

A. LODGED

- 4/00161/14/FUL MR & MRS BROWN
CONVERSION OF REDUNDANT BUILDING INTO DWELLING
FIVE ACRES FARM, NETTLEDEN ROAD, POTTEN END, BERKHAMSTED,
HP4 2RF
[View online application](#)
- 4/00944/14/FHA DR HELEN WATERHOUSE
FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION AND TWO STOREY FRONT EXTENSION
10 DEANS CLOSE, TRING, HP234AS
[View online application](#)
- 4/01012/14/FHA MR P JACKSON
REPLACEMENT DOUBLE GARAGE WITH SELF CONTAINED
ACCOMMODATION
6 WESTWICK CLOSE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 4NH
[View online application](#)
- 4/01201/14/FUL The Champneys Group Ltd
OAK TIMBER FRAMED BUILDING TO PARK VEHICLES AND FOR
STORAGE TO BE USED WITH THE OWNER'S DWELLING AND BUSINESS
SUITE.
OWNERS DWELLING AND BUSINESS SUITE, CHAMPNEYS HEALTH
RESORT, CHESHAM ROAD, WIGGINTON, TRING, HP23 6HY
[View online application](#)
- 4/01358/14/FUL EXIMIUS DEVELOPMENTS LTD
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO
STOREY SEMI-DETACHED PAIR AND DETACHED DWELLING TO
PROVIDE THREE THREE BEDROOM DWELLINGS AND ALTERATIONS TO
EXISTING VEHICLE CROSSOVERS.
THE PENNANT, DOCTORS COMMONS ROAD, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3DW
[View online application](#)

B. WITHDRAWN

None

C. FORTHCOMING INQUIRIES

None

D. FORTHCOMING HEARINGS

None

E. DISMISSED

None

F. ALLOWED

4/00024/14/FUL BRAYBEECH HOMES LTD
CONSTRUCTION OF FOUR SEMI-DETACHED HOUSES
LAND AT 15 AND R/O 14, STATION ROAD, TRING, HP23 5NG
[View online application](#)

The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

The roof design follows that of the neighbouring dwelling at 18 Station Road and 17 Station Road accommodates a third storey within the roofspace. In addition, the hipped roof design would afford a sense of spaciousness, albeit less than a more conventionally designed hipped roof, and the use of rooflights would minimise the prominence of the third storey.

I acknowledge that spacing between the proposed dwellings, agreed between the main parties at the hearing as being 3m, would be fairly narrow, as would the spacing between the proposed dwellings and the side boundaries. In addition, I appreciate that inadequate space between buildings can contribute to the perceived bulk of a development. However, the Area Based Policies SPG states spacing within TCA16 varies and requires it to at least be in the medium range of 2-5m. Moreover, the detailed design of the proposed dwellings, including bay windows, would break up the elevations and assist in minimising any perceived bulk, and the narrowness of the space to the side boundaries would, to an extent, be offset by the adjacent footpath and garden to either side. Concerns raised in respect of legal matters, such as covenants and rights of way, together with property values and the motives of the appellant, from which it is concluded that none of these concerns affects the planning merits of the proposal.

I acknowledge that the proposed dwellings would be seen from Station Road, including from the access between Nos 15 & 17 and in fairly long views from the playing fields. However, whilst backland development by its nature disrupts building lines, given the extent of the set back from the road that would be achieved, I do not consider that the building line on Station Road would be unduly disrupted.

I conclude that the proposed development would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area. As such it accords with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (CS), adopted September 2013, which is concerned with quality of site design and requires developments, amongst other things, to respect adjoining properties including in terms of scale, height and bulk and layout and site coverage. In addition, other than a mathematical breach of the density standard, it generally accords with the Area Based Policies SPG for TCA16 in that it provides residential development within

an opportunity area, whilst maintaining a spacious, open character.

Turning to local concerns, I appreciate that the proposed development would alter the immediate environment for occupiers of nearby dwellings. However, neither the Council nor appellant share the concerns of local residents that the proposal would materially harm their living conditions in terms of outlook, privacy, light or noise and disturbance. Taking account of the distance that would be achieved between the proposed and existing dwellings, together with the garden sizes of the existing dwellings and that an access already runs to the side of No 15 providing parking to the rear, I see no reason to take a different view. With respect to concern about the proximity of the proposed refuse stores to 17 Station Road, this is intended as a collection point only, which, as discussed at the hearing, could be secured by condition.

4/01604/13/RET

JMS AUTOS LTD
CHANGE OF USE FROM CAR PARK TO CAR SALES AND INSTALLATION
OF PORTACABIN AND STORAGE CONTAINER
CAR PARK AT MAYLANDS COURT, MAYLANDS AVENUE, HEMEL
HEMPSTEAD, HP2 4SE
[View online application](#)

The Inspector allowed the appeal, quoting Policy CS15 which sets out that General Employment Areas are sometimes the most appropriate location for non B-class uses and that they may be permissible as an exception to policy where clear justification exists and they comply with other policies and objectives. Other factors which weighed in favour of the proposal included that the site had been vacant for 13 years and the proposal would make a very small contribution to the numbers of people employed within the area. The site was also previously a car park and the proposed use therefore would not result in a loss of employment floor space.

It was further noted that while the proposal would not accord with the Maylands Master Plan 2007, there is no evidence that suggests a temporary use of the site would prevent redevelopment, deter potential investors or affect the strategic importance of the GEA. Also, the lack of a specific timeframe for implementation of new proposals and planning permission for redevelopment of the area was seen as a significant factor in considering the appeal.