



DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
30 July 2015

ADDENDUM SHEET

ITEM 5.01

4/00775/15/FUL - CONSTRUCTION OF A 2-BED AND 3-BED SEMI-DETACHED BUNGALOW INCLUDING ACCESS ROAD AND CAR PARKING

LAND REAR OF 10 ATHELSTAN ROAD, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 9QE

Recommendation

As per the published report

ITEM 5.02

4/01173/15/FUL - SINGLE 4 BED DETACHED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND GARDEN (AMENDED SCHEME).

10 ATHELSTAN ROAD, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 9QE

Recommendation

As per the published report

ITEM 5.03

4/00884/15/FHA - SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION

10 ATHELSTAN ROAD, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 9QE

Recommendation

As per the published report

.....

ITEM 5.04

4/02013/15/MFA - CONSTRUCTION OF TWO EDUCATIONAL BUILDINGS WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING, DISABLED PARKING AND SERVICING AREA

WEST HERTS COLLEGE, DACORUM CAMPUS, MARLOWES, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP1 1HD

The applicants have made the following comments on the draft conditions attached. Please be advised that unless proposed to be removed the reasons for imposing the (revised) said draft, conditions remain unchanged. For ease of reference each point will be taken in turn:

Draft Condition 3:

Applicant comments: If possible, it would be appreciated if instead of being a pre-commencement condition submission of this is 'prior to damp proof course'. This will enable the materials to be finalised with the successful contractor and take the pressure off all parties. They will be submitted as soon as possible to allow for ordering lead-in times.

The LPA has discussed this matter previously with the applicant and advised it would not use such a wording especially as we have taken into account demolition matters. Therefore the draft condition will remain as worded.

Draft Condition 4:

Applicant comments: This information has been submitted with the application (Drawing SP(90)02 Rev 9). The proposed time of planting has not been included. Given condition 6 puts a time limit on the implementation of the landscaping scheme, this is not required.

The LPA agree there is some repetition in draft condition 6 but as deals with hard and soft landscaping (see below) it will be more appropriate to amend to remove the superfluous requirements.

Draft Condition 6:

Applicant Comments: The timing of implementation of the landscaping is an issue for the project. The strategy, as explained in the DAS is that the new building will be completed, existing students decanted from Block C, Block C will be demolished and

the land landscaped. Therefore it is not possible to complete the landscaping prior to occupation. It is therefore requested that this is within 12 months of occupation.

Some of the information requested in this condition has already been provided with the application (and is included on the approved plans). The following shows what we believe is still required.

- Hard surfacing materials are shown on the landscape plan – however detailed manufactures specification and samples to be provided
- Means of enclosure – the gate to undercroft is the only ‘means of enclosure’, agreed that details to be provided
- Soft landscape works which including planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities - are all provided on planting plan (SP(90)06). Methodology for cultivation etc. to be provided.
- Details of trees to be retained and measures for their protection during construction works – this has been provided on the tree protection and removal plan (SP(90)07) – protection methods have been provided within the approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- Proposed finished levels are provided on the landscape plan SP(90)02
- Car parking layouts and other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation area - information are provided on Landscape Plan (SP(90)02 and Transport Statement Appendix (which were also submitted separately).
- Information on minor artefacts and structures – detail of benches to be provided
- Proposed and existing functional services above and below ground – to be provided Retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant – This is not relevant to this application.

We request that this condition is reworded to only request the information which has not already been provided. We also suggest that the details are submitted and agreed prior to occupation. The condition also needs to be reworded to require the landscaping to be substantially complete within 12 months of the occupation of the building rather than prior to occupation for the reason above:

The LPA note the issue with regard to the staggered demolition of buildings on site but after consultation with HCC Highways but would recommend that the wording of the draft condition should be changed to as follows:

“Other than the demolition of Blocks K and L, the following additional details of both hard and soft landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development. These details shall include:

- *means of enclosure;*
- *details of cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment*

- *minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc);*
- *proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc, indicating lines, manholes, supports etc);*

The other items will be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. The approved landscape works shall be carried out within the first planting season following the completion of the development permitted.

Once approved the scheme be implemented fully in accordance with the approved plans and details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.”

Draft Condition 7:

Applicant Comments: Some of the above information (hard surfacing, landscaping) has been provided on the landscaping plan (SP(90)02) or are not being proposed. The refuse storage details have been provided on Drawing DT(90)01. We request clarification on what further information is required.

As with the above, the temporary car park cannot be completed until the demolition of Block C is complete and the site compound is removed from this area. Therefore, it is requested that this wording is amended to state that it will be completed within 12 months of occupation. The condition is reworded to state “The approved landscape works shall be carried out within 12 months of the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.

The LPA consider that as with draft condition 6 above that the landscape works can be carried out within the first planting season following development and the draft condition is re-worded accordingly:

“Notwithstanding the details submitted for the temporary car park and prior to occupation of the site, full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include:

- *hard surfacing materials - indicated on the landscape plan - detailed manufactures spec and samples to be provided)*
- *natural vegetation and planting (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate - none proposed (existing trees retained)*
- *full details including elevational details of cycle parking - To be provided*
- *full details including elevation details of refuse storage - see drawing DT(90)01*
- *proposed finished levels or contours - To be provided*
- *any other minor details - (assume none)*

The approved landscape works shall be carried out within the first planting season following development.”

Draft Condition 8

Applicant's comments: Completing this will be a significant challenge given the tightness in the programme between appointment of the contractor (we cannot confirm the CMP before this) and start on site. We suggest that we agree the principles with your Environmental Health / Highways Colleagues and hopefully this will speed up a decision when formally submitted. The CMP will be largely the same as the demolition management plan which has already been signed off as part of the Prior Notification procedure, so no significant issues anticipated. We would be grateful of assistance from the LPA in discharging this condition as soon as possible, once submitted. That we discuss this as soon as possible

The LPA agrees to this request.

Draft Condition 9:

Applicant's comments:

As above, completing this will be a significant challenge given the tightness in the programme between appointment of the contractor (we cannot confirm the CMP before this) and start on site. We suggest that we agree the principles with your Environmental Health colleagues and hopefully this will speed up a decision when formally submitted. We would be grateful of assistance from the LPA in discharging this condition as soon as possible, once submitted.

The LPA agree to assist in this process

Draft Condition 10

Comments of applicants: A Drainage Strategy has been submitted as part of the planning application and is listed as an approved plan. The scheme/discharge rate has been approved by Thames Water. We would request that the LPA reword this condition to be 'drainage to be carried out in accordance with the approved details (LS14121/DSS001 in two parts).

