

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS, 1971 and 1972

MR



DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL

To R P Senior and A J Rathbone
1,2B The Front
Potten End
Nr. Berkhamsted

Conversion of Nos 1 & 2 to Two Dwellinghouses and
Two-Storey Rear Extensions to Nos 1,2 and 3.
at 1. and 2. The Front, Potten End.

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 8.4.88 and received with sufficient particulars on and shown on the plan(s) accompanying such application.

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

- (1) Notwithstanding the inaccuracies in the submitted drawings the proposed extensions by reason of their elongated nature and prominence within the rural street scene dominate and consequently detract from the character of the existing dwellings and would have an overbearing effect on the adjoining property.
- (2) The submitted scheme makes no provision for off-street parking facilities to serve the proposed residential units.
- (3) The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt on the approved County Structure Plan and the adopted Dacorum District Plan wherein permission will only be given for the use of land, the construction of new buildings and changes of use or extension of existing buildings for agricultural or other essential purposes appropriate to a rural area or small-scale facilities for participatory sport or recreation. No such need has been proven for the residential unit and therefore the proposed development is unacceptable in terms of this policy.

Dated Second day of June 1988

Signed

SEE NOTES OVERLEAF

P/D.15

Chief Planning Officer

NOTE

1. 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 s.36 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971, within six months of receipt of this notice. (Appeals must be made on a form 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.
2. 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 Borough 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.
3. 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 s.169 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971.

2 JUN 1988

4/0639/88. CONVERSION OF NOS. 1 AND 2 TO TWO DWELLINGHOUSES AND TWO-STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS TO NOS. 1, 2 AND 3. 1, 2 AND THE FRONT POTTEN END.
APPLICANT: R P SENIOR AND A J RATHBONE

DESCRIPTION - Nos. 1, 2 and 3 form two dwellings which adjoin the junction of The Front with Church Road and Plough Lane. This junction forms the focal point of the core of the village. The local school and village post office/store are to the immediate south of the application site Church Road. The recreation ground and local public house are to the west and north of Nos. 1, 2 and 3 respectively. In the past Nos. 1 and 2 formed separate units. The proposal involves converting Nos. 1 and 2 to two dwellings and the erection of 3 two-storey rear extensions incorporating individual gable roofs. The plans submitted to the Council show discrepancies between layouts of the ground and first floors and the side elevations. Clarification has been sought in respect of the dimensions and a revised set of plans and application forms are anticipated. It is understood that the depth of the extension would be approximately 15 ft 6 in. In the circumstances it is estimated that additional floor space would be about 290 sq ft to each of the 3 two-bedroom units. A rear garden measuring about 60 ft in depth lies parallel with Plough Lane. It is understood this is entirely associated with Nos. 1 and 2. A detached single garage is located at the northern end of the garden served by a vehicular access from Plough Lane. The garage and driveway are also restricted to Nos. 1 and 2.

POLICIES

Hertfordshire County Structure Plan

Policy 2; Green Belt

Dacorum District Plan

Policies 1, 4, 5, 18, 19, 62 and 66

REPRESENTATIONS

Nettleden-with-Potten End Parish Council

Notes that 'there is a discrepancy in the overall depth of the development, No. 639, between the east and west elevations and that shown on the ground and first floor plans. We note that there is no information given in answer to the questions 9 (i) and 9 (ii). If the dimensions are to be those of the plans as opposed to the elevation, the extension is going to be a very large percentage increase in each property, say about 76%, and will have a considerable impact on the adjoining property. It is also interesting to note that by means of this development two houses, one of reasonable size and one small one, will be converted into three reasonable size houses in a Green Belt where new house building is not permitted'.

Local Residents

No comments received

Director of Housing and Health

No objection

County Surveyor

Comments awaited

CONSIDERATIONS - In assessing the application there are several issues. These relate to Green Belt policy, the visual impact, the effect upon the amenity of 4/6 The Front, parking arrangements and the provision of amenity space. The floor space increases to the three respective units have been noted to be approximately 75%, assuming that Nos. 1 and 2 were converted to two dwellings. The adopted Guidelines permit floor space increases of about 100% and therefore the scheme complies with this Policy. Notwithstanding the above and that the application site lies within the core of the village, the applicant has not submitted any evidence to justify the creation of an additional residential unit as specified in Policy 4 of the District Plan. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy, albeit that in the past three dwellings existed at the site. Members will recall that in March 1988 an application (ref 4/0140/88) was refused to convert one dwelling into two units at Buckland Field, Bradden Lane, Jockey End, for policy reasons. This dwelling originally formed a pair of semi-detached properties and clearly the circumstances are similar. With regard to the visual impact, I am concerned about the depth of the extensions. In occupying a prominent corner plot directly visible from the local recreation ground, the dwellings contribute to the rural street scene by their simple design. The elongated nature of the proposed extensions would, in my opinion, tend to dominate the appearance of the dwellings, albeit that the roof design of the development represents a subordinate design feature. Extensions of reduced depth would complement the character of the dwellings on this prominent corner and lessen the impact upon the amenity of No. 4/6. The cumulative effect of the northern aspect of No. 4/6 and the close proximity of the flank wall of the proposed two-storey extension to the main kitchen window and bedroom above would be somewhat overbearing. Due to the limited capacity of the existing off-street parking arrangements which are restricted to Nos. 1 and 2 and that the proposal fails to incorporate facilities for the new unit or No. 3, the submitted scheme clearly fails to accord with the Council's adopted parking standards. Moreover no indication has been given as to how the rear garden would be sub-divided between the respective units. Although there are a number of objections to the present proposal, there would be scope for extending the existing dwellings by more modest rear elevations.

RECOMMENDATIONS - That planning permission be **REFUSED** (on form DC4) for the following reasons:

- Notwithstanding the inaccuracies in the submitted drawings*
1. The proposed extensions by reason of their elongated nature and prominence within the rural street scene dominate and consequently detract from the character of the existing dwellings and would have an overbearing effect on the adjoining property.