



PLANNING

MR D CLARKE
47 GRAVEL LANE
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD
HERTS
HP1 1SA

Applicant:
MR G SHIELLS
66 POYNDERS HILL,
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,
HERTS,
HP2 4NT

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

APPLICATION - 4/00698/97/FUL
ERECTION OF DWELLING
66 POYNDERS HILL, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HERTS, HP2 4NT

Your application for full planning permission dated 2 May 1997 and received on 6 May 1997 has been **REFUSED**, for the reasons set out overleaf.

Director of Planning
Dacorum Borough Council
Civic Centre
Marlowes
Hemel Hempstead
Herts
HP1 1HH

Date of Decision: 20 June 1997

REASONS FOR REFUSAL APPLICABLE TO APPLICATION: 4/00698/97/FUL

Date of Decision: 20 June 1997

1. The proposed dwelling would have a detrimental effect on a group of mixed trees adjacent to the site. The loss of these trees would be detrimental to the appearance of the street scene and the character of the area in general.
2. The proposed dwelling would appear cramped on the site, resulting in overdevelopment of the site which would affect adversely the visual and general amenities and detract from the character of the area.



The Planning Inspectorate

Room 1404
Tollgate House
Houlton Street
Bristol BS2 9DJ

Direct Line
Switchboard
Fax No

0117-9878927
0117-987 8000
0117-9878769
1374 8927

PLANNING DEPARTMENT DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL

GTN
E-Mail ENQUIRIES.PINS@GTNET.GOV.UK

D Clarke Esq
47 Gravel Lane
Boxmoor
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD
Herts
HP1 1SA

Ref.					Ack.	
DoP		D.P.	D.C.	S.C.	As You	Ref
					9766	
Received -2 DEC 1997					Our Ref:	
Comments					T/APP/A 910/A/97/283814/P8	
					Date:	
					- 1 DEC 1997	

Dear Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6 APPEAL BY MR GRAHAM SHIELLS APPLICATION NO: 4/00698/97/FUL

1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine the above mentioned appeal. This is against the decision of the Dacorum Borough Council to refuse planning permission for an extension to form a 2 bedroomed dwelling on land at 66 Poynders Hill, Leverstock Green, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council and also those made by interested persons. I have also considered those representations made directly by interested persons to the Council which have been forwarded to me. I inspected the site on 21 October 1997.

2. From all I have seen and read in this case I take the view that there is one main issue, which is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the surrounding urban locality, with particular reference to street trees and to the contribution the site makes to the street scene.

3. The development plan comprises the approved Hertfordshire Structure Plan and the adopted Dacorum Borough Local Plan. Relevant policies in my view are those from the Local Plan concerned with the quality of development (policy 8, in particular criteria (b), (c) and (d)) and with the preservation of trees (policy 94).

4. 66 Poynders Hill is the easternmost of a group of 10 houses (66-84 even) built in 1968 by the New Towns Commission to a common design. They possess, in my opinion, a degree of care for design, materials and setting which typifies much of the domestic scale architecture of Hemel Hempstead New Town. Each house is linked to its neighbour by a first floor element, under which is the sideways facing "front" door and a way through to a garage in the rear garden. Each also has a plot width of 10m (house 7m, way through 3m). The exception is the appeal property which has an additional side garden to the east, of maximum width 7.2m, and where the attached 2 bedroom dwelling is proposed. This side garden is presently separated from a landscaped public amenity strip on the west side of Tewin Road by a brick wall continued by a close boarded fence. The 3 trees the Council

claim would be affected by the proposal have their trunks on public land but with a substantial canopy spread over the site of the proposed dwelling, and are close to the angle of the eastern boundary of the site where the wall changes to the fence.

5. As far as trees are concerned, it was clear from my visit that the eastern boundary of No 66, and its continuation northwards along the west side of the Tewin Road amenity strip, were at one time an old hedgerow, and now have the varying sizes, ages, species and states of health of trees typical of such a feature. It seemed to me that this hedgerow was probably deliberately retained to form part of the original setting of the nearby housing. Whether this was the case or not, it in my opinion forms a significant part of the street scene today.

6. The proposed dwelling would require foundations that in my view would be difficult to construct without some interference with the root systems of the 3 trees close to the site boundary. It would also be likely, to my mind, that occupiers of the proposed dwelling would exert pressure on the Council for the trees to be either removed or severely cut back in order to avoid loss of light and leaf-fall related gutter blockage. Such pressure could be difficult to resist. The proposal would therefore put at risk trees which, although not particularly special in themselves, are an important part of the character and appearance of the surroundings.

7. As regards the site itself, it was clear to me that the buff coloured brick wall separating the side garden of No 66 from the front was part of the original design of the group of 10 houses and that it was also intended that cars would not be expected to intrude into the front garden areas of the houses. The appeal proposal would at ground floor level come forward of the line of the side garden wall (and the front elevation of No 66 itself) by about 0.9m and could only provide off-street parking spaces by surfacing two-thirds of the intended front garden area and having vehicles parked hard up to the front door and the only window to the kitchen. The plot size may be larger than those of terraced houses in Tewin Road and the eastern part of Poynders Hill beyond the Tewin Road junction. However these in my view are not so related to the local street scene as are the group 66-84 even and the detached and semi-detached houses (33-47 odd) opposite which together contribute to a much more spacious local environment.

8. The features I mention above show that it would not be possible to erect the dwelling in the side garden of No 66 without the loss of elements which I consider significant in the design and the generally spacious character of the street scene. I note the intention to use brick and tile hanging to match the elevations of the existing houses. However the proposed windows and doors on the front elevation are not typical features, neither are side additions to houses which are wide enough to create a small separate dwelling yet not wide enough to reflect the generally spacious nature of the immediate surroundings. Overall I consider the scheme would appear cramped and out of character with the street scene to an unacceptable degree.

9. I conclude on the main issue that the risk to trees important to the street scene and the cramped and out-of-character nature of the scheme would be contrary to the development plan and would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding urban locality. I have taken account of all other matters put to me including concern by some interested persons

about traffic and parking problems at the junction with Tewin Road but none has sufficient weight to alter my conclusion on the main issue.

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

Yours faithfully

M. J. Thomson

M J THOMSON BA (Hons) DipTP
Inspector