



Public Document Pack

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AGENDA

**THURSDAY 11 JANUARY 2024 AT 7.00 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBER, THE FORUM**

The Councillors listed below are requested to attend the above meeting, on the day and at the time and place stated, to consider the business set out in this agenda.

Membership

Councillor Guest	Councillor Cox
Councillor C Wyatt-Lowe	Councillor Link
Councillor Durrant	Councillor Mottershead
Councillor Hobson (Vice-Chairman)	Councillor Patterson
Councillor Maddern	Councillor Riddick
Councillor Stevens (Chairman)	Councillor Silwal
Councillor Bristow	Councillor Mitchell

For further information, please contact Corporate and Democratic Support or 01442 228209

AGENDA

6. APPEALS UPDATE (Pages 2 - 26)

Report to follow

Agenda Item 6

6. APPEALS UPDATE

6.1 APPEALS LODGED

Appeals received by Dacorum Borough Council between 04 November 2023 and 31 December 2023.

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
1	22/03069/FUL	W/23/3332517	Plot 1, Cupid Green Lane, Hemel Hempstead	Written Representations
2	23/01525/FUL	W/23/3332531	158 High Street, Berkhamsted	Written Representations
3	23/00974/FUL	W/23/3333363	Land Between 26 And Collins Bridge, Station Road, Berkhamsted	Written Representations
4	22/01836/MFA	W/23/3333545	Rectory farm, Kings Langley	Public Inquiry
5	23/00680/FHA	D/23/3333585	19 Clarence Road, Berkhamsted	Householder
6	23/00902/FUL	W/23/3333636	Land Adjacent Row Beech Cottages, Watling Street, Kensworth	Written Representations
7	23/01625/FHA	D/23/3333865	8 Langdon Street, Tring	Householder
8	23/01342/ROC	W/23/3334039	Gable End, 1 Threefields, Sheethanger Lane, HH	Written Representations
9	23/00423/DPA	W/23/3334029	Site of 1-31 Nightingale Walk, Hemel Hempstead	Written Representations
10	23/02168/RET	D/23/3334767	New Lodge, Dunstable Road, Markyate	Householder
11	23/02373/LBC	Y/23/3334769	New Lodge, Dunstable Road, Markyate	Written Representations
12	23/02040/RET	D/23/3335244	7 Olivers Close, Potten End	Householder

6.2 PLANNING APPEALS DISMISSED

Planning appeals dismissed between 04 November 2023 and 31 December 2023.

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
1	22/01286/FUL	W/23/3316011	Sharlowes Farmhouse, Flaunden	Written Representations
Date of Decision:			10/11/2023	
Link to full decision:				
https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3316011				
Inspector's Key conclusions:				
<p>The development proposed is demolition of outbuilding and the erection of a new detached house and garage. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Flaunden Conservation Area.</p> <p>The FCA includes a dense cluster of buildings arranged around a crossroads. Along the roads, building plots become more scattered, interspersed by generous green spaces including gardens and occasional fields or paddocks, creating an irregular pattern of development with no consistent relationship to the road frontage. Established trees and hedgerows contribute to the FCA's rural character, and the age and diverse mix of vernacular buildings contribute significant historic and architectural interest. The significance of the FCA is therefore derived from the appearance and layout of buildings, and the area's spacious, green, rural character.</p> <p>Through increasing the footprint and volume of development, the proposal would have an urbanising effect upon the site. Due to this increased scale, its siting, and the clearance of some trees and vegetation, the proposed development would be more visually prominent in the street scene than the existing building.</p> <p>The design of the dwelling as a period style cottage with sympathetic facing materials seeks to complement dwellings within the FCA, and the layout of the proposed development has sought to achieve a fragmented appearance with a staggered frontage sited forward of houses to the north. However, the siting of the development within a previously undeveloped gap would appear out of keeping with the rhythm and pattern of development within the FCA.</p> <p>The proposed development would therefore consolidate development and erode this gap along the frontage of Birch Lane. The proposed development would not therefore appear as natural infill but would appear unsympathetic to the historic and rural character of the FCA.</p> <p>The proposed development would result in the loss of a gap which contributes positively to the rural character of the FCA and serves to separate historic buildings within the FCA from modern development beyond the FCA boundary.</p>				

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
2	22/00897/FUL	W/22/3313055	Land at Chenies Court, Hemel Hempstead	Written Representations
	Date of Decision:		14/11/2023	
	Link to full decision:			
	https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3313055			
	Inspector's Key conclusions:			
<p>The development proposed is the demolition of existing 43 garages and construction of 8 one-bedroom flats in two x two story blocks. Parking for 13 cars, bin and cycle storage and associated landscaping works.</p> <p>The overall building height, external brick finish and window proportions would not be uncharacteristic of the area and the timber fencing, at the side and rear of Sites 2 and 3 would not be too dissimilar to the existing garage court walls or indeed existing boundary treatments in the locality. However, the convoluted building design including the projecting elements and hipped roofs would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development, jarring with its regularity and simplicity. Moreover, and notwithstanding the revised block plan (Site 2), the introduction of the 2 storey buildings in combination with the proposed fencing would read as a visual intrusion of built form, eroding the open aspect of the area and the sense of spaciousness. Consequently, whilst I recognise that the proposed housing density would be lower than the existing flatted development and that the Character Appraisal does not specify any special design requirements for the Woodhall Farm area, I nevertheless find that the appeal development would read as a visually intrusive and incongruous form of development.</p> <p>I am not persuaded that the proposal would lead to increased pressure to prune or fell the nearby trees, including those covered by TPO29. Accordingly, the appeal development would not be harmful to the wellbeing of the trees and thus, their contribution to local character would be unaffected.</p> <p>The amended elevational drawings submitted in respect of Site 3 indicate that obscured glazing would be installed in the side windows facing Nos 32-37. These windows would also be non-opening below a height of 1.7 metres, measured from the internal floor level. Were I minded to allow the appeal, and subject to a suitable condition, I consider that these measures would be sufficient to mitigate any harmful overlooking of the neighbouring flats. whilst overlooking could be adequately mitigated, the appeal proposal would nevertheless have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of the existing occupiers of Nos 32-37 with particular regard to outlook. This would be contrary to Policy CS12 of the Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan where they seek to avoid visual intrusion.</p> <p>The proposal would result in the loss of 43 garages. However, the evidence confirms that the garage courts are independent of Chenies Court and are no longer use by residents for parking. As I observed at my site visit, the garage courts are in poor condition and the extent of overgrown vegetation restricts access to several of the units across the 3 sites. Further, the dimensions of</p>				

