

## TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Ref. No. 4/0623/93

Bridge Garage Riversend Road Hemel Hempstead Herts HP4 2DL

John Spencer Signs Courtney Street Hull Humberside HU8 7QF

DEVELOPMENT ADDRESS AND DESCRIPTION

Bridge Garage, Riversend Road, Hemel Hemsptead FREE STANDING PLINTH SIGN

Your application for advertisement consent dated 28.04.1993 and received on 29.04.1993 has been GRANTED, subject to any conditions set out on the attached sheet(s).

Director of Planning.

Date of Decision: 22.06.1993

(encs. - Conditions and Notes).

## CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO APPLICATION: 4/0623/93

Date of Decision: 22.06.1993



1. This consent is granted for a period of five years commencing on the date of this notice.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992.

2. Any advertisements displayed, and any site used for the display of advertisements shall be maintained in a clean and tidy condition to the reasonable satisfaction of the local planning authority.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992.

3. Any structure or hoarding erected or used principally for the purpose of displaying advertisements shall be maintained in a safe condition.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992.

Where an advertisement is required under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992 to be removed, the removal shall be carried out to the reasonable satisfaction of the local planning authority.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992.

5. No advertisement is to be displayed without the permission of the owner of the site or any other person with an interest in the site entitled to grant permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992.

No advertisement shall be sited or displayed so as to obscure, or hinder the ready interpretation of, any road traffic sign, railway signal or aid to navigation by water or air, or so as otherwise to render hazardous the use of any highway, railway, waterway (including any coastal waters) or aerodrome (civil or military).

Reason: To comply with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992.

3

## The Planning Inspectorate

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

Houlton	House Street PLANNING DEPARTM DACORUM BOROUGH CO	1374	
Gordon J Scott 2 Grange Road TRING Herts HP23 5JP		Ack. Your reference  GJS/GS/152 Our reference  T/APF/A1910/A/93/228548/P5 Date 29 NOV 1993	

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990. SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6 APPEAL BY MR AND MRS T DORAN APPLICATION NO 4/0624/93

- 1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine the above mentioned appeal. This appeal is against the decision of the Dacorum Borough Council to refuse planning permission for two-storey extension, garage, granny annexe and alterations to roof at The Cottage, Megg Lane, Chipperfield. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council, and those made directly by the Chipperfield Parish Council to the Borough Council which have been forwarded to me. I inspected the site on 15 November 1993.
- 2. The Cottage is situated within the Green Belt, in an area of housing whose informal layout and road surfacing indicates that it originated before the onset of post-war planning controls. Policy 1 of the Hertfordshire Structure Plan does not include residential development or extensions as appropriate development within the Green Belt. Policy 47 refers in part to protecting and enhancing essential urban and rural character and to taking into account the cumulative effects of developments. The Dacorum District Plan 1984 is no longer relied on by the Council for development control purposes, but appears consistent with the Structure Plan.
- 3. A new Borough Plan has been subject of a Local Plan Inquiry. You have referred to Policy 4 which indicates in part that house extensions within Chipperfield will be permitted, but Megg Lane is situated well beyond the Proposals Map policy area village boundary. Policy 20 in part deals with extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt. It states these will not be permitted unless five criteria are met. The Plan has emerged in response to the local circumstances of the Borough and has been certified by the County Council. The Inquiry Inspector recommended Policy 20 remain unchanged. The Council accepts this. The supporting text states in part that householders should have some scope to extend their homes. I have concluded that extensions to dwellings are envisaged as conditionally appropriate development within the Green Belt, and that this policy should have substantial weight.
- 4. From my inspection of the site and area, and from consideration of the representations made I have concluded that the main issues in this case are whether the extension would be appropriate development within the Green Belt having regard to Policy 20, and if not, whether there are very special circumstances sufficient to justify the proposal.
- 5. The Council considers that the extension would not meet the criteria in Policy 20 by reason of size, design, bulk and massing and effect on the setting of the building. Criterion (A) in part requires an extension to be



