



TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Ref. No. 4/1394/90CA

Mrs S. Newton
"Dorville"
13 Western Road
Tring
Herts

Jeffrey Powell Associates
53 Cambridge Street
Aylesbury
Bucks
HP20 1RP

DEVELOPMENT ADDRESS AND DESCRIPTION
=====

Rear of 13 Western Road, Tring

DEMOLITION OF BOUNDARY WALL AND DOUBLE GARAGE

Your application for *conservation area consent* dated 21.09.1990 and received on 03.10.1990 has been *REFUSED*, for the reasons set out on the attached sheet(s).


Director of Planning.

Date of Decision: 29.11.1990

(encs. Reasons and Notes)

REASONS FOR REFUSAL
OF APPLICATION: 4/1394/90CA

Date of Decision: 29.11.1990



The existing wall to 13 Western Road provides a desirable and substantial degree of enclosure to the rear garden of the dwelling, and provides a pleasant visual feature to the street scene. In the absence of any approved proposals to develop the rear garden area of the site, the loss of the wall would be detrimental to the character and appearance of this part of the Tring Conservation Area.



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

GTN 1374

Mrs S Newton
13 Western Road
TRING
Hertfordshire
HP23 4BG

PLANNING DEPARTMENT					
DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL					
Doc					App
PROPOSED	DP	DC	DS	MA	OUR REFERENCE
					Date

Your reference

OUR REFERENCE

Date

20 SEP 91

19 SEP 91

T/APP/A1910/A/91/176932/P8
E/91/807477/P8
A/91/184459/P8
E/91/807906/P8

Madam

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6
PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS) ACT 1990
SECTION 20 AND SCHEDULE 3
APPLICATION NOS: 4/0689/90, 4/0521/90CA, 4/1393/90 AND
4/1394/90CA

1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine your appeals against the decisions of the Dacorum Borough Council to refuse:
 - a. planning permission and conservation area consent for the erection of 2 No. pairs of semi-detached houses on land at Queen Street at the rear of 13 Western Road, Tring; and
 - b. planning permission and conservation area consent for erection of 1 No. pair of semi-detached and 1 No. linked detached house on the aforesaid site.
2. I have considered all the written representations made by you, by the Council and also those made by other interested persons including those made directly to the Council and forwarded to me. I inspected the site on 20 August 1991.
3. The applications for conservation area consent describe the proposed works as being for the erection of dwellings. However, the works which require conservation area consent are the demolition of the double garage and the partial demolition of a boundary wall. I shall deal with these appeals against the refusal of conservation area consent as if the applications had been made in that form.
4. The site in relation to applications a. forms the south-eastern half of the grounds of No. 13 Western Road. It contains part of the cultivated area of the rear garden to that property plus an uncultivated area, a double garage and hardstanding area. While the garage abuts a rear service road its access is from Queen Street; the hardstanding area, set behind double gates, is accessed from the rear service road.
5. The north-eastern and south-western boundaries of the site are defined by high brick walls, the latter set at the back of the pavement to Queen Street.



6. The sites in relation to applications b. form the whole grounds of No. 13 Western Road.

7. Unrestricted parking is permitted along both sides of Queen Street except adjacent to the junctions with Western Road, where single yellow line markings prohibit parking between 8 am and 6.30 pm. Adjacent to the junction of Queen Street and King Street parking is prohibited at all times (double yellow line markings) on the north-eastern side of Queen Street.

8. The site lies within the designated Tring Conservation Area.

9. From my inspection of the sites and the surrounding area and from the written representations received, I am of the opinion that the decisions in these cases rest on whether or not the proposals would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area; on the adequacy of on-site car parking provisions; and on the effect of the proposals on the residential amenities of existing and prospective residents in the area.

10. The Council indicate that in principle there is no objection to some form of residential development on this site or to the demolition of the double garage, but consider that both proposals would, if permitted, be detrimental to the general amenities of the area in that the development would be cramped; would lack adequate car parking provision; would adversely affect the residential amenities of No. 11 Western Road and, in the case of applications a. would affect the residential amenities of unit No. 1; and would remove a section of wall which presents a pleasant feature in the street scene.

11. The Queen Street frontages present a mixture of uses and variations in appearance with the major feature being the boundary wall to the grounds of No. 13 Western Road. The Council accepts that the wall is of no special quality. The proposals would result in the demolition of the garage and some 30 m of the boundary wall.

12. It would seem to me that the density of the developments proposed would be out of keeping with the generally low-density development in the area contained within the block surrounded by Western Road, Queen Street, King Street and Langdon Street. In this area the properties have, for the most part, long rear garden areas. Both the proposals would introduce a cramped form of development that would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. I note that there is an area of high-density development to the south of King Street, but do not consider that this site visually relates with that area.

13. The parking/garaging provision in relation to the proposals indicate that the minimum space per dwelling for the parking of 2 cars would be available. In such circumstances it would appear that the Council's car parking standards would be achieved. However, in relation to the application for 4 dwellings no provision has been made for any replacement car provision to No. 13 Western Road.

14. The development of this site for residential purposes in the form proposed would result in the overlooking of the rear gardens of

No. 11 Western Road. While in most residential developments some overlooking of the grounds of adjacent property occurs care has to be exercised, when new proposals for development are introduced in already developed areas, to ensure that the existing residential amenities of adjoining properties are not unduly affected. In this case, in view of the density of the development proposed, I am of the opinion that the residential amenities of the occupiers of No. 11 Western Road would be adversely affected.

15. I am not convinced by the Council's argument that the same would apply in relation to the rear garden of unit No. 1 (application No. 4/0689/90). The nearest point of the garden would be some 18 m from the main part of No. 11 Western Road, and any prospective purchaser of the new property would be aware of the proximity of that building to their rear garden area.

16. I now turn to the objection raised by a large number of interested persons in that the proposals would lead to a loss of on-street parking spaces in Queen Street. This would clearly be so as there are no parking restrictions applicable to the street's frontage of the site. However, I do not consider that the loss of some on-street parking facilities in Queen Street would by itself warrant the dismissal of these appeals.

17. It is claimed by a third party that there is reason to believe there is a restrictive covenant which requires the owner of No. 13 Western Road to provide and forever after to maintain a boundary of at least 6 ft high along, inter alia, the south-west side of the property. However, any control by private covenant is an entirely separate matter from development control under the Town and Country Planning Acts, and therefore is of no concern in relation to these appeals.

18. It has also been stated that there is no need for the proposed developments as there is already an adequate supply of housing land in the district. The Council confirm the adequacy of a 5-year supply of housing land. The fact that there is an identified supply does not in itself preclude residential development on other sites. As with other planning applications each case has to be considered on its own merits.


19. I am drawn to the conclusion that both proposals would lead to an over-development of the site, and that they would unduly affect the residential amenities of the occupiers of No. 11 Western Road. Accordingly, I consider that both your appeals against the refusals of outline planning permission must fail.

20. While I can see no objection in principle to the demolition of the double garage and part of the south-western boundary wall of No. 13 Western Road, I consider that it would be inappropriate at this time to grant conservation area consent in view of the fact that the proposals for the demolition of the sites are unacceptable. Consent for the demolition of unlisted buildings within a Conservation Area is normally only granted when there are acceptable and detailed plans for the subsequent development of the site. Accordingly, your appeals against the refusals of conservation area consent must be rejected.

21. I have taken into account all the other matters raised in the written representations, but do not find therein any reasons that outweigh the considerations which have led me to these conclusions.

22. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby dismiss these appeals.

I am Madam
Your obedient Servant

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'J M Steers', written over a vertical line.

J M STEERS DA(Manc) Architect
Inspector