



# PLANNING

Civic Centre Marlowes  
Hemel Hempstead  
Herts HP1 1HH

MR N A JOHNSON  
17 CRABTREE LANE  
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD  
HERTS  
HP3 9EG

J NORWOOD  
LITTLE POPPINS  
LONDON ROAD  
BOURNE END HEMEL HEMPSTEAD  
HERTS  
HP1 2RJ

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

APPLICATION - 4/02001/98/FHA

LITTLE POPPINS, LONDON ROAD, BOURNE END, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HERTS,  
HP1 2RJ  
INSTALLATION OF 3 DORMER WINDOWS IN ROOF OF OUTBUILDING

Your application for full planning permission (householder) dated 24 November 1998 and received on 25 November 1998 has been **REFUSED**, for the reasons set out overleaf.

Director of Planning

Date of Decision: 12 January 1999

**REASONS FOR REFUSAL APPLICABLE TO APPLICATION: 4/02001/98/FHA**

Date of Decision: 12 January 1999

**1. The application site is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt wherein there is strict control over built development. The proposed dormer windows would be large, dominating and intrusive features in this rural locality and would therefore be harmful to the appearance of the Green Belt, contrary to the provisions of the development plan and Planning Policy Guidance Note 2.**



# The Planning Inspectorate

Room 1404  
Tollgate House  
Houlton Street  
Bristol BS2 9DJ

Direct Line 0117 - 987 8927  
Switchboard 0117 - 987 8000  
Fax No 0117 - 987 8139  
GTN 1374 - 8927

E-mail ENQUIRIES.PINS@GTNET.GOV.UK

*Handwritten initials and signature*

PLANNING DEPARTMENT DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL						
DecP	E.D.	D.P.	D.C.	E.C.	S.S.	FILE
Received			21 MAY 1999			
Comments						

N A Johnson  
17 Crabtree Lane  
Hemel Hempstead  
HP3 9EG

Your Reference:  
Our Reference:  
Date:

T/APP/A1910/A/99/1016682/P8  
20 MAY 1999

Dear Sir,

## TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6 APPEAL BY MR J NORWOOD APPLICATION NO: 4/02001/98/FHA

1. The Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions has appointed me to determine this appeal against the decision of the Dacorum Borough Council to refuse planning permission for installation of 3 dormer windows in the roof of an outbuilding at 'Little Poppins' London Road, Bourne End. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council and I inspected the site on 6 May 1999.

2. The outbuilding is within the garden of 'Little Poppins', a bungalow located in the settlement of Bourne End, which forms part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. Having visited the site and read all the representations before me, I consider that the most important issues in this case are whether the proposals would constitute an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt and their effect on the appearance of the area.

3. Within the Green Belt, the general principle is that permission should not be given, except in very special circumstances, for new buildings or uses of land. However, the national policy advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts (PPG2) is that limited extension of dwellings is acceptable within a Green Belt, "provided it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building." Paragraph 3.15 of PPG2 states that the visual amenities of the Green belt should not be injured by proposals for development which might be detrimental by reason of their siting, materials or design.

4. The Council have drawn attention to policies in the Structure Plan Review, the Borough Local Plan and the First Review of the Local Plan (Deposit Draft published in November 1998). The Structure Plan is based on the advice in PPG2 and sets out the approach to be adopted in Local Plans. Local Plan Policy 3 states that very small scale building which may be necessary to sustain an acceptable use will be permitted provided it has no adverse impact on the character, function and appearance of the Green Belt. Policy 20 sets out criteria which are to be applied to extensions proposed to dwellings in the Green Belt, while Policy 8 sets out a variety of criteria which are to be applied to proposals to assess quality of development. The equivalent policies in the emerging Review are identical or similar to the adopted policies insofar as they relate to the appeal proposals. I have taken account of the proposed changes, but, since the Review is some way from adoption, I have given them only limited weight.



5. The building subject of this appeal was permitted by the Council in January 1998. It incorporates an existing garage and includes a second garage and a hobbies room. There is a pitched roof over the whole building and windows in the gable walls at each end of the building give light to the loft space. The appeal proposals envisage forming 3 dormers in the front roof slope to give further light and adequate standing room in the loft space.

6. Prior to the approval of the existing building an earlier proposal for a larger garage/store building was refused and the resulting appeal was dismissed. This proposal included 3 dormer windows, of different design, slightly larger and higher on the roof than the present proposals. In dismissing this appeal, the Inspector first reached the conclusion that the building would constitute "a limited and small-scale extension for 'Little Poppins' (that) .... "would comprise an appropriate form of residential development in the Green Belt..." However, in his view "the large dormers would result in the building appearing as an intrusive new feature within the pleasant rural surroundings of Bourne End".

7. The Council have pointed out that the building now erected has a total floorspace of 103 sq m and consider it "far exceeds what would normally be considered as limited in size in terms of Policy 20 of the Local Plan". I am not convinced on this latter point. The building is quite large in relation to the existing bungalow, but it is clearly a related and subservient building in scale and design. I have also taken into account the size of the garage which already existed, the location of the property within the settlement, the size of the plot and the space around the building and the proximity of a group of very substantial buildings at the adjacent hotel, which, together with tall boundary trees, form a backcloth to the building. In this context the building does not appear to conflict with the criteria in Policy 20. Moreover, in relation to the advice in PPG2, I do not regard it as a disproportionate addition to the property over and above the size of the original building.

8. Additional usable floorspace would be added to the building as a result of the present proposals and the dormer windows would be visible from the street over the boundary hedge, adding significantly to the visual impact of the building. However, having weighed these considerations, I have not reached any different conclusions in relation to the factors I have mentioned in paragraph 7. The dormers themselves have been designed with care to become an integral feature of the appeal building, so that it would remain an appropriate, minor feature of the street scene, sited below road level behind a hedgerow and with tall trees and larger buildings behind it. Accordingly, I cannot see that the proposals would be an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt and, subject to use of appropriate materials on the dormers, I am satisfied they would not cause material harm to its rural character or appearance. In my judgement, the proposals would comply with the relevant local planning policies affecting the Green Belt and with the design criteria in Local Plan Policy 8.

9. Therefore, I propose to grant planning permission, subject to a condition requiring use of tiles to match those on the existing roof, in order to ensure that the appearance of the dormers is satisfactory. I have given careful thought to all the other matters raised in the representations which you and the other parties have made, but none of these have convinced me that I should come to any other conclusions.

10. For the above reasons and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby allow this appeal and grant planning permission for installation of 3 dormer windows in the roof of an outbuilding at 'Little Poppins' London Road, Bourne End, in accordance with the terms of application no.4/02001/98/FHA dated 24 November 1998 and the plans submitted therewith, subject to the following conditions:

1. the development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 5 years from the date of this letter;

2. the colour of the tiles to be used in the construction of the 3 dormers hereby permitted shall match those used on the roof of the existing building.

11. This letter only grants planning permission under Section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. It does not give any other approval or consent that may be required.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C.D. Cockshaw', written in a cursive style.

C.D. COCKSHAW BA MRTPI  
Inspector