

4/00419/18/FUL	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE AND FLAT ROOF SIDE EXTENSION. CONSTRUCTION OF NEW 2 BEDROOM DWELLING.
Site Address	2 NUNFIELD, CHIPPERFIELD, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 9EW
Applicant	Cahoon Developments, Kingsmead
Case Officer	James Gardner
Referral to Committee	Called-in by Ward Councillor

1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**

2. Summary

2.1 This application relates to the construction of an infill dwelling. Infilling is defined as a form of development whereby buildings are constructed within a gap along a clearly identifiable build up frontage of within a group of buildings. The principle of infill dwellings is acceptable in Chipperfield and would help to maintain important services and facilities – i.e. post office, churches, pubs, village school, village store, coffee shop etc.

The construction of this dwelling would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area or the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal is considered to broadly comply with the relevant local and national planning policies.

3. Site Description

3.1 The application site forms one of a semi-detached pair with gabled roofs and painted brick walls. It is set back from the highway and the front garden is partially enclosed by an established boundary hedge. A detached garage and a concrete / crazy paved hardstanding are located to one side. The remaining area is laid to lawn and includes soft planting. Number 2 is flat fronted and has little in the way of architectural detailing, although does benefit from a modest porch with a mono-pitched roof

3.2 The immediate area is of mixed character, comprising large detached dwellings on the north-western side of Kings Lane and more modest semi-detached dwellings within Nunfield.

4. Proposal

4.1 The proposal comprises the demolition of an existing flat-roofed side extension and single storey detached garage and the construction of a 2-bedroom dwelling, forming a terrace of three dwellings.

The dwelling would match the simple yet pleasing architectural style of the parent dwelling and its counterpart (no. 4 Nunfield).

5. Relevant Planning History

No recent history.

6. Policies

6.1 National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

6.2 Adopted Core Strategy –

NP1, CS1, CS2, CS6, CS8, CS9, CS11, CS12, CS17, CS18, CS19, CS20, CS29, CS32, CS35

6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policies 10, 13, 18, 21, 57, 58

Appendices 3, 5, 7.

6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

- Accessibility Zones for the Application of car Parking Standards (July 2002)
- Landscape Character Assessment (May 2004)
- Affordable Housing (Jan 2013)
- Chipperfield Village Design Statement

6.5 Advice Notes and Appraisals

- Sustainable Development Advice Note (March 2011)
- Conservation Area Character Appraisal for Chipperfield.

7. Constraints

- CIL2
- Small Village
- Area of Special Control for Adverts
- Green Belt

8. Representations

Consultation responses

8.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

8.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B

9. Considerations

9.1 Main issues

The main issues to consider are:

- Policy and principle
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Impact on Character and Appearance of Area
- Impact on Setting of Chipperfield Conservation Area
- Impact on Trees and Landscaping
- Impact on Highway Safety
- Other Material Planning Considerations

Policy and Principle

9.2 Policy CS1 states that the rural character of the borough will be conserved and that development which:

- Supports the vitality and viability of local communities; and
- Causes no damage to the existing character of a village and/or surrounding area; and
- Is compatible with policies protecting and enhancing the Green Belt will be supported.

Policy CS6 provides for limited infilling with affordable housing for local people provided the development is sympathetic to its surroundings, including the adjoining countryside, in terms of local character, design, scale, landscaping and visual impact. An additional requirement is that the development retains and protects features essential to the character and appearance of the village.

Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy seeks to promote residential development to address a need for additional housing within the borough and new dwellings are supported in principle by policy CS18 of the Core Strategy.

Chipperfield is a designated small village within the Green Belt and as such the principle of infilling is ostensibly acceptable provided that it provides affordable housing for local people. Regard must, however, be had to the Affordable Housing SPD - Clarification Note (published in March 2015) which states that areas falling within the "rural area" as defined in the Clarification Note only need to provide affordable housing where the scheme creates 6 or more units.

The National Planning Policy Framework encourages the provision of more housing within towns and other specified settlements and encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed. Paragraph 89 confirms that limited infilling in villages is acceptable in Green Belt terms.

Saved Policy 10 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2004) seeks to optimise the use of available land within urban area. Optimising the use of urban land assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.3 The impact on the established residential amenity of neighbouring properties is a significant factor in determining whether the proposed development is acceptable. Policy CS12 states that development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of privacy. Saved Appendix 3 of the DBLP contains guidance on layout and design for new developments. Whilst guidance is provided as regards the separation distances between rear walls (23 metres), there is no minimum distance for flank walls.

9.3.1 Visual Intrusion

There is no statutory planning definition of visual intrusion or whether development is overbearing. The proximity of built development, height, mass and bulk, topography, orientation and the existing layouts of adjoining dwellings are all relevant factors. As such, whether development is visually intrusive or overbearing is a matter of planning judgement.

