

6. APPEALS UPDATE.

A. LODGED

4/00488/16/ENA MR A MATHERS
APPEAL AGAINST ENFORCEMENT NOTICE, CONVERSION OF ONE
DWELLINGHOUSE TO SEVEN FLATS
1 AIREDALE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 5TP
[View online application](#)

4/02278/15/FHA Williams
BOUNDARY FENCING AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING
6 KILN CLOSE, POTTEN END, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 2PX
[View online application](#)

B. WITHDRAWN

None

C. FORTHCOMING INQUIRIES

4/00488/16/ENA MR A MATHERS
APPEAL AGAINST ENFORCEMENT NOTICE, CONVERSION OF ONE
DWELLINGHOUSE TO SEVEN FLATS
1 AIREDALE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 5TP
[View online application](#)

D. FORTHCOMING HEARINGS

None

E. DISMISSED

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
[View online application](#)

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