



TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Ref No. 4/0140/93

D Zerfams
Woodstock
Chesham Road
Bovingdon
Herts

DEVELOPMENT ADDRESS AND DESCRIPTION
=====

Woodstock, Chesham Road, Bovingdon

SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION * 42

Your application for *full planning permission (householder)* dated 29.01.1993 and received on 02.02.1993 has been **REFUSED**, for the reasons set out on the attached sheet(s).

Director of Planning

Date of Decision: 04.03.1993

(ENC Reasons and Notes)

REASONS FOR REFUSAL
OF APPLICATION: 4/0140/93

Date of Decision: 04.03.1993



The proposed development would appear incongruous and dominant and would prove detrimental to the general character of the street scene.

NORTHGATE
DOCUMENT STAMPED
TO ENSURE DETECTION
BY SCANNER



The Planning Inspectorate

An Executive Agency in the Department of the Environment and the Welsh Office

Room 1404
Tollgate House
Houlton Street
Bristol BS2 9DJ

Direct Line 0272-218927
Switchboard 0272-218811
Fax No 0272-218769
GTN 1374

~~JDA~~
~~2JAM~~
~~3/08~~

Mr D Zerfahs
Woodstock
Chesham Road
BOVINGDON
Herts
HP3 OEA

PLANNING DEPARTMENT						
DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL						
Ref.					Ack.	
DoP	T.C.P.M.	D.P.	D.C.	B.C. or A.S.P.	File	
				T/APP/A1910/A/93/223061/P5		
Received			26 JUL 1993		Date: 23 JUL 1993	
Comments						

Dear Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6
APPLICATION NO: 4/0140/93

1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine your appeal. Your appeal is against the decision of the Dacorum Borough Council to refuse planning permission in respect of an application for a single storey front extension at Woodstock, Chesham Road, Bovington. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council and also those made by the Bovington Parish Council and interested persons including those made directly to the Council and forwarded to me. I inspected the site on 28 June 1993.

2. Although you have described the proposal as a single storey front extension, the proposed building would only be joined to the main dwelling at roof level. Taking account of the general design and layout of the proposal, it appears to me that it is better described as a new building in the front garden for the purpose of providing additional residential accommodation.

3. From my reading of the representations and my inspection of the site and its surroundings I consider that the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

4. The objective of maintaining the quality of the built environment is reflected in a number of policies of the approved Structure Plan, the adopted Dacorum District Plan and the deposit draft Dacorum Borough Local Plan. The last of these has made substantial progress towards adoption and needs to be accorded due weight. Policy 8 of the draft Local Plan seeks a high standard of design and quality of development; a number of the criteria contained in this policy pertain to the need for development to relate satisfactorily to its surroundings. These criteria are amplified in the Environmental Guidelines, as explained in Policy 9. The Guidelines state, inter alia, that a front extension may be



acceptable if it is fairly small and does not project beyond the front wall of the dwelling in a way that dominates the street scene. It is against this background that the proposal needs to be assessed.

5. As you have pointed out, Chesham Road contains a diverse mixture of houses and bungalows. However, the dwellings are all set well back from the road, albeit that there does not appear to be any specific building line. Many of the front gardens in the general vicinity of the appeal site contain a variety of soft landscaping. Indeed, some dwellings are largely hidden from view from the road because of dense vegetation. For the most part, buildings are not particularly prominent in the street scene and the area has an attractive semi-rural character.

6. Due to a combination of circumstances including that they are both relatively new and that hard features (hard surfacing and brick walls) dominate the frontages, Woodstock and the adjoining property The Waylands are quite prominent in the street scene. It is my view that the proposed addition would be obtrusive in itself and would make Woodstock even more prominent than it is at the present time. While the addition would be screened from the north-east, it would be clearly visible in the street scene when facing the site or when approaching it from the south-west. Vegetation is helping to soften the appearance of the front boundary at Woodstock and it is likely that this mellowing process will continue as the landscape matures. However, the proposed building would extend close to the front wall and, with a maximum height of about 3.6 m, I consider that it would remain as an obtrusive addition. I have concluded that the proposal would be out of keeping and would cause material harm to the semi-rural character and appearance of this section of Chesham Road, contrary to the provisions and purpose of Policies 8 and 9 and the Environmental Guidelines of the draft Local Plan.

7. I recognise that the design of the proposal reflects the style of the existing house but this does not alter my view that it would be unacceptably out of keeping in relation to the general street scene where vegetation in front garden areas is a prominent and unifying element. I have considered all the other matters raised in the representations but find that there is nothing so cogent as to alter the conclusions I have reached.

8. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby dismiss your appeal.

Yours faithfully



NICHOLAS STREET BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI
Inspector