“Drainage to be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy detailing on and/or off site drainage works (LS14121/DSS001 in two parts). No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed”.

Thames Water has asked for this specific condition wording and the LPA is satisfied that the draft condition, in its present form, should stand.

Draft Condition 11:

Comments of applicants: Details of SUDS has been included within the approved drainage strategy and has been approved by Thames Water (as explained above). This condition however conflicts with condition 14.

We would request that the LPA reword this condition to be 'to be carried out in accordance with the approved details' and remove condition 14.

The LPA has taken on board the comments of the Local Lead Floor Authority (LLFA) in drafting this condition and recommends that this draft condition should stand. However in their response they suggest Greenfield run off rate is required 'where possible'. As this is a brownfield site, it is considered appropriate that the draft condition wording has been amended slightly with regard to this aspect only and this is set out below:

"Notwithstanding the information provided and apart from the demolition of Blocks K and L, no development shall commence on site until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage strategy should demonstrate the surface water run-off generated up to and including the critical storm event will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site following the corresponding rainfall event and provide pre-development greenfield run-off rates where possible. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

The scheme shall also include:

- 1. Detailed pre and post development surface water run-off rate calculations for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.*
- 2. Detailed pre and post development surface water volume calculations for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.*
- 3. Surface water calculations including all impermeable and permeable areas to provide a total volume and surface water run-off rates*
- 4. Provide betterment by achieving greenfield run-off rates where possible*
- 5. Provide a sustainable drainage system prioritising above ground methods such as ponds, swales etc.*
- 6. Provide source control measures such as permeable paving, infiltration trenches to ensure surface water run-off from the proposed car parking and roads can be treated in a sustainable manner and reduce the requirement for maintenance of underground features.*
- 7. Final detailed drainage strategy including a detailed drainage which sets out the final development layout.*
- 8. Details of the proposed informal surface water flooding including the return*

rainfall event it will flood, the location it will flood and expected depths of flooding.

9. *Full details demonstrating how the development will utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) or reason given as to why there are practical reasons for not doing so. Details should include the aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible in line with the following drainage hierarchy:*

- (i) store rainwater for later use*
 - (ii) use infiltration techniques, such as porous surfaces in non-clay areas*
 - (iii) attenuate rainwater in ponds or open water features for gradual release*
 - (iv) attenuate rainwater by storing in tanks or sealed water features for gradual release*
 - (v) discharge rainwater direct to a watercourse*
- 6 *discharge rainwater to a surface water sewer/drain “*

Draft Condition 12

Applicant's Comments: A Geotechnical and Environmental Site Investigation has been submitted and is referred to in the condition which confirms all the items requested. We would therefore question why Part 1 and 2 is needed.

We would request the LPA provide contact details for the relevant Dept so that we can request Applied Geology discuss this condition and so determine the additional requirements (if any) as a matter of urgency.

The LPA consider that this draft condition is reasonable as the condition requires further information on top of the Investigation already carried out and no changes to this wording are recommended

Draft Condition 14

Applicants comments: This condition contradicts Condition 11 which includes infiltration in the hierarchy. We would request that this condition is removed (as suggested above-condition 11).

The LPA agrees that draft condition 11 now covers the requirements of this condition and agrees therefore that draft condition 14 can be deleted. Accordingly, condition 15 will now become condition 14.

Draft Condition 16

Applicant's comments: An intrusive bat survey was undertaken and the tree removed prior to submission of the planning application. As a result Tree T7 is not shown on our tree retention and tree removal plan. It was included in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment document for transparency and completeness. This is explained in the DAS (paragraph 11.9) WE would therefore request that this

condition is removed as it is not necessary or possible to comply with it.

The LPA note the discrepancy between the Aborigicultural Impact Assessment and the Design and Access Statement and therefore agree to remove this condition.

For information, the LPA advise that:

Draft Condition 17 is now draft condition 15

Draft Condition 18 is now draft condition 16

Draft Condition 19 is now draft condition 17

Applicant's Comments: The information requested in Part A has already been provided with the planning application (as outlined below):

i) Roads, footways, and on-site water drainage – this has been provided within the approved drainage strategy, AECOM transport drawings and Transport Statement.

ii) Access arrangements in accordance with those shown in principle on approved plan 50162 SP(90)02 Revision 9 – What further information is required?

iii) Parking provision in accordance with adopted standards – this has been explained in the TS and in landscape plan and accompanying drawings by AECOM. The only parking provided is the disabled parking bays. This has been detailed on the landscape plan (SP(90)02 and disabled parking assessment (AECOM) – what further information is required?

iv) Turning areas - have been shown (with auto-track analysis) on the Landscape Plan (SP(90)02 and contractor compound assessment and disabled parking assessment (AECOM) – what further information is required?

We would suggest that the above does not need to be prior to commencement and can be agreed prior to occupation.

We would request the LPA confirm what further information is required as a matter of urgency and that the draft condition is re-worded to reflect the documents / drawings that have already been submitted and any further details to be provided prior to occupation

The LPA has spoken to the Highways authority on this matter and they have confirmed that they have no objection to amending the wording to require details prior to occupation. However, this aside the condition should stand and the revised wording is as follows:

17. Notwithstanding any details already submitted prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted full details (in the form of scaled plans and / or written specifications) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority to illustrate the following:

a)

i) Roads, footways, and on-site water drainage,

ii) Access arrangements in accordance with those shown in principle on approved plan 50162 SP(90)02 revision 9,

iii) Parking provision in accordance with adopted standard and

iv) Turning areas.

b)

A Stage 2 Road Safety Audit for the proposed highway improvements and access junction shall be completed and submitted to and for approval by Hertfordshire County Council.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and proper planning and development in accordance with Policy CS8, and Saved Policies 54, 55, 61, 62 and 63 of the Saved Dacorum Borough Local Plan.

Draft Condition 20 is now draft condition 18

Draft Condition 21 is now draft condition 19

Draft Condition 22 is now draft condition 20

Draft Condition 23 is now draft condition 21

Draft Condition 24 is now draft condition 22.

Recommendation

1. That notwithstanding the comments from the applicants that no changes to the content of the draft content of conditions 3,4,8,9 and 12 is proposed.
2. That the LPA agrees to assist with the discharge of draft conditions 8 and 9 with regard to a Construction Management Plan and Piling.
3. To avoid repetition and superfluity that draft conditions 11 and 14 are deleted
4. That the wording of conditions 6, 7 and 11 are revised as set out above
5. That the numbering of the draft conditions is revised as set out above.