<p>the garages would no longer comply with the standards set out within the Highway Design Guide¹ and thus, it is reasonable to assume that their size would restrict their functionality having regard to current vehicle standards. The evidence is therefore not indicative that the proposal would generate additional parking stress through displacement. find that the proposed development would not adversely affect highway safety with particular regard to parking displacement and the safety, convenience and accessibility of the proposed parking.</p> <p>The Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. In such circumstances, paragraph 11 of the Framework is engaged. Notwithstanding the Framework's desire to significantly boost the supply of housing and the Council's housing land supply position, the benefits associated with the proposed development would be moderate. Consequently, the adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and living conditions would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out at paragraph 11 d) does not apply.</p>				
No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
3	22/01106/MFA	W/23/3317818	Solar Array, Little Heath Lane, Little Heath, Berkhamsted	Public Inquiry
Date of Decision:			14/11/2023	
Link to full decision:				
https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3317818				
Inspector's Key conclusions:				
<p>The development proposed is the erection of a 25 MW Solar PV Array, comprising ground-mounted solar PV panels, vehicular access including internal access track, landscaping and associated infrastructure including security fencing, CCTV cameras, and grid connection infrastructure including transformers, substation compound buildings.</p> <p>From a spatial perspective, the proposal would introduce a substantial amount of development into an open area. This would particularly result from the ground coverage of the arrays, along with the access tracks, fencing and other taller features. The appellant's position is that the development would be relatively modest in mass and footprint. In terms of three dimensional mass I agree with that position to an extent, as the panels themselves would be relatively limited in height – although some other elements of the scheme would be taller. I will return to that below in terms of the effect on the landscape. I do not agree that the footprint of the development would be modest as, dealing with that area which would become the solar farm (as opposed to the blue line area), the footprint would be very considerable. The proposal would cause moderate harm to the openness of the Green Belt in spatial terms.</p> <p>I consider that the development would be visually prominent from a number of locations and would appear as an uncharacteristic form of development. It</p>				

would cause moderate harm to the openness of the Green Belt. From a distance the panels and associated structures would blend together, as illustrated by a number of photomontages and plans, and the grass beneath the panels would be visible to only a very limited extent. Conversely as one approached the site, the grass would become much more visible, but the presence of the panels, fencing and other elements would be all the more prominent and harmful to the perception of openness.

I acknowledge the appellant's argument that the proposal is temporary in nature (40 years) and that the development would be removed and the land restored to its former condition – in essence openness would be restored at that point. Leaving aside the discussion as to what may happen at the end of the 40 year period – which can only be speculation - I do not find this argument to be persuasive in terms of reducing the effect on Green Belt openness. Consequently, both visually and spatially, the proposed development would result in moderate harm to the openness of the Green Belt. This adds to the harm caused by reason of inappropriateness.

In relation to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, the site currently performs a useful function. This is almost self-evident as the site is currently an open field and forms part of a number of such fields which are representative of the countryside in the area. The proposal, however it might be described, would not appear as countryside. Despite the maintenance of some space between and around the panels, the arrays and associated structures would fundamentally alter the countryside appearance of the fields. This would result in encroachment, in contradiction of the third Green Belt purpose.

Whilst I agree with the appellant that solar farms do not have to be completely hidden to be acceptable, the extent of any slope has a direct and obvious correlation with the degree of effect and any potential harm caused by a proposal. In this case the significant slope down to the valley floor brings most of the proposal above the height of buildings, movement corridors and viewpoints in the valley below. In addition the presence of the slope on the other side of the valley increases the visibility of the appeal site from that direction.

The parties are agreed that there would be a large adverse impact on landscape character within 500m of the site. This is an important matter as this distance would include views from Bourne End, Little Heath Lane and the dwellings located along it, Pouchen End, the Grand Union canal and walk, and the railway line. From all those locations the effect on the landscape character would be moderately adverse. As one moves further from the site the parties agree that the impact would decrease from large to moderate – at a point somewhere between 500m and 2kms. Precisely where this transition – not a fixed point - would occur depends on the exact viewpoint and the exercise of professional judgement. Within this wider radius I am especially concerned with the landscape effect as viewed from the Boxmoor Trust land and the golf course on the southern side of the valley. From this area the appeal site rising up the far side of the valley is very visible in largely uninterrupted views.

<p>Much of the landscape effect of this proposal relates directly to the sloping nature of the site, which has the consequence of increasing visibility and potentially increasing the effect of the scheme. This consideration is in the light of the national and industry approach to the best siting of solar developments.</p> <p>The proposal would cause at least moderate harm to the landscape character of the area. It would conflict with policy CS25. That the harm would persist for 40 years weighs in the balance against the development.</p> <p>Although there are few views of the site from within the AONB, the main consequence of the proposal would be in taking views towards the AONB from the south. In this case, I am especially concerned with the views of the site and the AONB from the higher land on the far side of the valley. In those views one can appreciate the site set against the AONB and, as the appellant accepted, the site forms part of the same landscape. The views towards the AONB from the far side of the valley would be adversely affected – there was reference to the appeal site forming part of the ‘gateway’ to the designated area, which is an approach I recognise. Overall, the proposal would harm the landscape setting of the AONB.</p> <p>In conclusion on renewable energy, it is clear that national policy as a whole supports and encourages the development of renewable energy sources, including solar developments. There is a significant national need to reduce carbon emissions and increase renewable energy generation to achieve Net Zero by 2050 and a Net Zero electricity system by 2035. These matters carry significant weight in support of the appeal proposal.</p> <p>In terms of the loss of agricultural land, the proposed development would not result in a significant loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. In addition there is the potential that the land could be used for grazing between and under the panels if the development goes ahead. I do not consider that this matter weighs against the proposal.</p> <p>The harm to the Green Belt and that caused by the landscape/AONB issues would not be clearly outweighed by the other considerations identified and therefore the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist.</p>				
No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
4	23/00895/ROC	D/23/3329469	17 Granville Road, Northchurch	Householder
Date of Decision:			28/11/2023	
Link to full decision:				
https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3329469				
Inspector’s Key conclusions:				
<p>It is proposed to amend the plans to add an access ramp, raised platform and privacy screening as shown in the newly submitted plans to allow an alternative access to the original single staircase shown on the original planning permission.</p>				

