

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS, 1971 and 1972



DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL

To Mr Winslade
221 Northridge Way
Hemel Hempstead
Herts

..... Two storey side/rear extension

.....

at 221 Northridge Way

..... Hemel Hempstead, Herts

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 05/05/1990 and received with sufficient particulars on 14/05/1990 and shown on the plan(s) accompanying such application.

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

The proposed development, by reason of its mass and design, is unsympathetic to the character of adjacent and nearby development, and would be detrimental to the character of the street-scene and the environment of the locality.

Dated 11 day of July 19 90

Signed.....

Chief Planning Officer

SEE NOTES OVERLEAF

P/D.15

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 the date 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.



Planning Inspectorate

Department of the Environment

Room 1404 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

Direct Line 0272-218927

Switchboard 0272-218811

GTN 1374

Mr C M Winslade

221 Northridge Way

Hemel Hempstead

Herts

HP1 2AA

14 JAN 1991

Your Ref

Our Ref:

Date:

T/APP/A1910/A/90/167882/P8

11 JAN 91

Sir

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 & SCHEDULE 6 APPLICATION NO: 4/0711/90

1. As you know I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine your appeal against the decision of the Dacorum Borough Council to refuse planning permission for a two-storey side/rear extension at 221 Northridge Way, Hemel Hempstead, Herts. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council as well as those made by interested persons, including representations made both in response to the appeal and the original application. I inspected the site on 17 December 1990.
2. From the representations made and from my inspection of the site and its surroundings, I consider the main issues in this appeal area the effect of the proposed extension upon:-
 - (1) the appearance of the street scene; and
 - (2) the amenity of immediately neighbouring residents at no.223.
3. The appeal property is a substantial detached two-storey dwelling on a large corner plot. A large two-storey side extension has been added recently to the south west side. The proposal would involve building a staggered part single-storey and part two-storey side and rear extension on the other (north east) side.
4. No.221 as originally constructed was of similar design to the other 4 detached houses on this side of the road. The houses are arranged in a staggered layout and in my opinion, although they are separated by little more than a garage width, the physical arrangement and the mature planting within the gardens including hedges together creates a pleasing appearance.
5. The boundary between no.'s 221 and 223 is staggered. Under the proposals the front portion of the extension would be constructed alongside the shared boundary with no.223, the front of which is around 0.8m from the front garden boundary. The extension would extend no further forward at ground floor level than your existing garage, but at first floor level it would extend about 1.6m forward of the front of no.223. The main two-storey section would be constructed about 0.8m from the two-storey side wall of no.223, extending back from the neighbour's rear house wall by approximately 5.5m at ground floor level and about 1.8m at first floor level.
6. At present although the garage of your home is built alongside the boundary of no.223 an appearance of visual separation is maintained by the gap between the 2

properties at first floor level. This separation is an important element in maintaining the attractiveness of the street scene, in my view, which is worthy of retention. If the two-storey side extension were to proceed, only a 0.8m gap would remain between both two-storey dwellings, creating a terraced effect and looking as though the extension had been squeezed into a gap only just wide enough for it. On this issue I have therefore concluded that the two-storey element of the proposal would unacceptably harm the attractive appearance of the street scene by eroding the space between the large detached dwellings.


7. On the second issue, no.223 stands broadly to the north or north east of the proposed extension. Given that the two-storey element would extend around 1.6m to the front and about 1.8m to the rear of that dwelling there would be a discernable increase in the degree of overshadowing during afternoon and evening sun of the nearest front and rear windows as well as the patio and rear garden. Whilst this would not be enough on its own to be an overriding objection, it does add further weight against the proposal.

8. I have therefore concluded that planning permission for the particular scheme currently before should be refused, since it would unacceptably harm the street scene and would also lessen the amenity for the neighbours at no.223, contrary to the provisions of Policies 18 and 66 of the adopted Dacorum District Plan.

9. I have taken account of your particular family circumstances and your desire for extra living accommodation, but the strong planning objections to a permanent building have outweighed these shorter-term personal needs in my assessment. Whilst your plot is a larger corner site, the extension would be located almost directly adjacent to the neighbouring property rather than maintaining adequate spacing between the dwellings. I have taken account of all the other matters raised in the representations, including the lack of objections from those living opposite, but none have been sufficient to outweigh the considerations which have led to my decision.

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

I am Sir
Your obedient Servant



C J CHECKLEY BA (HONS) MRTPI
Inspector