ITEM 5.05

4/01171/15/FHA - SINGLE-STOREY FRONT EXTENSION, PART SINGLE-STOREY, PART TWO-STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND ASSOCIATED ALTERATIONS

122 NEW PARK DRIVE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 4QW

Additional comments from applicant

Here are 4 photos that I want you to include for committee. There is a ground floor view and a first floor view (from my back garden and back upstairs window) of both 120 and 124 New park Drive's back garden view from my property which clearly shows that both gardens are NOT massively overlooked from my property and that both gardens do (and still will) have privacy. 124 have stated that our extension will go "Half way down her garden". We have 10x 2 metre panels separating our gardens and our ground floor extension will come out the length of 2 panels and the top extension will only come out the length of 1.5 panels which is nowhere near half the length of the garden at 124 as my neighbour is suggesting.



Recommendation

As per the published report

ITEM 5.06

4/01158/15/FHA - TWO-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

THE GREY HOUSE, KITSBURY ROAD, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3EA

A number of the consultation responses were not included within the agenda report.

Berkhamsted Citizens Association

The Berkhamsted Citizens Association wishes to object to this application on the following grounds:

- 1 The side extension is not a suitable addition to what is an extremely elegant house in the Conservation Area.
- 2 The extension with balcony does not relate well to the house.
- 3 The balcony may cause overlooking of adjacent gardens.
- 4 The proposal is not an enhancement of the Conservation Area.

Claremont House

We would like to object to this planning application because it would:

1. dramatically reduce the distance between our house and the Grey house
2. spoil our view of Berkhamsted and the valley
3. allow the balcony to overlook our garden at the cost of our privacy
4. plant trees on our boundary which would deprive us of sunlight and cast a large shadow over our garden
5. ruin the look of the Grey House and alter the feel of the surrounding area.

Egerton House

We are writing in response to your letter dated 24th March, 2014, for the application seeking planning consent to construct a two storey extension on the side of the Grey House. We consider this application to be inappropriate on grounds of both over

development and a failure to preserve both the heritage of the Grey House and the surrounding Conservation Area. As such we seek to strongly oppose its approval.

As a new resident to the area we have researched with depth the planning application process historically made to redevelop the Grey House and the new plots 2,3,4 and 5 by Howarth Homes. In order for these developments to be passed there have been three revised applications before consent was approved, which in turn demonstrates how important (and considered) the subsequent plan and layout of the area is. This makes the current application for the further development of the Grey House seem both cynical and without regard to previous planning decisions, especially given that the new residences are not yet even full!

In previous applications and appeals several key areas have been raised through rejection of applications which are key in our objection of the current proposal. Of particular note are the following in each of the applications/appeals:

2010 Original Application

Part of the original application in 2010 was rejected due to concerns about the layout, bulk, scale, height and mass of the development as a whole, which would impact adversely on the existing house and the Conservation Area at the top of the Kitsbury Road. The conservation officer also recorded the fact that the Grey House is considered a non-designated Heritage Asset, noting its importance and location within the Conservation Area

2011 19th May Appeal

The appeal was rejected on several grounds. Of particular note (with regard to the current application) were observations that in long distance views from the raised ground on the northern side of the town, the site formed part of the contrast of spacious plots and more densely developed housing, adding to the variety of the townscape. It also observed that the proposals to the Grey House itself had an “unbalancing” effect and an objection was made to the front dormers as these were contrary to the guidance contained in Appendix 7 of the Local Plan on Small Scale House Extensions. The architectural “integrity” of the building was an important consideration.

Late 2011 Appeal

This appeal made significant changes to the original application with the proposed number of dwellings being reduced from 6 to 5 and the western boundary of the Grey House being moved further away in order to maximise the distance between the Grey House and its neighbour. Once again the application was rejected on grounds of “lack of balance between the built development on site and the green (garden) space” and the insertion of front dormers which were “alien” to the property and the surrounding area. The planning officer supported the application, noting that

future site development should be controlled by the removal of permitted development rights “to avoid over-development by extension..... by no permitted development rights for side extensions for example.”

Finally, in 2012 an application was made which was finally passed. Key to the passing of this application was the reduction in proposed properties from 5 to 4 (thus alleviating density issues of earlier applications as well as the retention of the gap between the Grey House and Claremont House (to the immediate west) and the gap between dwellings 5 and 2. The planning officer noted that these gaps improved the longer views in the Conservation area (when viewed from the northern side of the valley) and removed the “alien” proposals to the front of the Grey House.

The current proposed plans are in direct conflict with many of the above mentioned statements from the planning officer when rejecting previous planning applications. The envisaged proposed two storey side extension significantly reduces the gap with Claremont House (its neighbour), limits garden space and destroys the space and “setting” of the Grey House within it’s grounds as well as damaging the long views initially identified in the original planning rejection. It also conflicts with the planning office’s desire to retain the original character of the Grey House by the addition of an extension not in keeping with the Conservation area or the Grey House itself.

The application also appears to be in conflict with the Dacorum Adopted Core Strategy of September 2013 on several counts. These include but are not limited to the following:

CS10 Quality of Settlement. The proposed development does not support the following guidelines:

Reinforce the topography of natural landscapes

Protect and enlarge significant views

Protect and enlarge wildlife corridors

CS11 Quality of Neighbourhood Design. The proposed development does not support the following guidelines :

Respect for density of area (as shown by rejection of previous planning applications) preservation of attractive streetscapes (the development will negatively effect the streetscape, density of housing in the area and impressive Grey House for all residents in the nearby vicinity)

Protection of enlargement of significant views (the development will destroy views across the valley for all residents in plots 2,4 and 5)

CS27 Quality of the historic environment. The proposed development does not support the following guidelines:

The development should favour the conservation of heritage assets

Development will positively conserve and enhance the appearance and character of conservation areas

The planned development of Grey House works in conflict against all points identified in this policy.