Consideration has been given to the individual characteristics of the application site and the spatial relationship which would exist between the new dwelling and The Paddock.

The proposed dwelling would be 8.27 metres high and utilise a gable roof form. It would be of identical height to the parent dwelling at no. 2 Nunfield and provide a similar visual appearance when viewed from The Paddock. This height is considered to be domestic in scale and not

unprecedented in residential areas. A separation distance of between 1 and 3 metres would be maintained between the new flank walls and the boundary. Furthermore, the extent of the two-storey built form would not extend beyond the rear wall of The Paddock by an excessive degree; indeed, this would equate to 1.68 metres in the case of the flank wall located 1 metre from the boundary and 3.56 metres in the case of the flank wall located 3 metres from the boundary.

The Paddock does not benefit from any windows on the flank wall fronting the application site, and as such no windows would directly observe the development. Visibility of the development would be limited to the windows on the rear elevation and from within the garden itself. The orientation of these windows means that the primary aspect is toward the rear of the garden, not the application site. Whilst built form would be brought noticeably closer when viewed from the garden, in and of itself, this is not considered to be harmful. The distances involved are not dissimilar to those which exist between the row of detached houses to the north of the site (also located on Kings Lane); namely, Redcroft, 5 Kings Lane, September Cottage and Broom Cottage.

9.3.2 Loss of Light

The Building Research Establishment's (BRE) 'Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)' has been considered by the applicant.

Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) remain relevant post adoption of the Core Strategy. Appendix 3 states that development should be designed and positioned in such a way that a satisfactory level of sunlight and daylight is maintained and that a 45 degree angle of light should be maintained as a basic minimum to all significant windows of habitable rooms. Saved Appendix 7 states that two-storey extensions up to the lines of 45 degree angles taken from the nearest windows of habitable rooms in adjacent properties are generally acceptable.

The '45 degree test' has been demonstrated on drawing no. 2 Revision H. However, as there was some ambiguity as to whether the development in its current form complies with the aforementioned test, the applicant has commissioned Right of Light Consulting Chartered Surveyors to conduct a daylight assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on the Paddock. Where development does not meet the 45 degree test it does not necessarily mean that there would be significant harm; rather, there is merely a potential for there to be negative impacts.

The assessment which has been carried out is based on the numerical tests laid down in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guide 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to good practice'. The tests comprise the Vertical Sky Component, Daylight Distribution, Annual Probable Daylight Sunlight Hours (in relation to both availability of sunlight to windows and overshadowing of gardens and open space).

The Executive Summary to the daylight assessment states that:

The results confirm that all main neighbouring windows pass the BRE diffuse daylight and direct sunlight tests. The development also satisfied the BRE overshadowing to gardens and open spaces requirements.

In summary, the proposed development will have a low impact on the light receivable by its neighbouring properties. Right of Light Consulting confirms that the development satisfies all the requirements set out in the BRE guide 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight'.

9.3.3 Loss of Privacy

The proposed dwelling has been designed in a way that minimises potential overlooking. Two windows are proposed to be inserted on the rear elevation of the new dwelling. The window nearest the Paddock would serve a bathroom and thus the expectation is that it would be fitted with obscure glass. Should planning permission to be granted a condition would be imposed requiring the window to remain obscure glazed in perpetuity. The second window is indicated on the floor plans as serving a bedroom. The centre of the window would be set in from the common boundary by approximately 5.35 metres and located approximately 3.85 metres forward of the original rear wall of the Paddocks. The window would afford oblique views of the top half of the rear garden, and these views would not be considerably different to those already afforded by the first floor windows of the existing dwelling. In a residential setting a certain level of mutual overlooking is not unexpected. The primary concern is protecting privacy within the house and the sitting-out area immediately adjacent to the rear elevation. A window serving a staircase is proposed at first floor level in the flank wall of the new dwelling, but would be obscure glazed and therefore would not result in any loss of privacy.

Impact on Character and Appearance of Area

9.4 Density

Policy CS11 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013) states that, within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should, inter alia, respect the typical density intended in an area, preserve attractive streetscapes and protect or enhance significant views within character areas.

Saved Policy 21 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) provides guidance pertaining to density:

Careful consideration will be given to the density of all new housing proposals to ensure that they make the most efficient use of the land.

Densities will generally be expected in the range of 30 to 50 dwellings per hectare net.

Higher densities will generally be encouraged in urban areas at locations where services and/or workplaces can be reached without the need for motorised travel or which are served well by passenger transport, for example at town and local centre.

Proposals which have a density of below 30 dwellings per hectare net should be avoided.

For sites at the edge of an urban area, special attention will be paid to the effect of development on open countryside and views. In such locations proposals will be expected to retain existing trees and hedges and incorporate appropriate landscaping in order to achieve a soft edge to the countryside.

