The relocation of the parking provision close to the rear boundaries of properties in West Common could cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to the residents of these properties and does not meet the objectives of policy ESD1 (design strategy) of the Harpenden Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2033. • A number of trees and landscaping are proposed to be removed within the proposal, to the detriment of the surrounding properties and the Harpenden conservation area. No planting plan is in place for the proposed replacement planting scheme. therefore, this is not in accordance with policy ESD14 (tree and hedges) of the Harpenden Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2033. **APPEAL DISMISSED.**

Appeal Decision Date – 13 October 2020

Land rear of The Red Cow, Westfield Road

5/19/2327 Three terraced houses with habitable loft accommodation, associated parking and landscaping HTC Recommendation - The Committee **expressed concern** that due to the positioning of the proposed properties, it appears that the required 13.5 metre rear distances have not been achieved. This may impact on neighbouring properties in Baulk Close resulting in a loss of amenity. Policies ESD2 of the HNP and 72 (v) of the St Albans District Plan refer. **APPEAL DISMISSED**

Appeal Decision Date – 3 November 2020

20 Pennycroft, Harpenden

5/19/2794 Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of replacement five bedroom dwelling and widening of access HTC Recommendation - **RECOMMEND REFUSAL.** The proposal appears to have failed to address Policy ESD14 of the HNP in that it has not detailed any plans to replant on a ratio of 2:1, the trees that are proposed to be removed. **APPEAL DISMISSED**

Appeal Decision Date – 11 December 2020

Land to Rear of 96 & 98 Cravells Road, Harpenden

5/19/2755 Two storey three bedroom dwelling with detached garage, new parking and associated landscaping (resubmission following withdrawal of 5/2019/0501) HTC Recommendation - **NO OBJECTION.** The proposal meets the relevant policies of the Harpenden Neighbourhood Plan 2018 – 2033 **APPEAL DISMISSED.**

Appeal Decision Date – 11 December 2020

21 Salisbury Avenue, Harpenden

5/20/0804 Change of use from Class C2 (care home) to Class C3 (residential) and demolition of single and two storey extensions to create single dwelling, construction of three, 2.5 storey buildings to create seven retirement apartments, detached garage, parking HTC Recommendation - **Recommend Refusal.** The Committee stated that the proposal was an overdevelopment of the site with regards to mass, scale, height and bulk and would result in a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties, the street scene and the Harpenden conservation area. The Committee considered that the applicant had

totally failed to address previous reasons for refusal. Policies ESD1 & ESD2 of the Harpenden Neighbourhood Plan and policies 69, 70, 85 & 87 of the St Albans District Plan refer **APPEAL DISMISSED.**