In summary we see the proposed development as unacceptable on the following grounds derived from both previously rejected applications and conflict with Dacorum Adopted Core Strategy:

Inappropriate increased density contrary to planning policy

Creating an alien unbalanced design that is out of keeping with the heritage asset that is the Grey House and the surrounding Conservation Area

Reduction of greenspaces and deterioration of streetscape contrary to planning policy

Destruction of significant views and long views contrary to planning policy

In addition to this the large construction project which is required by the proposed development raises many issues of concern. Within the new houses on plots 2,3,4 and 5 reside many families and young children (with 5 children between the ages of 1 and 10). The construction development required for the proposed extension means there will be significant health and safety concerns to these families as well as environmental concerns; and will severely affect the ability of these families to be able to enjoy their surroundings (not to mention other families at the top of Kitsbury Rd). The area has been under development for the last 3 yrs and further building will have an adverse effect to the local community. Other adverse affects include the daily noise and general nuisance caused by such a development and excessive wear to access roads and public areas (which are newly constructed) and prevent enjoyment of the area.

To conclude we strongly object to the proposed planning application reference 4/01158/15/FHA and respectfully request that the application is rejected.

Egerton House – Revised Scheme

I would like to respond to the recent re submission with changes of planning application 4/01158/15/FHA.

In response to this we would like to resubmit our full original objection of 14th April 2015 to the new submission as attached below.

Our objection remains the same as the resubmission only contains minor alterations to the original plan and is still in conflict with CS10, CS11 and CS27 of the Dacorum Core Strategy as well as continuing to be violently out kilter with The Grey House

character and its identity as a non designated Heritage Asset. The proposed extensions proximity to the Clarendon House continues to impinge on green spaces and continues to create an unbalancing effect to the location and the Grey House itself.

In summary, once again, we strongly object to the proposed planning application reference 4/01158/15/FHA and respectfully request that the application is rejected.

Kennet House

In your letter of 24th March, 2015 you have informed us of the above application seeking approval to construct a 2 storey side extension with balcony to the Grey House. We consider this planned extension to be wholly inappropriate and wish to oppose its approval.

First, we appreciate the important status and position of the Grey House - a non-designated Heritage asset within the Conservation area. We also understand the development of the Grey House and surrounding houses have been subjected to recent multiple applications (3), refusals and appeals over a 5 year period, making it particularly important that any subsequent changes, now, which could undermine these earlier decisions are very carefully considered. It is striking that the new houses (4) surrounding the Grey House are barely finished and all are not yet even occupied and significant change is already being proposed !

The 3'd planning (latest) application for the site (2012) was accepted with a number of important provisions:

- Maintenance of the gap between Grey House & (new) Claremont House (plot 3)
- Establishment of a gap between Kennet House (plot 2) and Ashton House (plot 5) -

Both these to ensure proportionate development and to avoid overdevelopment of the site

-Removal of Permitted development rights for any future development, specifically "to avoid overdevelopment rights for side extensions for example "

The objective was to avoid overextension of the house, particularly at the side - exactly what is now being proposed.

The current application is unacceptable on multiple grounds. Most importantly it appears to contravene the letter and intent of the Dacorum Adopted Core Strategy of September, 2013, from a number of perspectives:

CS 10 Quality of Settlement : guidelines included the requirement to :

- (b) Reinforce the topography of natural landscapes

(d) Protect and enlarge significant views

(g) Protect and enlarge wildlife corridors

The proposed development would not meet these overall requirements.

Specifically:

CS11 Quality of Neighbourhood design : these guidelines called for :

(a) Respect for density in an area. This question has been considered in detail and earlier decisions/conclusions have been drawn on what is appropriate. This application proposes overdevelopment, and significantly overreaches in terms of density.

(b) Preservation of attractive streetscapes. The current streetscape has been arrived at after considerable deliberation. The planned development would negatively impact the streetscape of Plots 2,3, 4,5 surrounding Grey House. Similarly the streetscape from

Kitsbury Road looking up the hill and towards the front of the house will be severely compromised by the construction of the side extension, which proposes a garden room,

balcony, pillars etc which are incompatible with the original house and its fine Victorian features.

(d) The protection of enlargement of significant views within the character area. The extension would largely obliterate long views of the Chiltern Hills from Plots 2,4 and 5 .

CS 27 Quality of the historic environment. This policy states :

- That development should favour the conservation of heritage assets
- The integrity, setting and distinctiveness of designated and undesignated heritage assets will be protected , conserved and if approved enhanced.
- Development will positively conserve and enhance the appearance and character of the Conservation areas. Negative features and problems identified in conservation area appraisals will be ameliorated or improved....

This planned development works against this policy: it favours significant expansion which will undermine the careful conservation and renovation which has been applied to restore the Grey House. The appearance and integrity of this Heritage asset will be severely compromised by this alien, and in appropriate expansion.

Our conclusion is that principally for reasons of unacceptably increased density, closure of green spaces ie reduction of the spacious landscaped garden and hence streetscape appearance, obliteration of long views, the inappropriate side extension

to the Victorian heritage asset (balcony, outside staircase, pillars etc) diminishing the balance and aesthetic of the house both from front and rear, plus it's incoherence in relation to the planning history and resultant stipulations (for example the rulings of Ian Radcliff - Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local

Government - in April 20LL) - for all these reasons the application should be rejected.

This objection does not fully address many other important issues of concern : environmental, safety issues, overlooking of neighbours sites and dwellings, excessive wear to newly installed infrastructure eg paving etc, nuisance ie dust, noise which are significant for a neighbourhood which has had to endure this site being under construction for the last 3 years....This objection does not fully address many other important issues of concern : environmental, safety issues, overlooking of neighbours sites and dwellings, excessive wear to newly installed infrastructure eg paving etc, nuisance ie dust, noise which are significant for a neighbourhood which has had to endure this site being under construction for the last 3 years....

Summary: the planned extension will destroy the character and ethos of an important local heritage asset, whilst provoking multiple negative consequences as detailed above. We respectfully request the application is rejected.

No address

I am writing to object to the above proposed development. The development of this site has been extremely contentious, to say the least and with each successive proposal, density has been a critical element.

Over-development of the site has been cited as an important reason for the refusal of planning permission on more than one occasion. Approval was eventually granted on the basis that the proposed density was deemed to be as high as was acceptable. This proposal will therefore result in a density which can only be deemed unacceptable.

Dwellings in the upper part of Kitsbury Road are predominantly relatively large with reasonably sized gardens and the proposal will inevitably result in a reduction of open space within the site. It will also obstruct views from neighbouring properties. Therefore, it cannot be said to either preserve or enhance the conservation area in which it is situated.

I strongly urge the planning authority to reject the above proposal.

25 Kitsbury Road

I am writing to register my objection to the above application as there are several aspects that appear to be contrary to the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (Section 3 of

Part 3 entitled Development Control) as well as the Dacorum Adopted Core Strategy of September 2013.