<p>Based upon the plans before me, and my site visit, I found that the ramp and access via a raised platform with privacy screens is a conflict with the original development description. The proposal would differ materially from the description of the development on the original decision notice which cannot be varied under S73. I find that the proposed amendment would be a fundamental change to the scale of the permitted scheme, with fundamentally different impacts and considerations, which exceeds the scope of a minor material amendment.</p> <p>Consequently, having regards to the facts of the case, I find that condition 3 cannot be amended as proposed. The appeal therefore cannot be determined under the provisions of S73 and an application for a revised planning permission under S70 would need to be made. Given my findings on the procedural matters as outlined above, with those being determinative, it is not necessary for me to consider the merits of any other issues raised in this case, as they would not alter my overall decision.</p>				
No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
5	22/02737/FUL	W/22/3313021	Nash House, Dickinson Square, Hemel Hempstead	Written Representations
Date of Decision:			05/12/2023	
Link to full decision:				
https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3313021				
Inspector's Key conclusions:				
<p>The development proposed is described as "conversion of basement into 1-bedroom flat."</p> <p>Whilst the proposed development in both appeals relates to the conversion of the basement to a residential unit, it is proposed to alter the parking arrangements on both schemes. In appeal A it is proposed to reconfigure the parking spaces so that the 8 spaces to the rear of the appeal building measure 2.4 metres x 4.8 metres and that suitable manoeuvring space for the disabled parking space is provided. In Appeal B, in addition to that proposed in Appeal A an additional parking space would be provided to the side of the appeal building.</p> <p>It is my view that 13 spaces are necessary to provide for this individual unit and the wider scheme.</p> <p>The proposal in Appeal A would only provide 12 spaces. Due to the parking pressures that already exist in the area, and that I observed during my site visit, the under provision of a parking space would necessitate additional parking elsewhere, thereby increasing on-street parking pressures. This would have a harmful impact on highway safety. The subsequent increased parking demand, even from one flat, when taken cumulatively with the limited parking provision in the surrounding area, would further increase on-road congestion, noise and disturbance as drivers look for a parking space. It could also lead to unsafe or obstructive parking to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.</p>				

<p>Appeal B would provide 13 parking spaces through an additional space at the side of the appeal building. The provision of parking levels, in accordance with the SPD would ensure that parking is not displaced elsewhere. For the above reasons, whilst I have not found harm in relation to appeal B, Appeal A would be harmful to highway safety.</p> <p>With regards to Appeal B, the Council refers to Nash House as a non-designated heritage asset, which given its age, history and architectural design, I see no reason to disagree with. Nash House derives its significance from its prominence, age, history and architectural design.</p> <p>Whilst the wider development is modern, Nash House has a Georgian design and detailing and a pleasant, landscaped area. This landscaped area to its side and front provides a buffer between it and surrounding development which contributes positively to its prominence and significance. The development of an area of this landscaping for parking would erode the landscape buffer surrounding Nash House which in turn would erode its prominence, both of which contribute to its significance. As such, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the significance of this non designated heritage asset.</p>				
No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
6	22/02738/FUL	W/22/3313023	Nash House, Dickinson Square, Hemel Hempstead	Written Representations
Date of Decision:			05/12/2023	
Link to full decision:				
			https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3313021	
Inspector's Key conclusions:				
Joint appeal decision see Appeal No.5 above.				
No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
7	22/03066/RET	W/23/3322991	Sky House, 1 Fairydell Close, Kings Langley	Written Representations
Date of Decision:			11/12/2023	
Link to full decision:				
			https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3322991	
Inspector's Key conclusions:				
<p>The development proposed is described on the application form as "New stable block and new boundary fence".</p> <p>The Council has raised no objection to the appellant replacing the 2m high close boarded fence at the entrance to Fairydell Close with a post & rail fence and I see no reason to take a different view as this is a traditional form of boundary treatment consistent with the rural character of the area.</p> <p>However, the 2m high close boarded fence has a strident urban appearance wholly out of character with its countryside location. I recognise that it would be partly concealed by the hedgerow on Rucklers Lane, but given its</p>				

<p>deciduous nature and the narrowness of this strip of land it would not fully screen the fence throughout the year, even if it was reinforced with additional indigenous planting. In any event I do not consider reduced public visibility to be a sound basis upon which to justify an otherwise harmful design as this could be repeated too easily and often for all forms of poor quality development. I conclude that the 2m high close boarded fence would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>I am satisfied that the scheme would constitute an appropriate facility for outdoor recreation. However, despite; (1) the modest size & height of the stable block and close boarded fence and their partial screening from Rucklers Lane by a hedgerow strengthened by additional indigenous planting; and (2) additional landscaping in connection with the housing development, both structures would still nonetheless be clearly visible from Fairydeil Close. Furthermore, the extent of close boarded fencing and volume of the stable block would materially increase the amount of built form at the site. The development would as a consequence;- (a) not preserve the openness of the Green Belt; and (b) conflict with the purpose of including land within it. This means that the scheme would not accord with the outdoor recreation exception outlined at Paragraph 149 of the Framework. In light of the above, I conclude that the scheme constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Given the close proximity between their home and the appeal site, I can understand the appellant's desire for a stable block and acknowledge that the existing field shelter may be inadequate. I also recognise that a stable block would be consistent with the private equestrian use of the site and rural character of the area and that such uses assist in the maintenance of the wider countryside. However, be that as it may, this in itself does not represent the very special circumstances necessary to justify harm to the Green Belt as required by the Framework.</p>				
No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
8	23/00741/FHA	D/23/3327652	1 Tower Hill, Chipperfield	Householder
Date of Decision:			18/12/2023	
Link to full decision:				
			https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3327652	
Inspector's Key conclusions:				
<p>The development proposed is 2 storey side extension and associated alterations.</p> <p>It has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. Consequently, and for the purposes of this decision, the proposal would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt contrary to NPPF paragraph 149.</p> <p>The proposed extension would be highly visible from the road and would reduce the amount of open garden space to the side of the existing building. In spatial terms, there would only be a minor incursion into the Green Belt and</p>				

a minor negative effect on openness. Nevertheless, this would represent a harm to be weighed in the overall planning balance.

