

6. APPEALS

A. LODGED

4/03769/15/FUL RIVERGATE HOMES LTD
8 DWELLING UNITS - FOUR 3 BEDROOM HOUSES AND
FOUR 1 BEDROOM FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND

B. WITHDRAWN

None

C. FORTHCOMING INQUIRIES

None

D. FORTHCOMING HEARINGS

None

E. DISMISSED

4/00371/14/FUL BELGRAVE PROPERTY DEVELOPMENTS LTD
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE AND WORKSHOP
BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF 1 NO. 4 BEDROOM
DWELLING, DETACHED CAR PORT AND BIN STORE AND
ASSOCIATED HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING.
R/O 114-138, PICCOTTS END, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP1

The Inspector considered that the main issues in the appeal were whether the works would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the adjacent listed buildings and their settings, whether they would preserve the character or appearance of the Piccotts End Conservation Area in which the site lies, and whether the works would harm the significance of those designated heritage assets; whether this would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt that would conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt; the effect of the scheme on highway safety; the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, and if it would cause harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and other harm, whether that harm would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the works.

The Inspector considered that the new dwelling would not be at odds with the character

or appearance of the conservation area and as views to it would be limited, there would be little harm. It is considered sufficient distance away from the nearby listed buildings to avoid harm and the new dwelling would afford sufficient spacing on its own site. There was no evidence how at construction phase, the new dwelling would harm the listed buildings and the Inspector found this acceptable.

Turning to Green Belt matters, the Inspector considered the site to form previously developed land however he considered that the proposed buildings would be more bulky and dominant than those on site and considered that it would detract from the openness of the Green Belt. In coming to this view, takes account that the site is on the edge of the village. However, as the entirety of Piccotts End is in the Green Belt then this must still be harming the Green Belt's sense of openness. Furthermore, having regard to the purposes served by the Green Belt and noting the limited size of the village the scheme would result in an increased encroachment of built form into the countryside. Therefore, the Inspector concluded that it would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt that would conflict with the aims and purposes of including land in the Green Belt. The Inspector did not find the very special circumstances sufficient to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by virtue of inappropriate development.

In terms of Highway safety, it considered that one dwelling would not give rise to significant additional waiting on the narrow lane, resulting in highway safety implications. Finally, the Inspector concluded that the distance between the new dwelling and the neighbours was sufficient to avoid a loss of privacy.

4/02051/15/FUL

Lancaster Brown Surveys Ltd
TWO STOREY ROOF EXTENSION AND SIDE EXTENSION TO
PROVIDE AN ADDITIONAL 7 DWELLING UNITS. CONVERSION
TO PROVIDE 2 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND CONVERSION OF
PRIVATE STAIRCASES TO COMMUNAL.
NATIONAL WESTMINSTER BANK PLC, 12 BANK COURT,
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP1 1BS

The main issues in this case were:

- a) its effect on the character and appearance of the area, having particular regard to the location of the site in relation to the Grade II registered Historic Park and Garden and
- b) whether it would be consistent with the principles of sustainable design and make adequate provision for bicycles.

The Inspector considered that the nature and appearance of the buildings round the square (bank court) still reflect their origins from the era of the new town development, which was an important phase not just in the history of Hemel Hempstead but also in relation to town planning nationwide. However, they do not form part of the Historic Park and Gardens, being separated from it by the intervening road. The Inspector noted that the Council in its Statement said the appeal property is an undesignated local heritage asset, however in the HIS it is not identified as Building of Local Interest or a building of architectural merit. However, the Inspector considered that has a heritage value arising from its association with the new town era, its relatively unaltered appearance, and its location as part of the composition of the square. It should therefore be treated as a non-

designated heritage asset.

It was noted that the property used to be a bank, and it has an extant planning permission for retail, restaurants and non-residential institutions on the ground floor. Moreover, 2 flats have been accepted as 'permitted development' on the first floor. The proposal would result in the building's height being increased by 2 storeys with 7 more flats being created. To facilitate this, the first floor would be rebuilt and enlarged, and the works would extend over the rear yard. The effect of the development on the significance of the Water Gardens would, in the Inspectors opinion, be limited. The Inspector goes onto consider that the proposed works would not impede that route or reduce views of the Water Gardens. While they would be apparent from Bank Court, they would not affect the designated heritage asset or how that asset was experienced. However, the development would make one building in the square appreciably taller than the others, thereby appearing unduly dominant. As a result it would unbalance the square and undermine its distinctive and strong sense of unity. In townscape terms it would therefore be a discordant element in the square, adversely affecting its character and so constituting an incongruous feature that related poorly to its surrounding context. Furthermore, by significantly altering its height, scale and proportions the development would mask and obscure the building's origins and so would cause harm to the significance of this non-designated heritage asset.

Finally, as amended plans were submitted, it was considered that adequately addresses issues of cycle storage. Therefore given its location in the town centre close to services and facilities, the Inspector considered that contributions to public transport or sustainable transport measures are not necessary

4/02999/15/FHA

Pillay

SINGLE-STOREY FRONT PORCH, BAY AND GARAGE
EXTENSION WITH NEW FRONT BOUNDARY WALL, FENCE
AND GATES

122 NEW PARK DRIVE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 4QW

Appeal Summary

Background

The appeal concerns a two storey dwelling at the end of a terrace of four properties. The terrace is set back significantly further from the street than the immediately adjacent dwellings to either side. As a result, the houses within the terrace have fairly large front gardens. This gives them a particularly open and spacious setting that contributes positively to the streetscene.

Reasons for Dismissal

The disproportionately large single storey front extension, rather than being subordinate, would appear overly dominant in relation to the host dwelling and terrace, as well as the streetscene. It would also unduly diminish the attractive open setting to the front of the terrace.

The front of the property would be enclosed by a combination of a low wall, piers and railings. While having a degree of transparency, the railings would be 1.5m high at their maximum. This would be noticeably taller than the low walls, often with associated planting, found in the vicinity. Most significantly, the frontages of the other dwellings in the host terrace are unenclosed. In these circumstances, even with planting behind, the new boundary treatment would unacceptably detract from the pleasant sense of openness, while appearing visually intrusive and overly dominant.

Conclusion

It is concluded that the streetscene would be harmed. The development would not preserve the attractive streetscape or integrate with its character, while failing to respect the layout and scale of adjoining properties, contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS11 (b) and CS12 (f) and (g). The development would be contrary to the indication in Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan that extensions should not project beyond the front wall of the dwelling in a way that dominates the streetscene. There would also be conflict with the advice in the Council's Area Based Policies Supplementary Planning Guidance and the NPPF.

F. ALLOWED

None