1. Over Development

The Grey House is an important part of the Conservation Area and a Heritage Asset. The proposed extension represents an overdevelopment of the site in terms of density and bulk.

2. Development in a Conservation Area

Subsection d states: Development will not be permitted unless it avoids harm to the surrounding neighbourhood and adjoining properties through, for example, visual intrusion, loss of privacy, general noise and disturbance.

The development is out of keeping with the conservation area and neither enhances nor preserves it. Careful consideration was given to the spacing and proportions between the Grey House and the neighbouring properties under application 4/01044/12/FUL. There will be loss of privacy to neighbours as the proposed extension is too close to neighbouring properties. It would also result in significant harm to the setting of the Grey House, its heritage value and the appearance of the

Berkhamsted Conservation Area

3. Quality of Neighbourhood Design

Subsection CS11 Quality of Neighbourhood Design in the Dacorum Adopted Core Strategy calls for respect for density in an area and preservation of attractive streetscapes. The proposed extension represents an overdevelopment of the site in terms of density and bulk and does not relate to the form and quality of the existing building. It would therefore appear out of context with it and would not contribute to the local character or distinctiveness. The proposal would be visible from public vantage points and the oblique view of The Grey House and its setting from further down Kitsbury Road will be spoilt.

4. Quality of the Historic Environment

Subsection CS27 Quality of the Historic Environment in the Dacorum Adopted Core Strategy design states that development should favour the conservation of heritage assets. The integrity and setting of both designated and undesignated heritage assets should be protected and conserved. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. The proposed extension fails to favour the existing building; it does not respect the original architectural style of the house nor does it enhance it as an existing asset.

33 Kitsbury Road

The development of this site has been contentious to say the least. Successive proposals were rejected on the grounds that, amongst other factors, they

represented over-development. An appropriate density was finally agreed and permission granted on that basis. The current proposal will increase the density of the site, significantly increase the ratio of building to land on the site and in addition, will obscure views to the valley for neighbouring properties. Granting this proposal will make a mockery of the democratic process.

Hillside Villa

Our reasons for objecting to the proposed extension are as follows:

1. Granting planning permission for this extension would go against previous decisions made by the planning committee where the scale and density of development in the Grey House site were controlled because a self contained flat with its own access will by default bring another property into the development.
2. Due to the removal of tree cover within the site which the Grey House occupies it is visible day and night from Kitsbury Road due to the floodlighting used. We do not believe the proposed extension is in keeping with the previously acknowledged historical significance of the property to the town
3. Car packing was a concern prior to the Grey House development. The present house has two parking spaces and three cars. The addition of a self contained annex will no doubt lead to another car and further access/ parking issues.
4. The proposal to build an elevated patio area will mean that the privacy afforded by the wall between our properties will be removed and overlooking will be an issue for ourselves and neighbouring properties.
5. As part of the development a new timber sleeper wall appears to be being built in the garden close to the existing brick wall on the northern boundary. Higher levels have already been an issue with this development and the subject of planning intervention so one can only presume that a timber sleeper wall will mean the existing ground is to be built up further, causing potential safety issues with the brick wall and reducing privacy.
6. Having had detailed discussions with the DBC planning department on what would be a sympathetic extension to our property and the materials to be used we do not believe what is proposed eg bi-fold doors follows similar principles.

For all of the above reasons we strongly object and urge the planning department to do the same.

38 Kitsbury Road

I continue to object to the above application. The revised plans submitted do not address the fundamental issue that the creation of an extension on this site would be contrary to previous planning guidance in respect of site density and would detract from the quality of the grey house as a heritage asset within the town.

6 Anglefield Road

I have seen the revised plans and they do not affect my objection. The comments set out in my earlier letter still apply.

Please note that the application summary states there are 2 objections. In fact there are more.

Ashton House

We have recently moved into Ashton House, Kitsbury Road.

Upon moving in we were surprised to discover a planning application for The Grey House to which we were not aware, nor was highlighted during the declaration of purchase process by the vendor.

The planning application was only notified to us by our neighbours when moving in indicating this planning process has moved very fast.

Having reviewed the planned extension to the Grey House, we consider this planned extension to be inappropriate and wish to oppose its approval. Hence the need for us to write this letter to you with some high level objections considering the limited time we have had.

Of note, we understand that the Grey House and surrounding houses have been subjected to multiple applications, refusals and appeals over the past 5 years to which the grounding of what can be developed and respected is now quite clear.

The most recent planning application for the site in 2012 was accepted with important provisions, namely:

- Maintenance of the gap between Grey House & (new) Claremont House (plot 3)
- Establishment of a gap between Kennet House (plot 2) and Ashton House [plot 5) -

Both these to ensure proportionate development and to avoid overdevelopment of the site -Removal of Permitted development rights for any future development, specifically 'to avoid overdevelopment rights for side extensions for example "

The objective was to avoid overextension of the house, particularly at the side - exactly what is now being proposed.

The current application is unacceptable on multiple grounds. Most importantly it appears to contravene the letter and intent of the Dacorum Adopted Core Strategy of September, 2013, from a number of perspectives:

CS 10 Quality of Settlement : guidelines included the requirement to :

(b) Reinforce the topography of natural landscapes (d) Protect and enlarge significant views

(g) Protect and enlarge wildlife corridors

The proposed development would not meet these overall requirements. Specifically:

CS11 Quality of Neighbourhood design : these guidelines called for :

(a) Respect for density in an area. This question has been considered in detail and earlier decisions/conclusions have been drawn on what is appropriate. This application proposes overdevelopment, and significantly overreaches in terms of density.

(b) Preservation of attractive streetscapes. The current streetscape has been arrived at after considerable deliberation. The planned development would negatively impact the streetscape of Plots 2,3, 4,5 surrounding Grey House.

Similarly the streetscape from Kitsbury Road looking up the hill and towards the front of the house will be severely compromised by the construction of the side extension, which proposes a garden room, balcony, pillars which are incompatible with the original house and its fine Victorian features.

(d) The protection of enlargement of significant views within the character area. The extension would largely obliterate long views of the Chiltern Hills from Plots 2,4 and 5 .

CS 27 Quality of the historic environment. This policy states :

- That development should favour the conservation of heritage assets
- The integrity, setting and distinctiveness of designated and undesignated heritage assets will be protected , conserved and if approved enhanced.
- Development will positively conserve and enhance the appearance and character of the Conservation areas. Negative features and problems identified in conservation area appraisals will be ameliorated or improved....

This planned development works against this policy: it favours significant expansion which will undermine the careful conservation and renovation which has been applied to restore the Grey House. The appearance and integrity of this Heritage asset will be severely compromised by this alien, and inappropriate expansion.