The appeal property makes a positive contribution to the street scene due to its projecting gables at the front and side and distinctive architectural details, including red brick at ground floor, decorative tile hanging at first floor, and gable roofs with brick chimneys, clay tiles, bargeboard and timber panelling. It is set back from the road by a front and side garden. There is a large gap between the property and the public house to the south-east formed by the side garden, access road to properties at the rear, and the pub car park, which provides views of the side elevation and increases the prominence of the property in the street.

The proposal would mimic many of the existing architectural details on the front and side elevations. The quality of materials can be controlled by condition. It would have a broadly symmetrical relationship with the existing building on the front elevation and create greater balance with the adjoining property at No 3. However, it would not be a subordinate extension as the roof height would remain unchanged and the width would be similar to the existing front gable. Therefore, it would compete with the prominence of the existing building. Moreover, the distinctive projecting side gable and rear chimney would be lost and replaced with a much shallower side gable. While a sizeable gap to the public house would remain, there would be a significant reduction in garden space to the side of the property. Concluding on this main issue, the proposal would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

The appeal property and the adjoining semi at 3 Tower Hill are located on the north-western edge of Chipperfield Conservation Area. It is a large conservation area covering much of the settlement and incorporating significant areas of open space such as Chipperfield Common. There is a mix of attractive properties with varying architectural styles from smaller cottages on narrow plots to larger detached houses on generous plots. The significance of the conservation area is greatly informed by the rural and historic character and appearance of the settlement surrounded by countryside.

The proposal would dominate the existing building and obscure the detail and proportions of the prominent side elevation. The amount of open space to the side would be reduced. Notwithstanding the attempts to replicate architectural features and achieve symmetry with the existing and adjoining property, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area. It would also have a significant harmful effect on the locally listed building at 1 Tower Hill as a non-designated heritage asset. Therefore, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area contrary to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This carries considerable importance and weight in the overall balance.

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
9	22/03157/FHA	D/23/3315971	New Lodge, Dunstable Road, Markyate	Householder
	Date of Decision:		19/12/2023	
	Link to full decision:			
	https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3315971			
	Inspector's Key conclusions:			
<p>The development proposed is remodel the existing property and add a rear extension.</p> <p>Cell Park is a Grade II* listed building dating back to the 16th centuries with notable alterations and additions in each subsequent century through to the 20th. It is a large red brick country house with rich detailing including chimneys, turrets, and gables. Consequently, it has considerable special interest and significance as a listed building. The significance of the registered park and garden is derived from its association with the listed Cell Park and the survival of a 19th and 20th century designed landscape.</p> <p>There is a clear physical and functional relationship between New Lodge and Cell Park, at least historically and perhaps at the date of listing and/or 1 January 1969. Taking a precautionary approach in the absence of clearer evidence on ownership, I consider that New Lodge is curtilage listed for the purposes of this decision. It is important to stress that the building is not listed in its own right. As such, its relevance lies not in its own merit but in the contribution it makes to the special interest of Cell Park. Even if the lodge is not listed by virtue of being within the curtilage of Cell Park, it is located within the parkland surroundings in which the listed building is experienced. Therefore, the lodge forms part of the listed building's setting. It also forms part of the registered park and garden.</p> <p>The proposed development would modernise the appearance of the building with slates replacing the thatched roof, red facing bricks applied to external walls, and metal windows inserted into existing openings. A large two storey rear extension utilising similar materials would replace the walled courtyard and be partly sunken into the ground.</p> <p>The enlarged size of the building would not be obvious from the entrance gate due to the location of the extension. However, once inside the appeal site the building would appear almost doubled in size even with the sunken elements. The gable projections and front bay windows would remain, but the existing plan form would be in competition with the scale and bulk of the extension. The glazed link and the use of flat roof elements would not offset the size and dominant form of the extension.</p> <p>Moreover, even from the entrance gate, the building would have a considerably altered appearance because of the changes in materials. The quality of the brick and slate can be controlled by condition and the colour of the brick could reflect the entrance gate and screen wall. Nevertheless, the thatched and rendered appearance would be lost. There would also be some loss of fabric on the existing rear elevation and from the removal of the walled</p>				

<p>courtyard. The ability to understand the building as a modest entrance lodge to a country house and parkland landscape would be greatly diminished.</p> <p>Consequently, the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building and the registered park and garden. It would also detract from the building as a non-designated heritage asset. Thus, the development would not preserve the special interest or setting of the listed building as required by the LBCA Act. This carries considerable importance and weight in the overall balance.</p> <p>The proposed development would provide a larger family dwellinghouse, but the building is already used for residential purposes as the optimum viable use. Therefore, the public benefits carry little weight and would not outweigh the harm identified.</p> <p>New Lodge is set back from the road and largely hidden by vegetation even in winter months. The proposed development would have little effect on the AONB or its skyline due to the amount of screening and the location of the building at the lower part of the site. However, it would represent a considerable enlargement in built form with a long and bulky rear extension that would overwhelm the modest proportions of the existing building. There would also be a marked and adverse change in the simple appearance of the building through the use of a completely different set of external materials. As such, the proposed development could not be regarded as a limited extension, and it would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>There is little information from the appellant on the potential effects on nearby trees. While it is possible that a planning condition could secure details of tree protection and replacement planting, this is a sensitive location in terms of heritage assets where clarity should be provided before a decision is made. In the absence of sufficient information, it is not possible to conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on trees.</p>				
No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
10	22/02533/FHA	D/23/3320339	Flinton, Lady Meadow, Kings Langley	Householder
Date of Decision:			19/12/2023	
Link to full decision:				
https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3320339				
Inspector's Key conclusions:				
<p>The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and storage building and erection of replacement garage, with home office within roof space.</p> <p>There is agreement between the parties that the new building is in the same use as the one it replaced, and that it has, approximately, a 25% larger floor area than that building. The appellant indicates that a 25% increase in floor area would not be materially larger than the building it replaces, a view supported by Inspectors in other Local Authority areas.</p>				

