

Cookies on appeal a planning decision service

We use some essential cookies to make this service work.

We'd also like to use analytics cookies so we can understand how you use the service and make improvements.

[View cookies \(/cookies\)](/cookies)

Planning Inspectorate Manage your appeals

Appeal 6008747

Interested party comments

Appeal type	Planning
Appeal procedure	Written
Appeal site	Land to the front of Everglades, Maiden Street, Weston, Hitchin, SG4 7AA
Appellant contact details	Jim Caudle [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Local planning authority	North Hertfordshire
Application number	25/02950/FP

Interested party 1

Comments	I support this application. I am a long term resident of Weston and a Parish Councillor. I write as a resident, the Parish Council recorded no objections. When I moved to Weston 45 years ago there were a lot of properties suitable for single people, first time buyers or more elderly people wishing to downsize. These have nearly all been developed into larger family properties unsuitable for these people. The three properties surrounding this site, Homefield, Kwetu and Amberley have all been extensively extended both horizontally and vertically in recent years from modest bungalows/houses to large family homes. It is important that the open aspect of the village is maintained but this property of low profile tucked behind the recently extended Homefield would not be detrimental to this and the removal of the extensive array of sheds and workshops can only enhance the area. The revised plans reasonably address the concerns of neighbours and the condition offered that the property would not be extended vertically in future should be incorporated into the permission. Weston is now very short of small ground floor properties suitable for older people with mobility issues and this property would fulfil a need, albeit in a small way. The most affected property, Kyrenia, was only able to be built after their application was sent to appeal so I ask that the same consideration be afforded to this application. [REDACTED]
----------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 2

Comments	In response to the Appellant's appeal, I would like to make the following additional comments in support of NHDC's refusal to grant planning permission. The refusal reason is about the character and layout of the development, not just the building footprint. The Council's refusal was that the site is small, leaves very little private amenity space, sits close to boundaries, creates an unfavourable relationship with the host dwelling, and appears "contrived and out of context" with the area's character. Whilst the design itself may be acceptable, the siting of the dwelling is still awkward and therefore conflicts with design policies SP9 and D1. The appeal focuses heavily on proving that the bungalow footprint is only about 117 m² on a 1,200 m² plot (less than 10%). Although the plot is large on paper, much of it consists of a shared driveway and landscaped frontage rather than genuinely private residential garden/"amenity" space. In reality, the available plot is bounded the area directly facing Kyrenia as shown in the various drawings, diagrams and photographs; approximately 280m². A site visit would confirm this. The Shared driveway land cannot be considered as "amenity space" because: • the driveway is shared access • it functions primarily as a vehicular route
----------	--

- residents cannot enjoy it with the same privacy as a garden
 - amenity space is usually expected to be directly associated with the dwelling.
- The only truly available amenity space is the relatively small private rear patio area.

In addition, there are no contractual arrangements for maintenance of the driveway and as it is highly unlikely to be able to be maintained by a prospective Elderly or Disabled resident, it should not even form a part of the land associated with the proposed development; logically it should remain with Everglades as the largest property. The appellant already comments in 6.1.3 "The small rear patio area will be more manageable than a large high-maintenance plot".

The "Kyrenia precedent" argument doesn't make sense

- The Kyrenia plot is not an identical size
- It does not have the same relationship with neighbouring properties
- It has much more (usable) amenity space [REDACTED]

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------

Interested party 3

Comments

On reading the officers report from the original application (12 March 2026) we agree with the findings.

In relation to the request to ensure that a restrictive covenant or planning condition is put in place to prevent further upwards development, we welcome the proposal by the council (paragraph 4.2.26; 2nd bullet) to remove Permitted Development Rights under Class AA and Class B to ensure that any future upward development on this site is prevented.

We would also draw attention to an inconsistency in the appellant's appeal statement with regard to the final adapted roof design: the final proposal (Version 4) of the submitted drawings specifies a maximum ridge height of 4m and fully hipped design (acknowledged in the officer's report, See section 4.3.6), not the 4.6m cited by the appellant.

As the neighbouring property most significantly affected by this proposal, we respectfully request that a full site visit be conducted to allow a comprehensive assessment of the proposal's actual character, scale, and impact. Only through an on-site inspection can the implications of the proposed development and its relationship to the plot and surrounding properties be properly understood and evaluated. [REDACTED]

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------