Our conclusion is that principally for reasons of unacceptably increased density, closure of green spaces i.e. reduction of the spacious landscaped garden and hence streetscape appearance, obliteration of long views, the inappropriate side extension to the Victorian heritage asset (balcony, outside staircase, pillars) diminishing the balance and aesthetic of the house both from front and rear, plus it's incoherence in relation to the planning history and resultant stipulations (for example the rulings of Ian Radcliff - Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government - in April 2011) - for all these reasons the application should be rejected.

This objection does not fully address many other important issues of concern : environmental, safety issues, overlooking of neighbours sites and dwellings, excessive wear to newly installed infrastructure eg paving, nuisance le dust, noise which are significant for a neighbourhood which has had to endure this site being under construction for the last 3 years.

Summary: the planned extension will destroy the character and ethos of an important local heritage asset, whilst provoking multiple negative consequences as detailed above. We respectfully request the application is rejected.

36a Kitsbury Road

We are immediate neighbours of the Grey House and are writing in response to the consultation on planning application 4/01158/15/FHA to construct a two storey extension on the side of Grey House. We do not consider that this development is appropriate as it would constitute over development and nor do we believe it is consistent with the character of the Grey House, an important local heritage asset. Ultimately, the proposal fails to enhance or preserve the Conservation Area and is not in accordance with the development plan. In our view, it should, therefore, be rejected.

Development at this site has been given detailed consideration over the course of the last 5 years. A number of observations and decisions have been made against the backdrop of the relevant planning policies by a range of statutory consultees, the local planning authority and on appeal by a planning inspector. There is now a new Core Strategy, which has replaced some of the policies that were then under consideration. However, this has not resulted in any material changes to the specific considerations then taken into account. Accordingly, a number of these observations and decisions are relevant to the instant application. It is also impossible to consider the present application without putting it into the context of recent planning history. We accordingly set out a brief history before commenting on the detail of the current proposal.

The Background

In 2010, the Grey House stood in its own considerable grounds, on a plot of 0.70 of an acre. The then owner, Black Lab Developments, sought permission to alter and refurbish the Grey House and to create an access road together with an additional six dwellings in its grounds. There were a range of objections to these proposals, including the following:

- i. The Town Council objected to the inclusion of a dormer and rooflights which would be highly visible across the valley, would detract from the envelope view and impact adversely on neighbouring properties. They were concerned about the layout, bulk, scale, height and mass of the development as a whole, which would impact adversely on the existing house and the Conservation Area at the top of the Kitsbury Road. They also had specific objections to the

size of the then proposed dwellings such that they would dominate, rather than be subservient to, the Grey House.

- ii. The conservation officer recorded the fact that the Grey House is considered a non-designated Heritage Asset, noting its importance and location within the Conservation Area. The proposals at that stage in relation to the Grey House itself were seen to be less than ideal, but nonetheless acceptable as they did not create a “harm”.

The application went to committee, where it was refused. The applicant subsequently appealed. The appeal was heard on 13 April 2011 by Ian Radcliff, an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. He dismissed the appeal by way of a reasoned, written, decision made on 19 May 2011. The main issue in the appeal was whether or not the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Berkhamsted Conservation Area as required by the various policies and to which special attention must be paid pursuant to section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. He made the following observations of relevance to the current application;

- i. The largely undeveloped nature of the plot provided a green backdrop to surrounding development;
- ii. In long distance views from the raised ground on the northern side of the town, the site formed part of the contrast of spacious plots and more densely developed housing, adding to the variety of the townscape;
- iii. The proposals would erode the spacious garden landscaped setting of the house to an unacceptable degree;
- iv. The proposals to the Grey House itself had an “unbalancing” effect. An objection was made to the front dormers as these were contrary to the guidance contained in Appendix 7 of the Local Plan on Small Scale House Extensions. The architectural “integrity” of the building was an important consideration;
- v. Overall, the proposal failed to maintain the balance between built development on the site and the gardens.

Later in 2011, the applicant made a fresh application for planning permission under reference 4/02008/11/FUL which, amongst other things, reduced the proposed number of additional dwellings on the site from 6 to 5. The proposed development adjacent to the western boundary of the Grey House was moved further away, in order to maximise the distance between the Grey House and its immediate neighbour and reducing the loss of the Grey House garden. Development at the rear of the Grey House, however, remained intense. Berkhamsted Town Council objected on various grounds, including:

- i. Lack of balance between the built development on site and the green (garden) space;

- ii. Insertion of tall narrow windows to expose the basement, which were contrary to the planning inspector's recommendations;
- iii. Insertion of front dormers which were alien to the property and the surrounding area.

The application was rejected by the planning committee. The decision was not appealed.

In 2012, the applicant made a third application for planning permission (reference 4/01044/12/FUL). This retained the gap between the Grey House and the proposed property to the immediate west (now Claremont House), which had been introduced in application 4/02008/11/FUL. In addition, it reduced the proposed additional dwellings from 5 to 4. Importantly, this allowed the gap between the proposed "gatehouse" (plot 2) (now Kennet House) and its immediate neighbour (now Ashton House) to be increased which the planning officer noted improved the appearance of the site in longer views (as had been noted as important to achieve by the planning inspector). It also removed the "alien" proposals to the front of the Grey House (the dormers and basement windows).

The planning officer supported the application, noting that future site development should be controlled by the removal of permitted development rights *"to avoid overdevelopment by extension..... by no permitted development rights for side extensions for example."*

This application was considered to have met the various objections raised by the planning inspector and was approved. Following the planning officer's recommendation, the permission imposed a condition removing permitted development rights.

The Current Application

In the first instance it is worth noting that, pursuant to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Council must determine this application in accordance with the adopted development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In addition, section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the Council to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area in which the Grey House is situated.

The proposal envisages a substantial two storey side extension (ground and basement) which will push the existing western flank wall of the property out by some 50% of the width of the frontage of the building. Were this permitted, it would (i) reduce the gap between the Grey House and its immediate neighbour, Claremont House, limiting garden space and destroying the balance of the "setting" of the Grey House within sufficient grounds, thus bringing the position close back to the inappropriate 2010 application in this respect. This would, in addition, now be

contrary to Policy CS11(a), which requires development to respect the typical density intended in an area and to enhance spaces between buildings and general character. It would also be contrary to policy CS12(g), which requires development to respect adjoining properties in terms including (so far as relevant to the instant application), layout, site coverage, scale, height, bulk and landscaping and amenity space. (ii) damage long views of the Grey House grounds by increasing the built up area visible from the road and in long views (contrary to paragraph (d) of Policy CS11); and (iii) prevent long views of the gap between Kennet House and Ashton House, as previously deemed important by the Inspector and planning authority (and again being contrary to sub paragraph (d) of Policy CS11). Indeed this latter view can only be protected if the western flank of the Grey House remains in its current position: as soon as this is moved westward at all, the gap between Kennet House and Ashton House would be obscured.