	<p>The proposed 25% addition to the floorspace would not be a significant increase in and of itself. The building would replace an existing structure, would be seen in the context of existing residential built form and would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the countryside.</p> <p>However, the appeal proposal would also entail a significant increase in height relative to the modest existing building and would have a substantially larger volume than the building it would replace. When viewed in conjunction with the increase in floorspace, this increase in volume would result in a noticeable increase in the scale of the building. There is no indication that the proposals subject of the decisions to which my attention has been drawn also resulted in a comparable increase in volume. Therefore, these decisions do not appear to be directly comparable to the appeal proposal.</p> <p>In light of the above I can only conclude that the proposed building is materially larger than the one it would replace. Accordingly, the proposal would not meet an exception listed in Paragraph 149 of the Framework. It would therefore be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The increase in footprint of the replacement building would result in more of the Green Belt being built upon than at present, reducing the spatial aspect of its openness. The increased footprint, volume and height of the building would also have a greater visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt when compared with the more modest proportions of the existing building. This would be particularly perceptible in views from Lady Meadow and from nearby public footpaths to the north and east of the site.</p> <p>Therefore, the proposal would result in a loss of openness of the Green Belt, in conflict with paragraph 137 of the Framework. I give significant weight to that harm.</p>
--	--

6.3 PLANNING APPEALS ALLOWED

Planning appeals allowed between 04 November 2023 and 31 December 2023.

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
1	22/03103/UPA	D/23/3315748	9 Darrs Lane, Northchurch	Written Representations
	Date of Decision:		03/11/2023	
	Link to full decision:		https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3315748	
	Inspector's Key conclusions:			
	Where the existing dwelling is a single storey dwelling, and subject to meeting certain criteria, Class AA of the GPDO permits the enlargement of a dwelling through the addition of one storey.			

<p>The proposal would involve the addition of a storey at first floor level. Whilst this would increase the height and bulk of the dwelling, the proposed front gable and chimneys match those of the existing dwelling, the layout and proportions of windows would reflect those located on the ground floor, and the angle of the roof pitch would be identical to that of the existing roof. The proposal would therefore broadly retain the architectural style and form of the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed external materials, including roof tiles, uPVC windows, and tile hung walls at first floor, would match the appearance of materials used in the existing dwelling.</p> <p>The change from one-storey to two-storeys would inevitably alter the building's visual appearance. However, the scale of the proposal would be commensurate with the built volume of the additional storey and would not appear disproportionate or out of keeping with other features, such as the shape and size of the ground floor storey and roof.</p> <p>The appeal property is located within a group of bungalows, situated on either side of Darrs Lane, which are similar in scale and form to the appeal property. Bungalows are therefore formative of the character of the immediate area surrounding the appeal site. By virtue of its additional storey, the proposed development would appear noticeably greater in scale and bulk than existing bungalows along this section of Darrs Lane.</p> <p>I consider the GPDO does not require assessment of the effects of upward extensions on the appearance of the wider area. The Framework and development plan policies are therefore only relevant in so far as they relate to the subject matter of the prior approval, in this case the external appearance of the building.</p>				
No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
2	22/01080/FHA	D/23/3320173	5 Home Farm, Park Road, Tring	Householder
Date of Decision:			17/11/2023	
Link to full decision:				
https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3320173				
Inspector's Key conclusions:				
<p>The development proposed is the insertion of two rooflights and a light tunnel tube inlet on the south elevation roof.</p> <p>The appeal property is a former barn which has been converted to a dwelling. It is situated within a group of buildings which formerly comprised Home Farm and is associated with the Tring Park estate. Whilst the complex does not contain listed buildings, it is located within the Tring Conservation Area (CA).</p> <p>The buildings of the former Home Farm complex are all now converted to residential use. However, the CA Appraisal indicates that these component buildings of Tring Park form a very important part of the history, character and appearance of the CA and possess historic interest through their former function, their connection to Rothschild and Huckvale, and for their design and</p>				

<p>materials which link them to many other buildings in the town. The appeal property therefore makes a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.</p> <p>The appeal property is situated in one corner of a group of converted barns arranged around a central courtyard. The form and layout of this group of buildings, along with materials and features such as the traditional wooden vents and finials atop the ridge of the plain tiled roofs, provide a clear reference to the former agricultural use of the buildings.</p> <p>However, the converted barns have doors and windows typical of dwellings, and rooflights are common across roof slopes. Domestic paraphernalia such as flues, meter boxes, aerials and satellite dishes are visible along the exterior of buildings. Across the wider Home Farm complex is a tarmac access road, footway, demarcated parking bays, and maintained verges and planting. These features, together with the neatly landscaped central courtyard and front gardens with established planted borders, lawns, patio seating, and boundary treatments comprised of low hedges and fencing, provide a distinctly domestic appearance to the area.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst there are prominent visual clues to its former agriculture use, the appeal property and its surrounding area is principally residential in character. Consequently, the proposed development, which would involve the insertion of roof lights and a lighting tube into the roof slope, would not be out of keeping with the appeal property's domestic appearance and would not alter its residential character.</p> <p>The proposed development would be located on the roof slope at the rear of the appeal property. This roof slope is not visible from any public highway. Furthermore, from the access road there are other more prominent rooflights visible on roof slopes of other nearby dwellings. The proposed development would not therefore appear out of keeping with the residential character and appearance of buildings in the area.</p> <p>For the reasons set out above, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area, and as such would have a neutral effect upon the significance of the CA.</p>				
No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
3	22/00456/FUL	W/23/3316262	Former Convent Of St Francis De Sales Preparatory School, Aylesbury Road, Tring	Written Representations
Date of Decision:			20/11/2023	
Link to full decision:				
			https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3316262	
Inspector's Key conclusions:				
The development proposed is demolition of the existing buildings. Construction of 7 new houses with associated parking and landscaping.				

