D/222/31.5



## Department of the Environment

Room 1309

Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

Direct line 0272-218863 Switchboard 0272-218811

CHIEF EXICUTIVE

1 2 JUN **1978** 

JI2

Messrs Claude Barker	& Partners L SERVICES DEP	Your reference Our reference
High Street WATFORD	PLANNING SECTION  3446/08/ 12 JUN 1978	T/APP/5252/A/78/00866/G9 Date 8 JUN 78
Gentlemen	FILE No.	009125

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9 APPEAL BY BERBERIS EUILDERS LIMITED APPLICATION NO:- 4/1205/77

- 1. I refer to your clients' appeal, which I have been appointed to determine, against the decision of the Dacorum District Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of 5 detached houses with integral garages on land adjoining Meadow View, Love Lane, Kings Langley. I held a local inquiry into the appeal on 25 May 1978.
- 2. From my inspection of the site and its surroundings and from the representations made I am of the opinion that the main considerations in this case are the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
- 3. It was common ground at the inquiry that the site was within the approved Metropolitan Green Belt the boundary of which passes along Love Lane in front of the site. This is shown in the approved First Review of the County Development Plan, in "Hertfordshire 1981" which has been accepted by the Secretary of State as an informal plan, and, most recently, in the Kings Langley Village Plan 1977 which is expected to be incorporated in the District Plan now being prepared.
- 4. On behalf of your clients it was contended that the site was only in the Green Belt by chance, that it should in fact be within the village envelope and that it made no useful contribution to Green Belt aims. On the contrary, the proposed houses would complete the residential development of Love Lane, complementing the small estate nearing completion opposite the site, and would improve the appearance of the area by screening unsightly farm buildings to the rear.
- 5. I do not accept these arguments. In my opinion the site has been included in the Green Belt deliberately and rightly. At this point Love Lane provides a clear boundary to the village. The site is a paddock used for grazing horses with land in agricultural use beyond it. It lies between a single bungalow adjoining the buildings of Hill Farm and the access to the Secondary School which is agreeably landscaped and planted with trees. Thus this stretch of Love Lane retains something of its rural character and appearance both of which would be lost if it were built up on both sides.
- 6. It was further contended that the proposed development should be regarded as infilling and permitted as such. I do not accept this either. Infilling is defined as "filling a small gap in an otherwise built up frontage". The site has a frontage of 200 ft and the school one of 170 ft most of which is taken up by grass and trees.

The distance between the bungalow adjoining the site to the south and the nearest dwelling to the north is at least 400 ft; this is not, in my judgement, a small gap. Nor do I consider that the numerous cases quoted as precedents are at all comparable as they all related to single dwellings on sites of commensurate size.

- 7. I have also taken into account the availability of land for housing in the area, the views of the Parish Council and local residents and all the other matters raised at the inquiry. In all the circumstances I can find no justification for making an exception to Green Belt policy which includes a strong presumption against development other than for appropriate purposes.
- 8. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby elsmiss your clients' appeal.

I am Gentlemen Your obedient Servant

P & TYLER OBE

Inspector

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS, 1971 and 1972

Town Planning Ref. No	4,1:05/77
Other Ref. No	e Erfrégere en en engal Filipagia

THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF
IN THE COUNTY OF HERTFORD
To represente authorem idmited, agents: atimeson, seels & Vince.
A to a large one soprato, di in apraet.  - residui il residuo, all liede  - residui il residuo, all liede  - residuo di redia di residuo di residuo di residuo di residuo di residuo di red
Residential development - five detached houses.
at odia condensation 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  2th force thereunder, 1977,, and received with sufficient particulars or
and shown on the plan(s) accompanying such application.

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

The site is within the Netropolitan wheen Belt as defined in the opproved Development Plan and in Mertfordshire lybl planning objectives, where it is the policy of the local Planning Authority not to permit development unless it is asserted for agriculture of other commine Green Belt purposes, or unless the sale sale quite outstanding reason by permission should be crimted. lio mich need of ageolol circumstances are apparent in this case. Purthernore, the proposed development does not comply with colicy 2 of the submitted County Structure Mc : withen Statement which states that it is the local Manufact Authorities policy to ration a Green Bolt extending over the whole of the rural county therein there is a passed presumption against development which will only be accepted, whether for the association of new buildings or the change of use or extension of existing buildings, has the development is essential in connection with agriculture or clearly needed for moureation or other use appropriate to the rural area concerned. The site is also irrluded within the Metropoliton Green Belt in the Minus Langley Village Flan 1977, a. Laboral local plan adopted by the county Council and the Decorum Metrict Council and the Desis for development control in the village. The proposed development conflicts with Folicy One of this Plan phich reflects the strategic opolicy in the submitted County of tructure Plan Writter Statement set out above. 8th December

Designation Director of Technical Bervices

## NOTE

- (1) If the applicant wishes to have an explanation of the reasons for this decision it will be given on request and a meeting arranged if necessary.
- (2) 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 section 36 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971, within six months of receipt of this notice. (Appeals must be made on a form which is obtainable from the Secretary of State for the Environment, Whitehall, London, S.W. L.) The Secretary of State has power to allow alonger 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.
- 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 District 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.
- (4) 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 section 169 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971.