
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2017

by K Ford BSocSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A1910/W/17/3173868

23 Howards Drive, Hemel Hempstead HP1 3NE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Alan Youssof against the decision of Dacorum Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 4/02329/16/FUL, dated 24 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of one 3 bedroom single dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a residential area characterised by terraced housing of a similar style and design. No 23 Howards Drive is a corner plot at the junction of Howards Drive and Cherry Orchard. The appeal site falls within the residential curtilage of No 23 and so I do not consider it to be vacant or under-used land. The proposal is to extend the terrace in which it is located by adding a 2 storey, 3 bedroom property to the end of No 23. The proposal would also involve the creation of a new front door entrance for No 23 onto Cherry Orchard and sub division of the existing rear garden to create one for each property.
4. The modest design of the proposed dwelling would reflect characteristics of the area and would mirror the adjoining property in terms of the eaves and ridge height, rear building line, fenestration and materials. The proposal would however stand further forward than the neighbouring property and consequently it would not integrate into the terrace. Whilst there is some staggering within the terrace and also in other terrace blocks in the area the group of 7 properties closest to the proposed development site follow the same consistent building line to create a strong front, rear and side building line. The proposal would consequently appear unduly prominent and incongruous when viewed from Cherry Orchard.
5. The side boundary of the house would be adjacent to the pavement on Howards Drive. However, properties on that side of the road are set back from

the highway as part of a clear building line that runs from Galley Hill to Fennycroft Road and so the proposal would break the views created by the building line and would appear dominant and overbearing as a result of the massing of the property. The landscaping proposed as part of the development would not reduce the impact or create the perception of openness around the appeal site post development.

6. The appellant has made reference to other examples of properties that have gable ends very close to the pavement. They however differ to the proposal. The dwelling on the corner of Fennycroft and Howards Drive is located at the end of Howards Road and the layout and orientation of surrounding properties in Fennycroft means that the property does not stand out as being different. 39 Howards Drive breaks the building line of the road and stands forward of neighbouring properties when viewed from the rear however the overall impact of the dwelling is softened by the area of open space which is in front of the property. The staggered extension to No 36 Howards Way fits in with the block in which it sits and is located on the opposite side of the road where the development pattern is different. The 3 properties do not reflect the overarching character of the area. These developments cannot therefore be directly compared with the appeal proposal which I have considered on its own merits.
7. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy CS11 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013 (Core Strategy) which supports development that respects the general character and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy which requires development to integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties in terms of layout.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has contested that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply with reference to the 2016 Strategic Housing Land Availability Statement. The Council has confirmed with reference to its Authority Monitoring Report for 2015/16, published in January 2017, that it has a 7.8 year supply 2017-2022. There is nothing to indicate that this is incorrect.
9. The proposal would make a positive contribution in terms of providing additional housing in a sustainable location. Nevertheless, even if the Council were unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites, the adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the modest benefit of the provision of one new dwelling.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR