

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS, 1971 and 1972

THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF ..... DACORUM .....  
IN THE COUNTY OF HERTFORD .....  
.....

To H. Robinson Esq.,  
10 Thatchers Croft,  
Hemel Hempstead,  
Herts.

B. Allen Esq.,  
34 Aysgarth Close,  
Harpenden,  
Herts.

Two-storey rear extension,  
.....  
at 10 Thatchers Croft,  
.....  
Hemel Hempstead.  
.....

Brief  
description  
and location  
of proposed  
development.

In pursuance of their powers under the above-mentioned Acts and the Orders and Regulations for the time being in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you in your application dated ..... 29th January 1981 ..... and received with sufficient particulars on ..... 3rd February 1981 ..... and shown on the plan(s) accompanying such application..

The reasons for the Council's decision to refuse permission for the development are:--

1. The proposed development is excessive on a site which is inadequate satisfactorily to accommodate the proposal together with the necessary amenities and vehicle parking facilities.
2. The proposed development would have a seriously detrimental effect on amenities and privacy at present enjoyed by occupants of adjacent dwellings.

Dated 2nd day of March, 19 81

Signed *Colin Barnard*

Designation Chief Planning Officer

## NOTE

- (1) If the applicant wishes to have an explanation of the reasons for this decision it will be given on request and a meeting arranged if necessary.
- (2) If the applicant is aggrieved by the decision of the local planning authority to refuse permission or approval for the proposed development, or to grant permission or approval subject to conditions, he may appeal to the Secretary of State for the Environment, in accordance with section 36 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971, within six months of receipt of this notice. (Appeals must be made on a form which is obtainable from the Secretary of State for the Environment, Whitehall, London, S.W.1.) The Secretary of State has power to allow a longer period for the giving of a notice of appeal but he will not normally be prepared to exercise this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal. The Secretary of State is not required to entertain an appeal if it appears to him that permission for the proposed development could not have been granted by the local planning authority, or could not have been so granted otherwise than subject to the conditions imposed by them, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of the development order, and to any directions given under the order.
- (3) If permission to develop land is refused, or granted subject to conditions, whether by the local planning authority or by the Secretary of State for the Environment and the owner of the land claims that the land has become incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state and cannot be rendered capable of reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted, he may serve on the District Council in which the land is situated, a purchase notice requiring that council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of Part IX of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971.
- (4) In certain circumstances, a claim may be made against the local planning authority for compensation, where permission is refused or granted subject to conditions by the Secretary of State on appeal or on a reference of the application to him. The circumstances in which such compensation is payable are set out in section 169 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971.


**Department of the Environment**

Room 1319

Tollgate House, Houlton Street, Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

104099

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
OFFICER**
**19 NOV 1981**

 File Ref. ....  
 Refer to *C.P. 6*  
 Cleared .....

PLANNING DEPARTMENT					
DACORUM DISTRICT COUNCIL					
Ref.				Direct line 0272-218 Switchboard 0272-21811 Ack GTN 2074	
C.P.O.	D.P.	A.C.	S.C.	Admin.	File
					Your reference
Received			19 NOV 1981		Our reference
Comments				T/APP/5252/A/81/09957/G7 Date	

**18 NOV 1981**

 Mr H Robinson  
 10 Thatcher's Croft  
 HEMEL HEMPSTEAD  
 Herts  
 HP2 6DN

Sir

 TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9  
 APPLICATION NO: 4/0118/81

- I refer to your appeal, which I have been appointed to determine, against the decision of the Dacorum District Council to refuse planning permission for a 2-storey rear extension at No 10 Thatcher's Croft, Hemel Hempstead. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the council and also those made by interested persons. I inspected the site on 27 October 1981.
- From my inspection of the site and surrounding area and the representations made I consider that the main issues are whether it would result in the over development of the site and whether it would be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining residents and the street scene generally.
- The house the subject of this appeal is located in a small cul-de-sac of similar houses which have mono-pitched roofs. The layout separates pedestrian access from vehicular access. No 10 is linked to No 8 at ground floor level and joined to No 12, which is sited at right angles to it. The proposal involves demolishing one of a pair of semi-detached garages and building over the rear yard at ground and first floor levels, up to the boundary with No 12.
- The proposed development would produce a house with five bedrooms. The size of the house would be doubled and it would have no garden space at all at the rear, and only a small garden, approximately 20 ft by 40 ft, at the front. A house of this size would usually have a much larger amount of garden around it. The proposal would in my view result in over development of the site.
- Your proposal would also involve building at the rear up to the boundary with No 12. Because of the size of the extension it would be equivalent to a new 2-storey house on this boundary. It would, in my view, dominate the rear garden of No 12 and be detrimental to the amenities of the residents of that house. Further, a bedroom window directly overlooks your neighbour's garden. This is unacceptable and the use of roof lights as an alternative to the window would not be appropriate.
- Moreover the extension would dominate the end of the cul-de-sac and because it involves changing the form of the roof it would be visually intrusive in the street scene.

7. I can understand your desire to extend your house to provide additional accommodation, but the site is too small to do this in the way you propose. Such an extension would be detrimental to your neighbours and to the area generally.

8. I have taken into account all the other matters raised in the representations but I do not find them sufficient to affect my decision and for the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby dismiss this appeal.

I am Sir

Your obedient Servant



BETTY TREVENA MDesSt FRIPi FRAPi  
Inspector