



PLANNING

Civic Centre Marlowes
Hemel Hempstead
Herts HP1 1HH

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

Applicant:
MR C MILLS
MANOR FARM COTTAGE
THE COMMON
CHIPPERFIELD
HERTS

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

APPLICATION - 4/01182/98/FHA

MANOR FARM COTTAGE, THE COMMON, CHIPPERFIELD, KINGS LANGLEY,
HERTFORDSHIRE
SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS

Your application for full planning permission (householder) dated 07 July 1998 and received on 08 July 1998 has been **REFUSED**, for the reasons set out overleaf.

Director of Planning

Date of Decision: 03 September 1998

REASONS FOR REFUSAL APPLICABLE TO APPLICATION: 4/01182/98/FHA

Date of Decision: 03 September 1998

- 1. The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt on the adopted Dacorum Borough Local Plan wherein permission will only be given for use of land, the construction of new buildings, changes of use of existing buildings for agricultural or other essential purposes appropriate to a rural area or small scale facilities for participatory sport or recreation. Policy 20 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan allows for extensions to existing dwellings in the Green Belt. The proposed development is excessive in size, beyond that which would normally be permitted under Policy 20.**

- 2. The proposed development would be detrimental to the general character and amenity of the Chipperfield Conservation Area and the adjacent listed buildings due to the design and form of the extensions.**



The Planning Inspectorate

Room 1404
Tollgate House
Houlton Street
Bristol BS2 9DJ

Direct Line
Switchboard
Fax No

0117 - 987 8927
0117 - 987 8000
0117 - 987 8139
1374 - 8927

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL
ENQUIRIES.PINS@GTNET.GOV.UK

D.F.	E.D.	O.F.	D.C.	E.C.	S.S.	FILE

Mr D Clarke
47 Gravel Lane
Boxmoor
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD
Hertfordshire
HP1 1SA

Received 16 FEB 1999

Your Ref:

9895

Our Ref:

T/APP/A1910/A/98/1013276/P5

Comments

Date:

05 FEB 1999

Dear Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 & SCHEDULE 6 APPEAL BY MR C MILLS APPLICATION NO: 4/01182/98/FHA

1. The Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions has appointed me to determine your client's appeal against the decision of the Dacorum Borough Council to refuse planning permission for a single storey extension and external alterations at Manor Farm Cottage, The Common, Chipperfield. I have considered all the written representations together with all other material submitted to me. I inspected the site on 8 February 1999.

2. The statutory development plan for the area includes the Hertfordshire Structure Plan Review 1991-2011 which was adopted in April 1998. Policy 5 defines the extent and the policy objectives of the Green Belt. Policy 43 refers to the Landscape Conservation Areas and indicates that particular regard will be had to the setting, siting, design and external appearance of proposals for development in such areas. Also included is the Dacorum Borough Local Plan which was adopted in April 1995. Policy 3 sets out the strict controls on development in the Green Belt while policy 8 signifies that a high standard of development generally is expected. Such development must fit in with its surroundings without harming the living conditions of neighbours and have appropriate access. Policy 20 specifically relates to extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt. These should be compact, well related to the surroundings and limited in size. The above Green Belt policies reflect national policy as set in Planning Policy Guidance No.2 (PPG2), 'Green Belts'.

3. Policy 89 highlights the importance attached to the preservation and improvement of the Landscape Conservation Areas while policy 91 sets out the special criteria against which proposals for development in such areas will be assessed. Policy 110 specifies that development in Conservation Areas must preserve or enhance the established character of such areas. Also relevant is the deposit draft version of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011 which was published in November 1998. This Plan includes policies which generally repeat the policies of the adopted Local Plan. The weight I have attached to this emerging Plan is in accordance with the advice contained in paragraph 48 of PPG1, 'General Policy and Principles'.



4. The appeal site is set back from the highway and is immediately east of the Manor House and associated barns which are listed buildings. The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt, the Chipperfield Conservation Area and a Landscape Conservation Area as defined in the adopted Local Plan. From my inspection of the site and its surroundings and from the written representations I consider that there are two main issues in this appeal. The first is whether the proposal represents an appropriate type of development in the Green Belt and if not whether there are very special circumstances that would justify an exception to the general presumption against inappropriate development in such areas. The second, having regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of this part of the Chipperfield Conservation Area.

5. On the first issue I saw that the proposed extension would replace an existing conservatory which was apparently constructed without planning permission. I also saw that the roof space is currently used as residential accommodation with light being obtained through a number of velux windows. The use of this area has substantially increased the accommodation above the floorspace figure of 100 sq.m. provided for in the outline planning permission for the dwelling (ref:4/1077/85) which replaced a former bungalow and granary on the site. The ground floor area of the dwelling appears to provide the appropriate floor space area which was allowed by the condition attached to the planning permission.

6. In the circumstances, I recognise that the proposed extension would only be modest. However, the provision of the dormers, which would generally replace the velux windows, in my judgement, would affirm the use of the roof space for living accommodation as well as the associated likely increased pedestrian and vehicular activity in this part of the Green Belt, contrary to the provisions of the earlier planning permission. Although you argue that the proposals would meet the requirements of policy 20 of the adopted Local Plan, I disagree. The aggregate increase in floorspace through use of the roof space plus the proposed extension, in my opinion, would be excessive, having particular regard to policy 20(e) and paragraph 3.6 of PPG2. Bearing in mind also the much smaller size of the original bungalow on the site, I consider that this scale of increase would be contrary to the spirit of national and local Green Belt policy. Moreover the proposed extension, although modest, would adversely affect the openness of the Green Belt which is a principal reason for including land within it. I therefore conclude that the proposals would represent inappropriate development which, by definition, would be harmful to the Green Belt. Furthermore no very special circumstances that would justify an exception to the general presumption against inappropriate development in such areas have been put forward.

7. I now turn to the second issue. I observed that the adjacent barns, which are listed buildings, are substantial but have simple profiles comprising pitched roofs with gable ends with no apparent additional structures. In this setting while the proposed dormers would be in scale with the existing dwelling, as demonstrated by the submitted impression, they would be out of keeping and conflict with the plain appearance of the barns. This would detract from the setting of these listed buildings. Furthermore the external appearance and design details of new development are important considerations in the context of the preservation of the quality of Conservation Areas as well as the designated Landscape Conservation Areas. The conflict between the proposal and the adjacent buildings would, in my view, be contrary to the aims of planning policy within such areas. For all these reasons I conclude that the

proposed development would not preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Chipperfield Conservation Area.

8. I find that the proposal would not accord with the national Green Belt policy. Neither would it accord with the policies of the development plan and there are no material considerations which would suggest a different outcome. I have taken account of all other matters raised but they do not outweigh the main considerations that have led me to my decision.

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

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Howard Rose". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized 'H' and 'R'.

HOWARD ROSE DMS DipTP MRTPI MInstWM
Inspector