

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS, 1971 and 1972

THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF DACORUM
IN THE COUNTY OF HERTFORD

To Mr Arthur Smith
18 Langley Avenue
Hemel Hempstead

.....Two storey side extension and detached garage.....
.....
at.....18 Langley Avenue.....
.....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 14th February 1984 and received with sufficient particulars on 14th February 1984 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 extension by reason of its siting and design would create a terracing effect detrimental to the visual amenities of the area.
2. The location of the garage is such that there is insufficient room to stand a vehicle within the curtilage clear of the garage doors thus having an adverse effect on general amenities and presenting a hazard to pedestrian and vehicular traffic

Dated ... 3rd day of ... April 19 84 ..

Signed..... *W. Barnard*

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, Tollgate House, Houlton Street, Bristol, BS2 9DJ). 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 and
Department of Transport**

Common Services

Room 1419 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

10588

Direct line 0272-218 950

Switchboard 0272-218811

GTN 2074

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE
OFFICER**

28 SEP 1984

File Ref.
Refer to *Ch. 2819*
Cleared

A T Smith Esq
18 Langley Avenue
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD
Hertfordshire
HP3 9NS

JMB
JMB
3) T.W
~~JMB~~
**RETURN TO M B FOR
COMMITTEE REPORT**

Your reference :

Our reference PLANNING DEPARTMENT T/APP/APP/107A/84/015758/63					
Date 26 SEP 84				Ack.	
C.P.O.	D.P.	D.C.	B.C.	Admin.	File
Received <i>JMB</i> 28 SEP 1984					

Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9
APPLICATION NO: 4/0189/84

- As you know, I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine your appeal which is against the decision of the Dacorum District Council to refuse planning permission for a 2 storey side extension to 18 Langley Avenue, Hemel Hempstead. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the council and also those made by another interested person. I inspected the site on 13 August 1984.
- From my inspection of the site and its surroundings and the representations made, I consider the main issue to be the effect that the extension would have on the character and appearance of the area.
- Langley Avenue and Sunrise Crescent consist mainly of pairs of semi-detached houses, many, including the appeal premises, being characterised by hipped roofs and double width, 2 storey bay windows with squared ends. Because they are located at the junction of Langley Avenue and Sunrise Crescent, the appeal premises and the next house, No 32 Sunrise Crescent, face away from each other at a slight angle, which is taken up partly by the existing 2 storey extension to No 32 and partly by the existing single storey garage to No 18 Langley Avenue which is on approximately the site of the appeal proposal.
- The side extension to No 32 Sunrise Crescent has a glazed forward extension at ground level which aligns with the bay, whereas the first floor is set back to align with the recessed corner. This pattern is repeated in the proposed extension to No 18, but with the whole extension carried out in brickwork. From my site inspection and examination of the submitted drawing, it is clear that the proposed extension would be some 2 m forward of the existing garage at ground level, and about 1 m forward at the first floor, and would therefore project forward of the extension next door on both floors, revealing a substantial area of flank wall.
- The council's main concern is the 'terracing' effect which the 2 extensions would together produce, by which I understand the effect of filling in the spaces between pairs of houses designed to stand apart. However, in my opinion, a 2 storey side extension could be designed which would not detract from the appearance of the area provided its design allowed the characteristic features of the houses - the bays and the hipped roofs - to be clearly seen. This is, in my opinion, evident from the examples of other existing 2 storey extensions in the immediate area to which you have drawn my attention, and which do not in my view detract from the character or appearance of the area.

6. Unlike the existing extensions at 4, 30 and 32 Sunrise Crescent, the appeal proposal shows the brickwork of the ground floor of the extension as a continuation of the bay. This would result in the appearance of the bay as a characteristic feature of the house being lost, to the detriment, in my opinion, of the visual amenities of the area. In addition, the forward projection of the extension beyond the line of the extension to No 32 Sunrise Crescent would leave exposed an area of the side wall. I consider that this relationship between the 2 extensions, which would be neither in alignment or parallel, would be very unsightly, and would also detract from the character and appearance of the area.

7. I have taken into account all other matters raised in the written representations including your need for an additional bedroom, but they do not affect my conclusions on the planning considerations leading to my decision.

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

I am Sir
Your obedient Servant



J I CHAMBERS BArch MCD MRTPI
Inspector