There appears to be consensus between the Council and appellant that the significance of the building is low. However, the building is of some architectural interest on its own merits, and overall makes a modest positive contribution to the character of the area. Consequently, through the demolition of the existing building, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area.

The existing building's hung tile details reflect the general character of the CA. However, the building is somewhat unusual in that it is a large villa in a large plot and differs from the appearance of other development of its time in the area. The form and appearance of the existing building is not therefore typical of development in the CA, and the building is not contemporary with the mid-nineteenth century development which the CA Appraisal identifies as being formative of Character Area 2. In addition, the site adjoins development that is modern in character and which does not follow historic street patterns.

Therefore, modern development, including a care home and housing estate, along with existing vegetation along the highway edge, provides both physical and visual separation from the CA. For these reasons, the loss of the existing building would have a neutral effect upon the setting of the CA and would not harm the CA's historic significance.

The design of dwellings would be similar to adjacent development and therefore would be in keeping with the surrounding area. Through its layout, scale and form, the proposed development would appear as an additional cul-de-sac arm of the modern St Francis Close estate development. The proposed dwellings would be oriented to face into the St Francis Close development and therefore the scheme would not address Aylesbury Road.

Due to the elevated topography of the site, its set back from the highway, the presence of existing vegetation including protected trees, together with the proposed landscaping scheme, the proposed development would be of very limited visibility from Aylesbury Road. Consequently, the proposed development would not be detrimental to the character of this section of Aylesbury Road which forms an important approach to the CA and would not harm views from the open space adjacent to the cemetery or the junction of Park Road and Western Road.

The proposed development would therefore have a neutral effect upon the significance of the CA. However, through the loss of the existing building on site which comprises a non-designated heritage asset, the proposal would fail to conserve the historic environment and would thus harm the character and appearance of the area.

The proposed development would adjoin the private road which is in the ownership of occupants of the St Francis Close development. Residents have raised concerns regarding pedestrian safety arising from additional traffic movements associated with the proposed dwellings. It is my understanding that the construction of a pedestrian footway was secured through a planning condition attached to the planning permission for the St Francis Close

<p>development and that the footway's absence is being investigated by the Council. Whilst the present lack of pedestrian footway is unsatisfactory, there are existing mechanisms within the planning system to ensure its provision. I also note the highways authority did not object to the proposal and I have no evidence to suggest the proposal would adversely affect highway safety.</p> <p>The scale of harm associated with the proposal would be the total loss of a non-designated heritage asset as a result of the demolition of the existing building on site, and thus attracts considerable weight against the scheme. However, in reaching a balanced judgement, I attach significant weight to the fallback position afforded by the existing prior approval consent. On this basis, the fallback position outweighs the harm arising from the loss of the non-designated heritage asset, including those effects on the character and appearance of the area.</p>				
No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
4	22/03760/FHA	D/23/3322514	29 Langley Hill, Kings Langley	Householder
Date of Decision:			27/11/2023	
Link to full decision:				
https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3322514				
Inspector's Key conclusions:				
<p>The development proposed is one and a half storey rear extension including room in roof space, extension to existing side dormer, re-roof with new tiles, reconstruct attached garage to side and installation of new doors and windows.</p> <p>There are several elements to the appeal proposal, however, the Council's refusal reason relates solely to the rear facing balcony with regard to overlooking and unacceptable loss of privacy.</p> <p>The Council's assessment considers the amenity of 5 Le Corte Close and given the separation, orientation and boundary features I have no reason to conclude that the proposal would have unacceptable impact upon that property.</p> <p>No. 27 is located to the east of the appeal site which means that the proposed extension to the existing dormer window is screened by the existing dwelling and given this, and the presence of existing dormer windows in this elevation, means that there would not be a negative impact upon the neighbouring amenity of no. 27 with regard to privacy or overlooking from this element. There are already rear facing windows to the rear elevation of the appeal site and the proposed balcony would be a recessed roof terraced balcony with walls either side of the balcony space. I find that the balcony, with natural use, would most commonly direct views down the appeal site garden and the walls either side of the balcony screen would views directly towards no. 27 – much like a window. Overall, based upon the design of the proposed balcony essentially being a recessed roof terrace with walls either side, I do not find that the proposal would result in overlooking or any loss of privacy to no. 27.</p>				

No. 31 is located to the west. There is an existing dormer window on this elevation with the proposal seeking a slight enlargement which, given the presence of the existing dormer window, would not have additional impact on the neighbouring amenity of the occupiers of no. 31 in relation to privacy. It is noted that there are no existing windows on the side elevation of no. 31 which further contributes to a lack of privacy concerns relating to the proposal. There are two proposed windows at first floor level which would face towards no. 31, however, from the floorplans I can see that these would both serve non-habitable rooms (bathrooms) which can be obscurely glazed, secured by condition, without detriment to the occupiers of the proposal as well as controlling any privacy concerns from the new windows in place.

In a similar manner to no. 27, the proposed balcony, as a recessed roof terrace, has a wall to the side which faces towards no. 31 which would prevent direct views towards the property and garden area immediately to the rear of the neighbouring property. There are already rear facing windows to the rear elevation of the appeal site and the proposed balcony facing towards the rear would, I find, function in a similar manner to a large bedroom window and would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy which would warrant refusal.

I find that the proposal has been designed in a way to minimise potential harm to the privacy of adjoining properties as a result of the provision of in-built screening on both sides which ensures outlook from the balcony is directed rearward and prevents future occupiers of the proposal from looking back towards neighbouring properties or the amenity space immediately to the rear of those respective properties. Overall, the balcony is limited in terms of functional space due to its pitched form and modest depth. I also note from the floorplans, that the balcony could only be accessed off what would essentially be a master bedroom suite. The balcony is not connected to, for example, the kitchen or dining area which may mean that it would be more commonly utilised by visitors to the site which, combined with the overall size, means that the ultimate use of the balcony would be limited and cannot be said to present potential for intensive use or overlooking/loss of privacy to the detriment of neighbouring properties.