The expansion of the Grey House and the loss of this unbuilt area would have further dramatic consequences for the occupants of the new houses built on site. All, other than Claremont House, will lose the open aspect and view across the valley. Claremont House will suffer as they will lose the green buffer between their boundary and the Grey House. Aside from failing to enhance or preserve the conservation area, this is contrary to paragraph g of policy CS12 (as described above). They will also suffer issues of overlooking and privacy, contrary to paragraph (c) of Policy CS12. Aside from the proximity of the proposed building to the boundary with Claremont House, the inclusion of a broad balcony at the front of the proposed extension, with an external staircase on the western flank (i.e., on the same side as the boundary with Claremont House) will plainly only serve to create a cramped feeling.

In addition to issues of density of development and loss of privacy, the proposed extension is out of keeping with the character of the Grey House. The extension is inconsistent with the largely original features of the property. It has an unbalancing effect on the symmetry of the front of the house, visible from the road. The design of what, from the front, will effectively look like a first floor balcony with external winding staircase is also alien. This cannot be said positively to enhance the characteristics of the street scene and to blend with the local building tradition, as set out at section 7 of the Environmental Guidelines SPG. It is plainly contrary to the Council's desire to protect and conserve all heritage assets and to conserve and enhance the appearance and character of conservation areas as set out in policy CS27 of the Core Strategy.

Conclusion

The history of this matter demonstrates that it is most unlikely that any additional densification of the built environment of this particular site would be appropriate. The current proposal specifically would result in extensive loss of garden space and views, as previously found to be contrary to planning policy on this site by Inspector Ian Radcliffe. It also involves an alien, unbalancing design that is out of keeping

with the rest of the house and fails to enhance or preserve the Conservation Area. It is manifestly contrary to the policies in the adopted development plan and material considerations (notably the negative effect on the Conservation Area and the planning history of the site) indicate that the application should be refused. Consequently, in our view the Council should refuse the application.

36a Kitsbury Road – Revised Scheme

I see the proposed plans have just been revised, presumably to take into account the preliminary comments of the Conservation Officer previously posted on the Dacorum website. I would note that those comments were all subject to his or her closing remarks which were: "However, I would also comment that the building has only recently been developed and extended, and at this stage I am uncertain whether Permitted Development was removed as I do have concerns regarding the overdevelopment of this site given that the Grey House is a substantial property without this extension." As you will know, when the development in its current form was authorised, it was made subject to removal of Permitted Development rights. This was directly related to concerns related to over development, which was the main obstacle to planning approval for the development of this site from 2010 to 2012. As you will have seen, from the initial planning application in 2010 to the final approval of the 2012 application, the density of development at the site was a critical feature. The approval that was finally given represented the highest density of development deemed acceptable. Nothing substantive has changed in planning policy terms since then and the proposed extension remains a considerable addition, which would remove a large and (so far as its position within the overall site is concerned), important area of open space. As such, the objections we raised in our letter of 14 April 2015 remain largely as set out in their letter. That is particularly true in relation to over densification, removal of green space, loss of views and, albeit some of the more grandiose elements have been watered down a little, the unbalancing effect of the proposed extension on the house and the site in general. In essence, the proposal continues to fly in the face of the Inspector's April 2011 decision and cannot be said to enhance the Conservation Area. We therefore continue to hold the view that this proposal should be (firmly) rejected.

Conservation and Design

The Grey House is a charming Victorian detached villa that has recently been developed along with its surrounding curtilage.

The application is for a two storey side extension with balcony.

The Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building and also special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

NPPF 131: In determining planning applications local planning authorities should take account of:

- The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation
- The positive contribution that heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality
- The desirability of new developments making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness

DBLP 120 Development in Conservation Areas; new development or alterations or extensions to existing buildings in the conservation area will be permitted provided they are carried out in a manner which preserves or enhances the established character or appearance of the area. Each scheme will be expected to respect established building lines, layouts and patterns, In particular infilling proposals will be carefully controlled; use materials and adopt design details which are traditional to the area and complement its character; be of a scale and proportion which is sympathetic to the scale, height and overall character of the building to be extended; and in the case of alterations and extensions be complementary and sympathetic to the established character of the building to be altered or extended.

I would comment that the building has only recently been developed and extended, and at this stage I am uncertain whether Permitted Development was removed. I do have serious concerns regarding the overdevelopment of this site given that the Grey House is a substantial property without this further extension.

I would also draw to your attention that in 2012 (4/01044/12/FUL) the Planning Inspectorate stated that any further development would unduly urbanise the site and that the spacious garden landscape setting would be eroded to an unacceptable degree. He continued, failure to maintain the balance between the built development to the site would be harmful to the setting of the conservation area.

I concur with these comments and would therefore recommend this application for refusal. **Object.**

Berkhamsted Town

It was **RESOLVED** to suspend Standing Orders to allow Mr Campbell, the applicant to speak for the application.

Mr Campbell explained that the amended application sought to address previous concerns regarding the extension.

This application had removed the balcony and spiral staircase so that there was only ground floor access to what would be a garden room. The loss of garage space meant the room would be used for storage of garden furniture and would remove the need for a storage shed to be constructed in the garden

The proposed extension has been reduced in size by 20%, and had been set back so as to be subordinate, proportionate to and complement the main building. The extension would be in materials appropriate to the Conservation Area and the restoration of the Grey House.

The reduced-size extension retained the gap between buildings, maintained the long view over the valley and would not adversely impact on neighbours.

Other houses in the neighbourhood have had similar sized extensions approved and built.

The meeting was reconvened.

The changes in this amended application are noted and appreciated.

However, a considerable amount of time and effort was expended on the development of this site which included the restoration of the Grey House, to ensure that an appropriate balance be maintained between the built environment and the spatial, green landscaped setting within the site, and that the architectural integrity and the setting of the Grey House be maintained. This included very careful consideration of the spacing between buildings.

The proposed extension detracts from both the intended spatial integrity of the site and the architectural integrity and design of the Grey House. As such, if approved, it would cause considerable harm to a heritage asset.

Contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS 11, CS 12 and CS 27, Saved Local Plan Policy 120 and contrary to the recommendations of Ian Radcliffe, the Planning Inspector who dismissed an Appeal for the development of this site in 2011 (APP/A1910/A/11/2145295 - attached).

Trees and Woodlands

I have no objection to the proposed construction of a two-storey side extension at The Grey House but would require the submission of further information regarding landscape proposals.

The extension is planned on the western side of the dwelling, towards an area of garden containing two small trees, a Birch and Holly. I believe that these trees form part of approved landscaping for application 4/00843/13/DRC. Two other trees are present on site, a Yew and a Pear. Both are protected by Area TPO 496, served in 2010.

It is proposed to remove the two smaller trees to create additional open space around the extension. The removed trees are to be replaced with three new ones along the western boundary.

The two larger TPO trees are to be retained. Tree protection measures have been proposed on the submitted 'Arboricultural Impact Plan and Tree Protection Plan' DS05011501.03 and are acceptable.

I have been unable to ascertain what species or planting size is proposed for these new trees and what planting specification. Such detail should be submitted for assessment.

The location of the new trees is shown on 'Site Layout Plan' 1951 / 02B.

Comments from Agent

From our conversation last week I understand that objections have been made by neighbours on our revised proposal but these do not appear on Dacorum's website. My client has requested that you forward the latest objection letters so that we can respond to them. I note that the comments of Conservation Team that we fully responded to have been removed from the website and that the Conservation Team has made comments on our amended proposal, which are also absent from the website. I would be grateful if you would also forward these. I must say that I find it highly unsatisfactory that having fully responded to the Conservation Team's comments it has now seemingly made different comments.

The 2011 dismissed appeal related to a proposal for "alterations and extension to the Grey House and 6 new dwellings". Although subsequently a number of non-material amendments were made to that proposal, the proposal that was implemented was for "alterations and extension to existing house and construction of four new dwellings" granted under planning application reference 4/01044/12/FUL. The extension to the Grey House took the form of a shortened and widened rear wing incorporating a double garage, replacing a detached garage that was previously located to the rear of the property.

As identified in the 2011 appeal decision the main issue is "whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area". As you will be aware case law has established that preservation in this context means the absence of harm NOT the absence of change.

Paragraph 7 of the appeal decision states that:

"The Grey House' is a large dwelling with substantial gardens surrounding it. The gardens provide a suitable setting for the house with both complementing each other. As a consequence, the house and its gardens make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The tall boundary wall and mature landscaping around the edge of the site screens views into the appeal site from surrounding land. Nevertheless, the largely undeveloped nature of the plot provides a green backdrop to surrounding development. Furthermore, in long distance views from the raised ground on the northern side of the town, the appeal site forms part of the contrast of spacious plots and more densely developed housing which adds to the variety of the townscape."

Paragraph 10 states:

The scheme would involve the renovation and alteration of 'The Grey House' and the construction of 4 new buildings; a detached dwelling; a semi-detached pair of houses; and a terrace of 3. houses with a detached garage. Although the appeal site slopes uphill, with the garden to the back of 'The Grey House' on higher land than the front garden, the proposed houses to the rear would be cut into the slope. As a result, all the houses on the site would be subservient in height to 'The Grey House'. However, the terrace and the semi-detached pair of houses would be substantial buildings in terms of their width and footprint. The 30m gap separating 'The Grey

House' from its western side boundary is occupied by a number of trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order which make a contribution to the open verdant character of the site. The terrace and the semi-detached pair of houses, along with the associated hard standing, would take up the majority of this open space and result in the loss of most of these trees. The resulting quantum of development would unduly urbanise the site. As a consequence, whilst there would be scope for soft landscaping and planting around the perimeter of the site to soften the impact of the new development, the spacious garden landscaped setting of the house would be eroded to an unacceptable degree.

The current proposal for a side extension to Grey House must be judged against the current circumstance of the site and not against what existed at the time of the appeal application, which was significantly different. The Inspector was clearly concerned with the quantum and scale of development that was proposed at the time, which differs from what has now been constructed. Also, he was not considering a two-storey side extension which is effectively single storey in scale as it is cut into the slope of the site. In the context of the proposal before you I firstly reiterate my early comments that:

“The proposal maintains a 5.1 m gap between the extension and the side boundary and a gap of 9.2 m between the side elevation of Claremont House and our proposed extension, which is quite significant. As demonstrated by the Site Location Plan, the site of The Grey House is larger than that of the site of No 36 on the opposite side of Kitsbury Road, which is an equally substantial property, and the gap between it and the adjacent terrace is less than is proposed between the proposed extension to The Grey House and Claremont House”. In the context of the immediate surroundings the proposal will maintain the spaciousness of the area, as a substantial gap will exist between the Grey House and its neighbour commensurate with the gaps between other properties on spacious plots in the area. When viewed from the new access road serving the recent development of four houses, the proposed extension is only single storey and is set at a lower level than the road, preserving a greater sense of openness between the Grey House and Claremont. I observe that the proposal will be largely screened by the existing boundary wall (see attached View of Grey House from access road).

I have now had the opportunity to consider the effect of the proposal on views across the valley, an issue with which the appeal Inspector concerned himself, and attach photographs of the site before and after the residential development on its former plot was constructed. From these photographs it can be seen that a single storey extension will not be or will only be barely visible in views across the valley due to screening by buildings and trees lower down the hill. The effect of the proposal on these views will be insignificant and will certainly not amount to harm to the Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset and the presence of the new housing development does not impact on this assessment. Please note that all the photographs are taken with a telephoto lens and that with the naked eye the effect of the constructed housing development and the current proposal is further reduced.

Recommendation

As per the published report

ITEM 5.07

**4/00876/15/FUL - ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING GARAGE BLOCK TO FORM
NEW TWO BEDROOM DWELLING**

2 HAWKINS WAY, BOVINGDON, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 0UB

Recommendation

As per the published report

ITEM 5.08

4/01905/15/FUL - 3-BED DETACHED DWELLING

19 CLAVERTON CLOSE, BOVINGDON, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 0QP

Recommendation

As per the published report

ITEM 5.09

**4/01814/15/FUL - TO INSTALL 6 PARKING BAYS ON GRASS AREA OUTSIDE
16/17/18**

**SACOMBE ROAD GRASSED AREA OUTSIDE 16/17/18 SACOMBE ROAD,
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP1**

Recommendation

As per the published report
