


TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL



Application Ref. No. 4/1501/90

M A Hunt  
Crossways Farm  
Nettleden Road  
Nettleden  
Herts

DEVELOPMENT ADDRESS AND DESCRIPTION  
=====

Adj. Crossways Farm, Nettleden Rd. Little Gaddesden

BARN

Your application for *full planning permission* dated 17.09.1990 and received on 22.10.1990 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: 4/1501/90

Date of Decision: 29.11.1990



1. The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt on the adopted Dacorum District 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. No such need has been proven and the proposed development is unacceptable in the terms of this policy.
2. The adopted Dacorum District Plan shows the site to be within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty wherein the policy of the local planning authority seeks to preserve the appearance of the area, encourage agriculture and conserve wildlife by the restriction of further development having particular regard to the siting, design and external appearance of buildings. The proposed development is unacceptable in the terms of this policy.



## Planning Inspectorate

Department of the Environment

Room 1404 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

Direct Line 0272-218927

Switchboard 0272-218811

GTN 1374

© CROWN COPYRIGHT 1990

Architect Design Studio

Woodcote  
Gate End  
NORTHWOOD  
Middx  
HA6 3QG

PLANNING DEPARTMENT,  
DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Your reference

Ref.

Ack.

C.P.O. TOWN

PP

LA

DO

Admin.

Our reference

7/APP/A1910/A/91/180283/P8

Received

25 OCT 1991

Date

24 OCT 91

Comments

Gentlemen

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6

APPEAL BY MARTIN ANTHONY HUNT

APPLICATION NO:- 4/1501/90

1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine the above mentioned appeal. This appeal is against the decision of the Dacorum Borough Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a barn to provide winter shelter for cattle and cover for feed etc on land adjoining Crossways Farm, Nettleden Road, Nettleden. As the building has been constructed, I am treating this appeal as an application for its retention under Section 63(2)(a) of the above Act. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council and also those made by the Nettleden with Potten End Parish Council, the Nettleden, Frithsden and District Society and an interested person. 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 1 October 1991.

2. From the representations made and from my inspection of the site and its surroundings, I have come to the conclusion that the main issues to be decided in this appeal are whether there are very special circumstances sufficient to justify the development as an exception to policies relating to the Green Belt and whether the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

3. The appeal site is situated on the south east side of Nettleden Road and together with a dwelling to the south west lies in a valley within attractive, open rolling countryside comprising low lying hills with pasture or cultivated land on the lower slopes and belts of trees capping the higher ground. The site comes within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The site area is given as .48ha but this is only part of the land which has been outlined in red on the submitted plan. The site as a whole is occupied by a dwellinghouse, 2 Nissen Huts and various outbuildings and sheds together with 2 barns, one of which is the subject of this appeal. The Council informs me that the Nissen Huts date back to the last World War and that the larger Hut has an established use for industrial storage. I understand that permission was granted in 1988 for the use of the smaller Nissen Hut for light industrial purposes and the use of the outbuildings as offices. This permission specifically limited the use by condition to shop fitting fabrication only and it appears that storage takes up most of the buildings as much as the assembly takes place elsewhere.

4. The Council states that at the end of 1989 it became aware of the use of Crossways Farm for the storage/parking of lorries and scrap vehicles in connection with the appellant's business. In May 1990 enforcement action was authorised to secure the cessation of the use of the land in connection with a scrap metal business and also to secure the removal of a 4m fence along the north east boundary. Following the erection of the barn, which is the subject of this appeal, in summer 1990, enforcement action was authorised in November 1990 to secure its removal.

5. This appeal relates to an application for the retention of the barn which has been erected close to the road frontage and adjacent to the access to the site.

6. You contend that the site has agricultural use and your client asserts that apart from the light industrial use and the house, the remainder is agricultural. You state that the barn was erected as a replacement for one which collapsed and that you believe the structure to represent permitted development. It appears that the appeal site originally formed part of an agricultural unit of 180 acres of land surrounding Crossways Farm. Although the occupation of the house permitted in 1961 was limited to a person permanently engaged in carrying out agricultural operations on the holding, the farm land is now no longer associated with the appeal site and the Certificate attached to the planning application for the barn indicates that none of the land to which the application relates is, or is part of, an agricultural holding.

