



# The Planning Inspectorate

Room 1404  
Tollgate House  
Houlton Street  
Bristol BS2 9DJ

*Please file*

Direct Line 0117 - 987 8927  
Switchboard 0117 - 987 8000  
Fax No 0117 - 987 8139  
GTN 1374 - 8927  
E-mail ENQUIRIES.PINS@GTNET.GOV.UK

*Team 1*

Mr G Anderson  
8 Gadebridge Road  
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD  
Herts  
HP1 3DU

Your Ref:

Our Ref:

T/APP/A1910/A/97/287260/P4

Date:

26 JAN 1998

Received

27 JAN 1998

Dear Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6  
APPLICATION NO: 4/01023/97/FHA

1. 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 in respect of an application for a first floor extension at 8 Gadebridge Road, Hemel Hempstead. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council. I inspected the site on 12 January 1998.
2. Having read the representations and visited the site and surroundings, I take the view that the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal upon the street scene.
3. The statutory Development Plan for the area consists of the Hertfordshire County Structure Plan 1991 and the Dacorum Borough Local Plan, adopted in 1995. Structure Plan Policy 47 states an intention to *"protect and enhance the existing settlements and the essential character of the county's urban and rural areas"*, having regard *"not only to the impact of individual developments but...also...the cumulative effect of development"*. Local Plan Policy 8 states that development will not be permitted unless it is *"appropriate in terms of...scale and bulk....both on the site itself, in relation to adjoining property and in the context of longer views"*, and *"avoids harm to the surrounding neighbourhood...through, for example, visual intrusion..."* Policy 9 sets environmental criteria for development including small-scale house extensions. The status of the Development Plan requires that I determine this appeal in accordance with its provisions, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
4. Following a low ridge between two valleys, Gadebridge Road is lined by a narrow belt of housing tightly arranged in a series of short culs-de-sac and terraces. Behind the housing, both valley sides are occupied by playing fields and school grounds. The appeal site is an end-terrace house which fronts Gadebridge Road and presents its side elevation to Catkin Close.



5. In common with several neighbouring culs-de-sac, including Clover Way and Well Croft, Catkin Close is landscaped at its junction with Gadebridge Road. A wide grass verge, planted with trees, extends part-way across the entrance to the Close. The trees are a pleasant feature in the street scene, which would otherwise be dominated by the densely built development. On approach along Gadebridge Road, the prevailing view of apartment blocks and terraced houses is alleviated at Catkin Close by a refreshing suggestion of open space in depth. The visual link between the trees in the cul-de-sac and the canopies of the larger trees in the school grounds behind adds to the quality of this small but important open space.

6. The proposed first floor extension would be built above the double garage which reaches right up to the back edge of the footway in Catkin Close. Because the existing extension is of a single storey only, a substantial open space remains above it, contributing to the openness at the entrance to the otherwise tight and compact Close, and permitting a view of the trees. The proposal would fill in virtually the whole area above the garage to roof-ridge height, up to the back edge of the footway. The first-floor extension in itself would be a disproportionately large and dominant element in the building, and would result in a visually intrusive development on a prominent site. Moreover, the extension would severely curtail the view of the trees in the Close and beyond, and would unacceptably reduce the quality and effectiveness of the landscaping and open space within the street scene.

7. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would have a materially harmful effect upon the street scene, in conflict with statutory policies. Although there is some variety in the forms of development in the surrounding area, that variety in itself would do nothing in my view to disguise, or to mitigate, or in any other way to justify the proposed development. Neither this nor any other matter raised is sufficient to outweigh my overall conclusion, which is that this appeal should be dismissed.

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

Yours faithfully



SUSAN HOLLAND MA DipTP MRTPI  
Inspector

# PLANNING

**Agent:**

MR D CLARKE  
47 GRAVEL LANE  
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD  
HERTS

**Applicant:**

MR G ANDERSON  
8 GADEBRIDGE ROAD  
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD  
HERTS  
HP1 3DU

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

**APPLICATION - 4/01023/97/FHA****FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION**

8 GADEBRIDGE ROAD, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HERTS, HP1 3DU

Your application for full planning permission (householder) dated 24 June 1997 and received on 25 June 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: 8 August 1997

PLANNING DEPARTMENT DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL						
Ref.						Act.
DoP		D.P.	D.C.	B.C.	Admin.	Plg
Recomm.		24 OCT 1997				
Comments						

**REASONS FOR REFUSAL APPLICABLE TO APPLICATION: 4/01023/97/FHA**

Date of Decision: 8 August 1997

. The proposed extension, due to its bulk, mass and design, is unsympathetic to the character of adjacent and nearby development, and by reason of its prominent location would appear visually intrusive and dominant and would therefore be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene.

PLAN 10 - 10/10/97	
DATE 10/10/97	
Ref.	
Def.	
Rev.	2400
Comments	