I do not find that the proposal would result in 180-degree view of the neighbouring garden or that there would be views of the entire area. Views from the balcony would be comparable to windows in a rear elevation with natural views down the garden, and to the ends of neighbouring gardens, being entirely appropriate and natural within a built-up residential area of this nature.

Whilst I acknowledge that the level of glazing and balustrading would be greater than a standard window, I do not find that this would result in increased levels of overlooking or intrusion into neighbouring privacy for the reasons I have outlined above. Whilst the balcony would, of course, be elevated due to its position a degree of overlooking, is commonplace in a residential area and I do not find that the proposal would increase the opportunity for overlooking further than, for example, a full-length bedroom window.

6.4 PLANNING APPEALS WITHDRAWN

Planning appeals withdrawn between 04 November 2023 and 31 December 2023.

None.

6.5 ENFORCEMENT NOTICE APPEALS LODGED

Enforcement Notice appeals lodged between 04 November 2023 and 31 December 2023.

None.

6.6 ENFORCEMENT NOTICE APPEALS DISMISSED

Enforcement Notice appeals dismissed between 04 November 2023 and 31 December 2023.

None.

6.7 ENFORCEMENT NOTICE APPEALS ALLOWED

Enforcement Notice appeals allowed between 04 November 2023 and 31 December 2023.

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
1	E/22/00368/COL	C/23/3322546	25 Crossways, Hemel Hempstead	Written Representations
	Date of Decision:		07/12/2022	
	Link to full decision:			
	https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3322546			
	Inspector's Key conclusions:			
	The appeal property contains a substantial detached dwelling with an extensive area of hard surface at the front and side. The appellant accepted that a number of light commercial vehicles, mostly associated with the appellant's landscaping business, including two tipper vans and two transit-type vans, have been parked and stored on the hard surface. Therefore, the activity alleged in the notice has in fact occurred.			
	According to the appellant, the vehicles parked and stored at the property are used solely by the occupiers of the dwelling for travelling to and from their			

place of work, or as in the case of one of the vehicles, for private recreational purposes. The appellant also stated that no loading or unloading of materials or equipment takes place at the property and that none of the vehicles are used other than by the occupiers of the dwelling. I am given to understand that the appellant's business is based at premises elsewhere in the town.

The parking and storage in the curtilage of a dwelling of vehicles used by its occupiers is an activity that would ordinarily be regarded as being ancillary or incidental to the primary dwellinghouse use. Travelling to and from a dwelling for purposes of work and for private recreation fall within the range of day-to-day activities typically undertaken by residential occupiers. Although most of the vehicles are also used off-site for commercial purposes, there is no firm evidence to suggest that they are being parked and stored at the property other than in the circumstances set out by the appellant. Therefore, in my view there is a functional relationship between the vehicle parking and storage activity and the primary dwellinghouse use, not dissimilar to that normally found at a dwelling. The Council accepted that up to two commercial vehicles could be parked or stored at the property without amounting to a material change of use.

An ancillary use is not necessarily distinguished by its scale. Accordingly, neither the number and size of the vehicles parked and stored at the property nor their commercial nature would necessarily be conclusive as to whether there has been a material change in character from the lawful use as a dwellinghouse. In practice, there is little difference between the size and appearance of vehicles at the property and the larger private domestic vehicle types typically used by many householders and kept within the grounds of dwellings, including for example, SUVs and pick-ups. Furthermore, where a single dwelling is occupied by a number of adult members of the same family, as in this instance, it is not unusual for there to be several vehicles parked or stored within the grounds to meet the occupiers' day-to-day travel requirements. Set in the above context, the vehicle parking and storage activity has a limited visual impact on its predominantly residential setting.

There is no firm evidence to indicate that the parking and storage activity has involved an increase in vehicular movements to and from the property over and above that normally associated with a single dwelling, or of any additional noise and disturbance being experienced by neighbouring residential occupiers and/or in the vicinity as a result. Furthermore, there is no firm evidence to suggest that the types of vehicles parked and stored at the property are significantly noisier, either when starting up or when running, compared to private domestic vehicle types typically used by householders. For this and the other reasons set out above, it seems to me that the activity at the property is little different in terms of its character to that which would ordinarily be associated with the lawful use as a single dwellinghouse. Consequently, I find that on the basis of the available evidence, as a matter of fact and degree and on the balance of probability, the commercial vehicle parking and storage activity is ancillary to the primary use of the property as a dwellinghouse and does not involve a material change of use.

	I conclude that the appeal should succeed on ground (c). Accordingly, the enforcement notice will be quashed.
--	---

6.8 ENFORCEMENT NOTICE APPEALS WITHDRAWN

Enforcement Notice appeals withdrawn between 04 November 2023 and 31 December 2023.

None.

6.9 SUMMARY OF TOTAL APPEAL DECISIONS IN 2023 (up to 31 December 2023).

APPEALS LODGED IN 2023	
PLANNING APPEALS LODGED	70
ENFORCEMENT APPEALS LODGED	14
TOTAL APPEALS LODGED	84

APPEALS DECIDED IN 2023 (excl. invalid appeals)	TOTAL	%
TOTAL	66	100
APPEALS DISMISSED	42	63.6
APPEALS ALLOWED	22	33.3
APPEALS PART ALLOWED / PART DISMISSED	0	0
APPEALS WITHDRAWN	2	3.1

	TOTAL	%
APPEALS DISMISSED IN 2023		
Total	42	100
Non-determination	5	11.9
Delegated	35	83.3
DMC decision with Officer recommendation	1	2.4
DMC decision contrary to Officer recommendation	1	2.4

APPEALS ALLOWED IN 2023	TOTAL	%
Total	22	100
Non-determination	0	0
Delegated	19	86.4
DMC decision with Officer recommendation	1	4.5
DMC decision contrary to Officer recommendation	2	9.1

6.10 UPCOMING HEARINGS

None.