- compact and well-related to the existing building in terms of design and bulk; (B) refers in part to retaining sufficient space around the building to protect its setting; and (E) requires that the extension be limited in size.
- 6. You state that the extension would produce a 102% increase in floor area and a 15.8% increase in site coverage. Viewed from Megg Lane, I consider that the proposal would visually more than double the apparent size and bulk of the building. It is not in dispute that the design would improve the appearance of the building by removing flat roofed extensions and improving the Megg Lane elevation. I consider, however, that the extent of the enlargement proposed and change to the front elevation onto Megg Lane is such that it would not be compact or well related to the existing building in terms of bulk. I have concluded that the proposal fails to meet Criterion A.
- You consider that the semi-rural character of Megg Lane is formed only 7. by the size of the gardens and the fact that some back onto open countryside. I also attach weight, however, to the informal surfacing of the single track road and absence of pavements, the mature garden vegetation, and the varied layout and sometimes spacious gaps between the dwellings. There are instances where the relationship of buildings to each other, or the extent to which they fill their plot frontage, is essentially urban. This does not, however, in itself alter my conclusion that a semi-rural character subsists in the vicinity of the appeal site and is worthy of retention, in particular within the Green Belt. The Council refers to filling the 11m gap between The Cottage and its north western boundary, to within 2m of that boundary at both ground and first floor levels. I consider that this would result in a significant loss of openness and semi-rural character, in particular as the extension would be a full two storeys in height at this point. Additionally, though sufficient space would remain to avoid a cramped appearance, this would depend upon there being no similar extension of the neighbouring dwelling. I have concluded that insufficient space would be retained to protect the setting of the building, and that the proposal fails to meet Criterion B.
- 8. Three indicators are given in Policy 20 of how Criterion E is to be assessed. The gist of these are "the appropriate degree of restraint in the Green Belt" referring to Policy 3; location, with control more tightly applied in the countryside and at the edges of established residential areas; and the amount of previous extension, with particular reference to enlargement not amounting to the creation of a new dwelling on the site. The site is within the Green Belt, and the dwelling has already been substantially extended following a permission granted in 1964. You have pointed out that the site is not within the countryside, but it is self evidently at or near the edge of an established residential area. The Cottage at present provides three bedrooms, as extended it is shown to provide seven. The two bedroom granny annex would be formed on two floors and would potentially be a separate semi-detached dwelling. I consider that in terms of accommodation and appearance the enlarged dwelling would be so different from the original as to amount to a new one. I have concluded that the proposal fails to meet Criterion E.
- 9. Policy 20 indicate that an extension should meet all the criteria set out therein. I have found that three of these criteria are not met. It is my conclusion on the main issue in this case that having regard to Policy 20, the extension would not be appropriate development within the Green Belt.
- 10. Turning to the second issue, the extension would improve the appearance of the present building. The weight to be attached to this consideration is, however, in my view substantially reduced by an extant recent approval for a lesser extension and granny annex that would similarly improve the appearance of the building. There is no evidence that this earlier scheme could not be implemented. You have compared the appeal proposal with this earlier scheme,

तमा स्थापना वा न । स्थापना वास्त्र व्यवस्था । वाच्य व्यवस्थान्य । वास्त्र वास्त्र वास्त्र वास्त्र वास्त्र वास्

but whatever may be its merits in terms of Policy 20, I consider that its lesser bulk and increased setback at first floor level from the boundary would make it materially less harmful than the appeal proposal.

- 11. You have referred to other dwellings where large extensions have been permitted, in the case of Kilve with a greater proportional increase in floor area and comparable increase in site coverage to that now proposed. The Council has responded with its view of the particular circumstances of the cases referred to. In any event, whatever the consistency of development control decisions in this area, this does not alter my conclusions on the individual merits of the present appeal. It is my conclusion on the second issue that there are not very special circumstances sufficient to justify the proposal.
- 12. I have taken into account all the other matters raised in the representations including that a condition could be imposed to prevent the granny annex from being detached from the use of the main building, but do not find that they alter or outweigh the conclusions I have reached on the planning merits of this case.
- 13. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me I hereby dismiss this appeal.

Yours faithfully

V F AMMOUN BSc DipTP MRTPI FRGS

Inspector