



2 December 2025

North Hertfordshire District Council
Development and Conservation
PO Box 10613
Nottingham
NG6 6DH

Reference MHP: 2025_0087

To Planning Support

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS OF PROPOSED USE OR
DEVELOPMENT FOR THE SITING OF A TWIN-UNIT CARAVAN FOR ANCILLARY
RESIDENTIAL USE, LAND AT 132 EASTERN WAY, LETCHWORTH GARDEN CITY, HERTS**

On behalf of Vicky Martin, I have pleasure in seeking confirmation that the siting of a twin-unit caravan for ancillary residential use, on land at 132 Eastern Way, Letchworth Garden City, would be lawful having regard to the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

As the current application falls to be determined having regard solely to matters of evidential fact and law, with the onus of proof on the applicant, there is no requirement for it to be publicised under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. Similarly, as the policies of the Local Development Plan are not relevant to the determination of an application submitted under the provisions of Section 192, any concerns regarding potential impact on the character or appearance of the area are not matters that the Council can attach any weight to.

Furthermore, in appeals which raise legal issues where the onus of proof is on the appellant, the Courts have held that the relevant test of the evidence on such matters is the “balance of probability”. As this test will accordingly be applied in any appeal against their decisions, planning authorities should therefore not refuse a Certificate because the applicant has failed to discharge the stricter, criminal burden of proof beyond reasonable doubt. Moreover, the applicant's own evidence does not need to be corroborated by independent evidence in order to be accepted. If the planning authority has no evidence

MH Planning Associates

63 West Princes Street, Helensburgh, G84 8BN **Tel:** [REDACTED] **Mob:** [REDACTED]
Web: www.mhplanning.co.uk **Email:** info@mhplanning.co.uk

to contradict or otherwise make the applicant's version of events less than probable, this is not in itself a valid reason to refuse the application.

The application has been submitted electronically through the 'Planning Portal' (reference PP-14536394) and comprises the following:

- The completed application form;
- The required fee of £294.00;
- The following drawings:
 - Site Location and Block Plans (1:1,250 and 1:500 @ A4);
 - Twin-Unit Caravan Manufacture Notes & Installation Guidance;
 - Detailed drawings of the proposed caravan; and
 - Structural calculations and lifting details;
- A Supporting Statement; and
- The following Supporting Documents:
 - Document 1 – Appeal Decision, Upper Farm, Bluebell Lane;
 - Document 2 – Appeal Decision, 159 Victoria Avenue, Borrowash;
 - Document 3 – Appeal Decision, 28 Lodge Lane, Romford;
 - Document 4 – Appeal Decision, 5 Combermere Close, Windsor;
 - Document 5 - Appeal Decision, 27 Elmfield Avenue, Teddington;
 - Document 6 – Appeal Decision, 34 Hayton Close, Luton;
 - Document 7 – Appeal Decision, New Oaks Farm, Ambleside;
 - Document 8 – House of Commons Hansard Debate;
 - Document 9 – Appeal Decision, Homefield, Moss Lane, Ormskirk;
 - Document 10 – Costs Decision, Homefield, Moss Lane, Ormskirk;
 - Document 11 – Appeal Decision, Woodfords, Shipley Road; and
 - Document 12 – Appeal Decision, Heathfield House, Tiptree.

The application is submitted on the basis that the unit in question is a twin-unit caravan (as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 (as amended)), and that the siting of a caravan, on land within a planning unit, to be used for purposes ancillary to the primary use of the planning unit, does not amount to "development" as per Section 55(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Yours sincerely



Michael Hyde MRTPI
On behalf of The Green Room