The density of the area is mixed, with the northern side of King Lane being low density and the Nunfield estate and Kings Close being higher in density. The application site is in relatively close proximity to these areas of higher density, all of which contribute to the overall character of the area. The area as a whole must be taken into account, not just constituent parts of it.

Housing density can be measured in a number of ways:

- Number of dwellings per hectare (dph)
- Number of habitable rooms.
- Quantity of floor area.

Dwellings per hectare is the most commonly used measure and therefore it is considered appropriate to use this to analyse the proposal.

The current density of the application site and its counterpart (no. 4 Nunfield) is 16.6 dwellings/HA. The addition of a further dwelling would increase the density to 25 dwellings/HA. This is not considered to be out keeping with the average density of the area.

It is acknowledged that density cannot necessarily be assessed purely in terms of mathematics. Indeed, it is also important to consider how the townscape is experienced by persons moving through it. In light of the concerns raised in connection with the impact on the character of the area, the importance of the existing gap between no. 2 Nunfield and The Paddock needs to be considered.

Policy CS6 of the Dacorum Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework are supportive of infilling within villages. Infilling will inevitably result in an increase in density and, by definition, involves filling in a gap in a built-up frontage. It must be conceded that there will be instances where it is not appropriate to fill in a such gaps – for example where it represents an important visual break that frames a viewpoint.

Owing to the curvature of the road, existing boundary treatment and set back from the road, the gap in question is not visible in the street when travelling along Kings Lane from the direction of Chipperfield Common. It is only when standing directly in front of the site that the gap becomes perceptible.

When travelling from the direction of Langley Road, the presence of a mature tree on the grass verge, the verdant frontage and the considerable set-back from the road mean that the gap between no. 2 Nunfield and The Paddock is not conspicuous.

The gap does not contribute to serial views and, furthermore, is not particularly wide; nor does it afford views of open countryside or important landscape features beyond.

The construction of a new dwelling would not appreciably add or detract from the rural setting. On this basis infilling in this location would not give the area a more urban feel. Although close to open countryside the application site backs onto the rear gardens of the dwellings within the Nunfield estate and an associated garage block.

Whilst it has been asserted that the application constitutes overdevelopment of the site, no further information has been provided to back up this statement. The dwelling would not be unduly cramped and would benefit from a side access, ample rear garden, and sufficient parking to the front. Under permitted development a side extension of up to half the width of the original dwelling (5.37 metres) could be constructed without planning permission, resulting in built development extending right up to the boundary with the Paddock.

Design and Quality of Development

9.5 In visual terms the dwelling is considered acceptable, clearly taking its visual cues from the parent dwelling and no. 4 Nunfield. Together they form a cohesive and attractive group within the street.

A two-storey forward projecting gable was originally proposed but was considered to be too dominant within the street and replaced by a single storey front extension. A false chimney is to be provided to aid integration with the other dwellings and give a traditional feel. Materials are to match the parent dwelling –i.e. painted brickwork and matching roof tiles.

The two-storey element to the rear of the new dwelling is shown as being rendered. This does not raise any particular concerns for two reasons. Firstly, with one exception (adjacent to no. 4a Nunfield), the rear extension would not be readily visible from public vantage points, and

then this would be from a distance in excess of 40 metres. Secondly, the distance is such that, for all intents and purposes, there would be no visual difference between painted brick and painted render; indeed, even from a much shorter distance the visual difference is by no means striking or obvious. The specific wording of policy CS12 also needs to be considered. The word “respect” should not be conflated with “identical”. Clearly, development can respect adjoining properties in terms of materials without being an exact duplicate.

It has been suggested that a terraced house would not be in keeping with the general character of the area. There are, however, numerous examples of terraced houses in Chipperfield and therefore it is difficult to see how the creation of a terrace along Kings Lane would be so harmful to the character of the village as to warrant a refusal of planning permission; indeed, there are two sets of terraces opposite the entrance to Kings Lane, on Chapel Croft. Additionally, development in historic parts of villages, towns and cities is often characterised by an eclectic mix of dwelling types and designs.

Saved Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan states that all residential development is required to provide private open space for use by residents whether the development be houses or flats. In the case of dwellings there is an expectation that areas of amenity space are positioned to the rear of the dwelling and have an average minimum depth of 11.5 metres.

The plans indicate that a garden depth of approximately 16.00 metres (D) x 7.50 metres (W) would be provided. In all respects this is considered acceptable, allowing enough space for a diverse range of outdoor residential uses.

Impact on Setting of Chipperfield Conservation Area

9.6 Whilst the application site does not fall within the boundary of the Chipperfield Conservation Area, it is located within close proximity.

The Conservation and Design Officer has been consulted and provided the following comments.