6.11 UPCOMING INQUIRIES

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Date
1	E/21/00041/NPP	C/22/3290614	The Old Oak, Hogpits Bottom Flaunden	tbc
2	22/01836/MFA	W/23/3333545	Rectory farm, Kings Langley	tbc

6.12 COSTS APPLICATIONS GRANTED

Applications for Costs granted between 04 November 2023 and 31 December 2023.

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
1	22/03760/FHA	D/23/3322514	29 Langley Hill, Kings Langley	Householder
	Date of Decision:		25/11/2022	
	Link to full decision:			
	https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3322514			
	Inspector's Key conclusions:			
	<p>The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and thereby caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process. The PPG makes it clear that a Local Planning Authority (LPA) is at risk of an award of costs if it fails to produce evidence to substantiate each reason for refusal on appeal and/or makes vague, generalised, or inaccurate assertions about a proposal's impact which are unsupported by any objective analysis.</p> <p>The appeal followed the refusal of permission on 28 February 2023 of an application made on 20 December 2022 for one and a half storey rear extension including room in roof space, extension to existing side dormer, re-roof with new tiles, reconstruct attached garage to side and installation of new doors and windows. There was a single reason for refusal which was concerned with the impact of the proposal upon neighbouring residential amenity with specific regard to overlooking and unacceptable loss of privacy.</p>			

My decision, which accompanies this costs decision, disagreed with the Council's decision, and allowed the appeal.

The proposal before me was recommended for approval before the Planning Committee. The Council has submitted minutes from the Planning Committee on 23 February 2023 with the appeal proposal being item 5, however, these are limited in nature to the procedural processes i.e., reason for referral, who spoke, the overall vote/motion to vote, the outcome and refusal reason given. I note both parties' comments regarding the inappropriate conduct which is claimed to have taken place within the committee meeting, however, I have assessed this application for costs upon its own merits based upon the written evidence which is before me.

The Council's response to the application states that consideration of the impact of the balcony lead to a substantial amount of debate, however, there is no evidence within the minutes of the meeting provided which outlines interaction between committee members to support this. The Committee are, of course, within their rights to disagree with the officer's recommendation but any refusal reason (whether via delegated powers or planning committee) must be supported by evidence of objective analysis and cannot be vague or generalised.

Members are able to assess the proposal and reach their own conclusions but based upon the evidence before me, such as the Committee Meeting minutes, I see no evidence of the refusal reason being substantiated. I have no evidence as to the discussions relating to the implications of the proposal being contrary to the policy stated nor, for example, any discussion by the Committee against the overarching objectives of the relevant policies and reasoned justification which had been set out by Council Officers, within their report, that had fully analysed and assessed the proposal when recommending approval.

I do not find that there was reasonable basis for the stance with regard to the application of the relevant policy, or claimed impact, which was utilised for the refusal reason. Overall, I find that the refusal reason put forward was not supported by any evidence of objective analysis by the Planning Committee. In this case there is both cause and effect which has resulted in unnecessary expense. It can be seen from my decision that I found there were insufficient grounds to refuse the appeal as a result of my findings for the refusal reason.

In failing to produce relevant evidence to support the reason to refuse planning permission, I consider that the Council has acted unreasonably resulting in unnecessary expense for the appellant. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the Planning Practice Guidance, has been demonstrated and that a full award of costs is justified.

6.13 COSTS APPLICATIONS REFUSED

Applications for Costs refused between 04 November 2023 and 31 December 2023.

None.

6.14 FURTHER SUMMARY OF APPEALS IN 2023

APPEALS LODGED IN 2023	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
HOUSEHOLDER	28	33.3
MINOR	29	34.5
MAJOR	2	2.4
LISTED BUILDING	2	2.4
CONDITIONS	2	2.4
TELECOMMUNICATIONS	2	2.4
LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE	2	2.4
PRIOR APPROVAL	3	3.6
LEGAL AGREEMENT	0	0
ENFORCEMENT	14	16.7
TOTAL APPEALS LODGED	84	100

APPEALS DECIDED IN 2023 (excl. invalid appeals)	TOTAL	%
HOUSEHOLDER	28	42.4
MINOR	22	33.3
MAJOR	2	3
LISTED BUILDING	1	1.5
CONDITIONS	3	4.5
TELECOMMUNICATIONS	2	3
LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE	1	1.5
PRIOR APPROVAL	2	3
LEGAL AGREEMENT	1	1.5
PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE	1	1.5
ENFORCEMENT	3	4.5
TOTAL APPEALS DECIDED	66	100

HOUSEHOLDER APPEALS DECIDED IN 2023 (excl. invalid appeals)	TOTAL	%
DISMISSED	16	57.1
ALLOWED	12	42.9
PART ALLOWED / PART DISMISSED	0	0
WITHDRAWN	0	0
TOTAL HOUSEHOLDER APPEALS DECIDED	28	100

MINOR APPEALS DECIDED IN 2023 (excl. invalid appeals)	TOTAL	%
DISMISSED	18	81.8
ALLOWED	3	13.6
PART ALLOWED / PART DISMISSED	0	0
WITHDRAWN	1	4.5
TOTAL MINOR APPEALS DECIDED	22	100

MAJOR APPEALS DECIDED IN 2023 (excl. invalid appeals)	TOTAL	%
DISMISSED	2	100
ALLOWED	0	0
PART ALLOWED / PART DISMISSED	0	0
WITHDRAWN	0	0
TOTAL MAJOR APPEALS DECIDED	2	100

ENFORCEMENT APPEALS DECIDED IN 2023 (excl. invalid appeals)	TOTAL	%
DISMISSED	2	66.6
ALLOWED	1	33.3
PART ALLOWED / PART DISMISSED	0	0
WITHDRAWN	0	0
TOTAL ENFORCEMENT APPEALS DECIDED	3	100

COSTS APPLICATIONS AGAINST COUNCIL DECIDED IN 2023	TOTAL	%
REFUSED	5	62.5
PARTIALLY GRANTED	2	25
GRANTED	1	12.5
WITHDRAWN	0	0
TOTAL COSTS APPLICATIONS DECIDED	8	100