



TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Ref No. 4/1488/90

C T M Farms Co
Gadehouse
Little Gaddesden
Berkhamsted
Herts

Lardi Cox And Partners
One The Old School House
George Street
Hemel Hempstead
Herts
HP2 5HJ

DEVELOPMENT ADDRESS AND DESCRIPTION
=====

Gutteridge Farm, Ivy House Lane, Berkhamsted
FARMHOUSE, GARAGES AND FARM OFFICES (OUTLINE)

Your application for *outline planning permission* dated 17.10.1990 and received on 18.10.1990 has been **REFUSED**, for the reasons set out on the attached sheet(s).

Director of Planning

Date of Decision: 10.01.1991

(ENC Reasons and Notes)



REASONS FOR REFUSAL
OF APPLICATION: 4/1488/90

Date of Decision: 10.01.1991

The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt and on 14 March 1990 the boundaries of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty were extended to include the application site. The proposed development will cause harm to the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty due to its prominent location on the crest of the south facing slope of the valley. The proposed development will be clearly visible in the local landscape and due to its size and siting will appear as an intrusive feature in this attractive landscape.



Planning Inspectorate

Department of the Environment

Room 1404 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

Direct Line 0272-218927

Switchboard 0272-218811

1/25 GB
2/80

PLANNING DEPARTMENT DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL						
Ref.					Ack.	
C.P.O.	T.C.P.M.	D.P.	D.C.	B.C.	Admin.	File
Received					1 JUL 1991	
Comments						

Lardi Cox and Partners
1 The Old School House
George Street
Hemel Hempstead
Herts. HP2 5HJ

Your Reference:

DB/G1299

Our Reference:

/APP/A1910/A/91/176807/P7

Date:

28 JUN 91

Gentlemen

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6
APPEAL BY C T M FARMS CO
APPLICATION NO:- 4/1488/90

1. As you know, I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine this appeal against the decision of the Dacorum Borough Council to refuse outline planning permission for farmhouse, garages and farm offices at Gutteridge Farm, Ivy House Lane, Berkhamsted. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the council and those made other interested persons. I have also considered those representations made directly by other interested persons to the Council which have been forwarded to me. I inspected the site on 14 May 1991.

2. The appeal site is at the edge of and presently forms part of a large arable field. It directly adjoins a group of farm buildings and a small wooden bungalow. The farmstead adjoins other buildings in a small scattered hamlet within open countryside between Berkhamsted and Potten End.

3. Planning policies for the area are contained in the Hertfordshire County Structure Plan, 1986 Review and the Dacorum District Plan and Draft Dacorum Borough Local Plan. The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The later designation makes it particularly important that the proposal would not harm the attractive appearance of the landscape. Both the Green Belt and rural settlement policies of those plans and long standing national planning policy would require there to be a special need arising from agriculture or a narrow range of other activities, for such development to be acceptable in this open rural location in the Green Belt where, normally, there would be a presumption against housing and office development.

4. I note that planning permission for a farmhouse on an adjacent site within the farmstead was given in 1989, following my colleagues dismissal of an appeal for a farmhouse on a slightly larger site to that now proposed. The council does not dispute that there continues to be a need for a farmhouse serving the holding.

5. From my view of the site and its surroundings and having considered the written representations, I consider that the main issue in this case is whether the proposal would seriously harm the landscape in this part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Metropolitan Green Belt.



6. I note that in their reason for refusal the council referred to the location of the development being on the crest of a slope. You have disputed this and the council now accept that there would not be a skyline view of the building.

7. On descending Ivy House Lane from about where Meadway joins it, I found the site to be very prominent, near the crest of a hill. The barn just to the rear of the appeal site is seen to the immediate rear of a very large and open arable field and, despite a leafy backdrop on the crest, I found it a very prominent feature in the landscape from there and from Bullbeggars Lane. From the A41 the barn is not, in my view, unduly intrusive. From the two lanes, the farmhouse would be seen to the front of the barn in the foreground of the view of the hilltop.

8. Although the barn is prominent and strictly functional in appearance it is the type of building which is expected in a rural area. The house shown is substantial and would have its longest elevation exposed towards the valley. Its appearance would be imposing but to my mind out of scale and character with its rural surroundings and harmfully overdominant in the landscape.

9. Because of the exposed nature of the site, this seems to me to be a poor choice for a house, compared to the approved scheme where the house would be integrated within the group of existing farm buildings. I have noted the operational problems and cost of resiting the dutch barn as would be required in the approved scheme. As you say, siting a house next to a grain dryer may be problematic and the farmstead area is rather confined unless there is a major reorganisation of the farm buildings. These matters do not however outweigh the harm I consider would arise from the appeal proposal.

10. As you say, an appropriate design can do much to moderate a visual impact but I do not agree that the illustrated scheme achieves that satisfactorily. I have considered whether a single storey or mainly single storey building of much more modest appearance could be accommodated acceptably on this site, provided it is physically closely grouped and visually associated with the farm buildings and the wooden bungalow. It seems unlikely to me that a house on this site could avoid a harmful intrusion into the landscape and such a scheme is not before me to enable me to make that assessment. On the basis of the scheme illustrated, I consider that the proposal would make a very substantial and harmful impact in this exposed position within a very attractive landscape.

11. I have considered all the other matters raised, including my colleagues findings on the earlier appeal. Although the proposal before me has advantages over that scheme, they are not sufficient to my mind to avoid the harm I foresee to the landscape. The evidence on agricultural need does not explain why this particular site rather than another within the farmstead or in the immediate locality is necessary for the supervision of the planned cattle fattening unit. Regarding your client's apparent view that the approved scheme is too small, national advice on agricultural dwellings is that it is the needs of the farm business, rather than that of the farmer's household which should be considered. No such evidence on why such a large building is required has been offered. Neither that nor the other matters raised outweigh those that have led to my decision.

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

I am Gentlemen
Your obedient Servant

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Daphne C M Maier', written in a cursive style.

DAPHNE C M MAIR BA[Econ] MPhil MRTPI
Inspector