

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL



Application Ref No. 4/0988/91

K.G.Patterson
325 Bridgewater Road
Berkhamsted
Herts

DEVELOPMENT ADDRESS AND DESCRIPTION
=====

R/o 325 Bridgewater Road, Berkhamsted,

ONE DETACHED DWELLING (OUTLINE)

Your application for *outline planning permission* dated 28.06.1991 and received on 16.07.1991 has been **REFUSED**, for the reasons set out on the attached sheet(s).

Director of Planning

Date of Decision: 26.09.1991

(ENC Reasons and Notes)



REASONS FOR REFUSAL
OF APPLICATION: 4/0988/91

Date of Decision: 26.09.1991

1. The proposed dwelling would be out of character with other dwellings in the locality and would be poorly integrated with the Bridgewater Road development and the proposed development at Sector J of the Tunnel Fields development. It would also prejudice the landscaping proposals for Sector J of the Tunnel Fields developments.
2. The proposed dwelling would be unsatisfactorily sited in relation to nos 325 and 327 Bridgewater Road and would cause overlooking to the rear gardens of these properties resulting in loss of privacy.
3. The proposal as submitted does not provide for a satisfactory means of access as it relies on a development not yet constructed. Furthermore, the access to the garage would cut through the garden space which would be detrimental to the character and amenity of the site and would result in little privacy for the occupants of the proposed dwelling.



Planning Inspectorate
Department of the Environment

Room 1404 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ
Telex 449321

Direct Line 0272-218 927
Switchboard 0272-218811

B/57/SF/P

2/28

PLANNING DEPARTMENT DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL						
K G Patterson Esq 325 Bridgewater Road Northchurch BERKHAMSTED Hertfordshire HP4 1LW				Ack.		
DcP	T.C.P.M.	D.P.	D.C.	B.C.	Admin.	File
Received 26 FEB 1992				Date		
Comments						

our reference
4/0988/91
our reference
T/APP/A1910/A/91/195179/P2
Date
24 FEB 1992

Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6
APPLICATION NO:- 4/0988/91

1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine your appeal. This appeal is against the decision of the Dacorum Borough Council to refuse outline planning permission for the construction of a dwelling house at 325 Bridgewater Road, Northchurch, Berkhamsted. I have considered the representations made by you and by the Council and those made by interested persons. I have also considered those representations made directly by the Parish Council, other parties and interested persons to the Council which have been forwarded to me. I inspected the site on 23 January 1992.
2. Although your scheme is in outline, your submitted drawing shows the dwelling to be sited at the north eastern end of the appeal site, avoiding the railway tunnels. The drawing and your representations indicate that the dwelling would be a chalet bungalow. The garage is shown at the other end of the site, but I note your comment that it could be integrated with the house. I have therefore treated your scheme as an outline proposal for a chalet bungalow with all matters reserved except for the siting of the dwelling.
3. From my inspection of the site and its surroundings and from consideration of all the representations made, I consider the main issues in this case to be, firstly, the implications of the dwelling for neighbours' living conditions with particular reference to privacy, and secondly, the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the area.
4. The approved Hertfordshire County Structure Plan, together with the adopted Dacorum District Plan and the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (which is in the form of a deposit draft and in my view carries some weight), seek to direct new development, including housing, to the urban areas. The District Plan and Deposit Local Plan also contain policies which aim to ensure that new development is acceptable in terms of its layout, privacy and its impact on the character of the area. To this end, a set of guidelines on the layout of residential areas is included in the latter.
5. On the first issue, I consider that the need to provide the chalet bungalow with adequate daylighting and a reasonable aspect

would lead to a requirement for openings close to one or more of the boundaries with the neighbouring gardens. The proposed dwelling would be rather closer to the rear of 325 Bridgewater Road than the 23 m indicated in the Council's guidelines and indeed, closer than the distance between the backs of the houses in the nearest part of the recently permitted phase of the Tunnelfields development. In my opinion, if windows were set in the rear elevation of the chalet bungalow they would affect privacy in both the house and garden of 325 and would have a more significant impact on 325 than would the nearest house on the Tunnelfields site, which would only be seen obliquely from 325. Even if it were possible to leave the rear elevation of the proposed dwelling blank, I consider that any openings facing the boundary with 327 Bridgewater Road would have an adverse effect on privacy in the rear garden of that house, whilst any on the other side would overlook at close range the nearest plot of the Tunnelfields development.

6. I appreciate that no design details for the chalet bungalow have been submitted but, having regard to the above, I do not consider that a significant loss of privacy could be avoided as a result of this scheme. I consider that this outweighs the advantages arising from additional residential development and is sufficient reason on its own to dismiss your appeal.

7. Turning to the second issue, I note that the appeal site would be at least as large as some of the plots of other dwellings in the area, including those of the proposed houses on the neighbouring Tunnelfields site. However, it seems to me that these houses are, or are proposed to be, well sited within their plots and adequately spaced. I consider that the position of the proposed dwelling tight up to the end of the plot would make it appear cramped in comparison with other development in the locality, including that on the Tunnelfields site. In consequence, whilst I do not believe that the provision of the drive would have much impact on the landscaped area, I consider that the siting of the house would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the locality. This in my view adds weight to the objections to your scheme.

8. In conclusion, I consider that the proposed chalet bungalow would have a particularly poor relationship with the adjoining plots. In my opinion the scheme would have an adverse effect on neighbours' living conditions and on the character and appearance of the area, and would be contrary to the objectives of the adopted Dacorum Borough Plan and the deposit Local Plan which seeks to protect privacy and promote development which harmonises with its surroundings.

9. I have taken note of the Council's view on the proposed access. From all the evidence, I consider that there would be a reasonable prospect of an access being provided from the Tunnelfields development, because that development has been granted planning permission. However, this does not change my opinion on the overall merits of the scheme.

10. I have considered all the other matters raised in the written representations but do not find them to be of such weight as to alter the balance of my conclusions.

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

I am Sir
Your obedient Servant

Jonathan Bore

JONATHAN L BORE BA DipUD MRTPI
Inspector