



# The Planning Inspectorate

Room 1022  
Tollgate House  
Houlton Street  
Bristol BS2 9DJ

Direct Line 0117-9878660  
Switchboard 0117-9878000  
Fax No 0117-9878624  
GTN 1374-8660

Ms L Kirkpatrick  
Dacorum Borough Council  
Planning Department  
Civic Centre  
Hemel Hempstead  
HERTS, HP1 1HH

Your Ref:  
4/01515/99/RET

Our Ref:  
APP/A1910/A/99/1033182

6 March 2000

Dear Madam

**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990  
APPEAL BY J F A BATEMAN (SANDHILL INVESTMENTS LTD)  
SITE AT 40 CHIPPERFIELD ROAD, BOVINGDON, HERTS, HP3 0JW**

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal.


If you have any queries relating to the decision please send them to:

The Complaints Officer  
The Planning Inspectorate  
Room 14/04  
Tollgate House  
Houlton Street  
Bristol  
BS2 9DJ

Phone No. 0117 987 8927

Fax No. 0117 987 6219.

Yours faithfully

  
Mrs T Stevens  
211B

PLANNING DEPARTMENT DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL							
DoP	E.D	D.P	D.C	B.C	S.S.	FILE	
Received		07 MAR 2000					
Comments							

materially greater impact than the present use on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it, and strict control is exercised over the extension of re-used buildings.

6. Local Plan Policy 100 indicates that proposals for conversion or re-use of redundant buildings in the countryside will be permitted where they do not result in the displacement of the existing use or the requirement for a new building; there would be no substantive change in the character and appearance of the building; the building is of substantial nature and worthy of retention, and the new use is appropriate. Appropriate uses must be acceptable in the location; cause no significant adverse impact on neighbouring land uses, and cause no adverse effect on the character and appearance of the building to be retained.
7. Planning permission was granted for the conversion of the original building on the site to a dwelling in 1998, and hence the principle of residential use has been established. The main differences between the current proposal and the approved scheme are that the roof pitch has been increased, raising the overall height by some 1.5m, a chimney has been added to the northerly end elevation, and there are a number of changes to the fenestration.
8. Whilst there would be no change in the floor area of the building, the raising of the roof does constitute an extension and, by making the building larger in mass, it would have an effect on the open appearance of the Green Belt and the advice in PPG2 is applicable. In relation to the Local Plan policy, the elevational differences have little impact on the character of the building, but the increased roof area would change its appearance, and the chimney would add a domestic feature, uncharacteristic of an agricultural building. In my view, these are substantive changes, and hence there would be conflict with Local Plan Policy 100(b).
9. Sub-section (iii) of the policy then requires that no adverse effect on the character and appearance of the building should be caused. Conversion of an agricultural building to residential use must inevitably change its character to a certain extent, and the Council have accepted this in granting the previous planning permission. However, that proposal retained the original form of the building. The new roof and timber cladding to the walls would have resulted in a changed exterior, but it would have retained the general character of a milking parlour.
10. It was suggested that the appearance of the building had been improved by the addition of a steeper roof and the use of traditional plain tiles, and it was pointed out to me that there were other buildings in the vicinity, and in the wider area, of similar height and roof pitch. I accept that there are comparable buildings in the area, in particular the garages to Pinewood and The Mares, but these are within domestic curtilages, and different policy considerations apply even though they are within the Green Belt. Whilst the roof as constructed may be traditional in appearance it does not retain the modest character of the original building, and would therefore conflict with this aspect of the Council's policy. It would also increase the impact of the building such that it would unacceptably detract from the openness of this part of the Green Belt.
11. Also, it was contended that the steeper pitch was required in order to use the roofing materials approved by the Council. A note from the Council's Building Control Section indicated that these could be used on a shallower pitch, although a letter from the Clay Tile Roof Council forwarded to me after the hearing advised that clay tiles should not be laid at pitches of less than 35° or 40°. In view of this conflicting advice, an alternative roofing material may be more appropriate, but I am satisfied that a material of acceptable