TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS, 1971 and 1972

THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OFDACORUM	······
N THE COUNTY OF HERTFORD	
	•••••••
•	
O C. Travers & Co.	
71 73 83 man	King, Esq.,
Ilama I Ilama aka ad	senburg Way, vehill,
**	el Hempstead,
Hert	•
Single storey rear extension	<b>:</b>
***************************************	Brief
t. 11-13 Alexandra Road, Hemel Hempstead	description and location
	of proposed development,
In pursuance of their powers under the above-mentioned Acts and the Orders and eing in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you	n your application dated
	n your application dated sufficient particulars on
eing in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you in the series of the June 1982 and received with the series of the series of the place 1982.	n your application dated sufficient particulars on
eing in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you in the series of the June 1982 and received with the series of the series of the place 1982.	n your application dated sufficient particulars on
eing in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you in the series of	in your application dated sufficient particulars on an(s) accompanying such
reing in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you in the June 1982 and received with 10th June 1982 and shown on the plapplication.  The proposed development is excessive on a site satisfactorily to accommodate the proposal toget amenities and vehicle parking facilities.	in your application dated sufficient particulars on an(s) accompanying such
reing in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you in the June 1982 and received with and shown on the plapplication.  The proposed development is excessive on a site satisfactorily to accommodate the proposal toget amenities and vehicle parking facilities.	in your application dated sufficient particulars on an(s) accompanying such which is inadequather with the neces
reing in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you in the June 1982 and received with and shown on the plapplication.  The proposed development is excessive on a site satisfactorily to accommodate the proposal toget amenities and vehicle parking facilities.	in your application dated sufficient particulars on an(s) accompanying such
eing in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you not	in your application dated sufficient particulars on an(s) accompanying such which is inadequather with the neces
eing in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you not	in your application dated sufficient particulars on an(s) accompanying such which is inadequather with the neces
eing in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you not	in your application dated sufficient particulars on an(s) accompanying such which is inadequather with the neces
eing in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you not	in your application dated sufficient particulars on an(s) accompanying such which is inadequather with the neces
eing in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you	in your application dated sufficient particulars on an(s) accompanying such which is inadequather with the neces
eing in force thereunder, the Council hereby refuse the development proposed by you	in your application dated sufficient particulars on an(s) accompanying such which is inadequather with the neces

26/20

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.
- lf 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 and Department of Transport

Common Services

Room1 421 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2

Telex 449321

Direct line Switchboard O

~	<u>2)</u> 7	~ C #9	Tracic
	PLANNING DEPARTM CORUM DISTRIC		<b>←</b>
	4)-	JONCIL	<b>T</b>
Ref.		Ack.	
C.P.O. D.P. 1272-218 950	р <b>X</b> (в.с.	Admin.	File
272-218 950 272-218811	1000		1
Receive Receive	14 MAR 1983		

Mr A King BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI WY: CUTIVE 4 Isenburg Way HEMEL HEMPSTEAD Herts

14 MAR 1983

Retur to 1- Balamber

Date

1 1 MAR 1983

Sir

HP2 6NQ

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971. SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9 APPEAL BY MESSRS CLIVE TRAVERS & CO APPLICATION NO:- 4/0642/82

6602

- I refer to your clients' appeal, which I have been appointed to determine, against the decision of the Dacorum District Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a single-storey rear extension to solicitors' offices for use as a central filing room at 11/13 Alexandra Road, Hemel Hempstead.
- I have considered the written representations made by you and the council and, as you know, I inspected the appeal premises and their surroundings on 27 January 1983. As a result I have come to the conclusion that the main issue in this case is whether or not the proposed development would result in an unacceptable reduction of existing car parking space.
- In its reason for refusal the council implies that there would be some loss of amenities other than car parking as a result of the proposed development but, from my examination of the plans and inspection of the premises, I find no evidence of this since the lavatory and kitchen area is to be retained and improved.
- 4. When a change of use was permitted in 1978, the plans apparently indicated, and the council apparently accepted, that the council's requirement for 4 parking spaces could be provided on the strip of ground along the south-east boundary of the appeal property. This would have involved the close parking of 4 cars in tandem - an arrangement which, at best, would have been extremely inconvenient for users and, at worst, would have resulted in vehicular manoeuvres seriously detrimental to the safety and free flow of traffic on Alexandra Road. It appears that, for these reasons, no more than 2 cars have regularly parked there. With or without the proposed extension, I can see no way in which the space at the side and rear of the appeal building could be used to provide satisfactory parking for 4 cars while, with the proposed extension, it would still be possible to accommodate the maximum of 2 cars which have in the past parked at the side of the appeal building.
- 5. The council contend that construction of the proposed extension and its use for the storage of files would release office space elsewhere in the building and permit an increase of staff and thus an increase in the number of vehicles requiring parking space. From my own observation of the crowded conditions which prevail at present, however, I am inclined to accept that this is not your clients' intention since it would clearly not be in their interests to do so. Nevertheless, if I were to grant planning permission. I should consider it necessary to impose a condition to ensure that the extension was used exclusively for storage purposes.

- 6. I fully appreciate the council's concern that the limited parking facilities in the vicinity should be available to the general public rather than per-empted by long-term business users, I regard the present parking arrangement as unsatisfactory and I note that, with the proposed extension, the remaining parking area would fall below the standard of provision normally required by the council. It is my view, however, that the proposed extension would not exacerbate the existing parking deficiency, that the extension is necessary to the efficient conduct of your clients' practice and that it would be contrary to the intentions of Circular 22/80, therefore, to refuse planning permission.
- 7. I have noted all the other matters raised in the written representations but do not find that they outweigh the considerations which have led me to these conclusions.
- 8. For the reasons set out above, and in exercise of powers transferred to me, I hereby allow your clients' appeal and grant permission for the erection of a single-storey rear extension to solicitors' offices for use as a central filing room at 11/13 Alexandra Road, Hemel Hempstead in accordance with the terms of the application (No 4/0642/82) dated 10 June 1982 and the plans submitted therewith, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1. the development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than 5 years from the date of this letter;
  - 2. the extension hereby permitted shall be used for storage ancillary to the business or practice occupying Nos 11/13 Alexandra Road and for no other purpose.
- 9. This letter does not convey any approval or consent which may be required under any enactment, byelaw, order or regulation other than Section 23 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971.

I am Sir

Your obedient Servant

W J C REDPATH DipArch RIBA

Inspector