7. At the time of the site visit, there were 11 calves in the barn in question. I was informed that there were 2 cows in the south western half of the shed located on the south west side of the access and that chickens were kept in a shed on the extreme south west corner of the site. There was also a goat and a small pony on a grassed area near the house. The north east part of the site and buildings along part of the south east boundary of the site are in light industrial/storage/office use. A barn situated near to the Nissen Huts is used for the storage of timber. The rest of the site, apart from the grassed area near the house, is rough surfaced with a number of cars parked near the Nissen Huts and others near the house, two dilapidated cars covered with tarpaulin near the timber storage barn and three others to the east of the Nissen Huts. Apart from the recently erected barn and part of the other shed near the access, there is no evidence of agricultural use and no pasture on the appeal site to support the 22 cattle mentioned in the letter which accompanied the planning application. In my opinion the appeal site cannot be regarded as being agricultural land and I do not consider that it forms an agricultural unit. The keeping of chickens, a goat and a pony is to my mind no more than would be regarded as purposes incidental to the enjoyment of a dwellinghouse. I therefore do not consider that in respect of the appeal site the appellant is entitled to claim permitted development rights by virtue of Article 3 and Schedule 2, Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning General Development Order 1988. In my opinion the development falls to be considered in the light of policies relating to the Green Belt and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

8. Policy contained in the approved Hertfordshire Structure Plan sets out that within the Green Belt permission will not be given for development for purposes other than that required for mineral extraction, agriculture, small-scale facilities for participatory sport and recreation or other uses appropriate to a rural area. The Government remains committed to upholding Green Belt policy and I have had regard to Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 which states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development except in very special circumstances. In my opinion the erection of a barn on land which is not agricultural does not represent an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt.

9. Your client states in his letter that, as there is no grazing on the appeal site, he rents a 5 acre field for his cattle and needs a winter shelter for them and cover for their feed etc. However, the Council states that no evidence has been given for the location of the rented land and that no evidence has been produced to prove the agricultural need for an agricultural barn on the appeal site. Neither has any evidence of commercial viability been submitted in respect of your client's enterprise although I recognise that it is not the sole means of support for your client who has a scrap metal business. For these reasons it seems to me that the barn is only justifiable on the basis of your client's present small-scale enterprise on the rented land and that the building is not related to the needs of the appeal site. I do not consider that your client's keeping of cattle is a sufficiently secure undertaking to justify a permanent building on this site and on this account, I consider that there is a possibility that your client's intentions with regard to keeping cattle may change or that a future owner may have no similar aspirations. In these circumstances the building would become redundant for the purposes for which it was originally intended. I therefore do not consider that the need for a barn on the appeal site constitutes the very special circumstances sufficient to justify an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt.

10. On the question of harm, I have had regard to Policy 2 of the Hertfordshire Structure Plan which states that the preservation of the beauty of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be the prime consideration and to Policy 23 of the adopted Dacorum District Plan which sets out that special attention will be paid to the siting, design and external appearance of such buildings as are permitted, including those required for agricultural purposes. The Council has also drawn my attention to paragraph 22 of Planning Policy Guidance Note 7 relating to the need to subject to scrutiny the design, external appearance and location of any new development in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In this respect I note from the Local Plan Review that Article 4 Directions have been made on land in the vicinity with the aim of maintaining the landscape quality and controlling inappropriate permitted development. The barn is over 5m at its highest point, about 13.7m wide and under 9m deep. It is open on its longest side facing south east and is block-built at the lower level with corrugated metal flank walls above and a corrugated roof. The lower part of the flank wall adjoining the access is faced with stock bricks. When viewed from the higher land to the east and south east where there is a footpath leading over towards Potten End, the barn is prominent and because of its height and the materials used, I consider that it causes harm to the character and appearance of the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Green Belt. I recognise that the Nissen Huts on the appeal site do not enhance the appearance of the area but I do not consider that they are a justification for further injury to the visual amenities of the area. I therefore conclude that the proposal is unacceptable.

11. I have taken account of your assertion that your client is trying to improve the whole of the site and that a marked improvement has been made since his acquisition but neither this nor any other matter raised in the written representations is sufficient to outweigh the considerations leading 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

M. A. Frith

M A FRITH BA DipTP MRTPI  
Inspector

# Nettleden



Forge Farm

Jolly Boys


2345  
1-408ha  
3-48

2041  
304ha  
75

3038  
445ha  
1-10

4636  
15-079ha  
37-26

5441  
324ha  
80



Golden Post

3821  
291ha  
72

5516  
6-653ha  
14-47

3606  
077ha  
19

PROPOSED  
BARN

3300  
9-739ha  
24-07

3300  
049ha  
12

3599  
016ha  
04

4400  
2-227ha  
5-50

4400  
1-458ha  
3-60

The Site

2785  
324ha  
80

4389  
449ha  
1-11

Crossway E