The proposed new dwelling is of a similar scale and proportion to the existing dwellings. However there is a forward projection containing a hall, bathroom and bedroom. It would be recommended that the design detail of this be reconsidered and simplified to match the existing cottages. The porch should be changed to a monopitch, the barge boards removed and the first floor bedroom window should match the proportions of the original dwelling. It would also be recommended that the brick corbled details below the eaves be copied from the original building and added to the proposed new dwelling. We believe that these changes would allow the proposed building to sit quietly in the background and not impact on the setting of the conservation area.

Our bigger concern would be the impact on the landscape to the frontage. We believe that this needs to alter as little as possible and retain planting to the frontage. The drives should be of a high quality material perhaps a bound gravel. To reflect the character of the area. Planting including tree planting is welcome and should be covered by condition.

Recommendation: We would not object to the proposals but would recommend that the design be reviewed and that if the alterations are considered acceptable that materials and in particular the landscaping are conditioned.

The relevant design amendments have been made in accordance with the Conservation Officer's advice.

The Chipperfield Conservation Area Appraisal identifies 5 distinct areas within the conservation

area. The application site falls just outside of Area 4 so it is relevant to consider the information provided therein.

In summarising the local character, the conservation area appraisal states that:

The houses in Area 4 represent an eclectic assortment of styles that capture the changes in suburban house types through each decade of the C20th. One or two adopt interesting design features – the framed chalet bungalow in Kings Lane with flint infill panels, for example. Later C20th developments have slotted in cottages such as Didsbury Cottages which complement and enhance the Conservation Area.

The above illustrates that C20th developments need not have a harmful impact on the Conservation Area and that a variety of designs are not incompatible in this location.

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.7 Given the sylvan nature of the area it is considered important that the addition of a new dwelling does not have a detrimental impact on the feel of the area. From pre-application stage the advice given to the applicant has been that a robust landscaping scheme would be an important part of any future submission.

In response, it is noted that, wherever possible, the existing hedgerow fronting the site is to be retained. An area of lawn is to be included and a new hedgerow is to be planted in order to separate the respective curtilages. The use of tandem-style parking would allow for the inclusion of greater levels of landscaping and avoid large areas dominated by car parking, which is actively discouraged by Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

The Trees and Woodlands Officer has not raised any concerns in respect of the application, although has requested details of the type of hedge to be used to separate the parking bays.

Impact on Highway Safety

9.8 It is proposed to utilise the existing access onto Kings Lane with an additional access being constructed to serve the parent dwelling (no. 2 Nunfield). This forms part of planning application 4/00421/18/FHA. The Highway Authority have been consulted and have confirmed they do not wish to restrict the grant of planning permission.

A permeable driveway with tandem-style parking for up to 2 vehicles would serve the new dwelling. Under saved Appendix 5 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), a 2-bedroom dwelling gives rise to a maximum parking standard of 1.5 spaces. As a result, the proposal exceeds the maximum standard and does not give rise to any undue concerns. The more general requirement of Policy CS12 – that sufficient parking is provided – is also considered to be satisfied.

Should planning permission be granted, details of the surfacing materials are to be reserved by condition.

The limited scale of the development is such that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) is not considered to be necessary.

Other Material Planning Considerations

9.9 Refuse

A brick-built covered bin store with space for up to 3 wheelie bins is shown on both the floor plans and elevations. This would ensure an acceptable visual appearance and would be

eminently more practical than storage in the rear garden.

Response to Neighbour comments

9.10 These points have been addressed above other than those listed below.

- *“My client’s property is not correctly illustrated on the drawings appended to the application i.e. the applicant has omitted the side extension and rear conservatory. This maybe has been done to their advantage in order to achieve the statutory 45° sight line.*

The proposed plans have falsely illustrated the properties to be parallel, whilst in fact they are not. We feel the submitted drawings and therefore unacceptable in their current state and misleading.”

The side extension has been rendered on the most recent plans, and the rear extension of the proposed dwelling has been reduced in depth in order to ensure that a 45 degree line is achieved. The base map has been based on data from Ordnance Survey.

- *“It is noted that the applicant has submitted two separate planning applications, however the drawings contained with the application 4/00419/18/FUL has incorporated the rear extension which is subject of approval under application 4/00421/18/FHA. This is a wellknown planning tactic in order to confuse the local authority. The applications should be updated to reflect and illustrate the existing arrangement. Furthermore, it should be noted that my client only received notification concerning Planning Application 4/00421/18/FHA.”*

The most recent plans satisfactorily the address the issue raised above and now accurately reflect the existing arrangement.

- *“The application refers to ‘internal alterations.’ From reviewing the drawings provided, the internal alterations are minor in nature, the content of which will not require planning permission. It is considered that this terminology has been used in order to deter the Local Authority leading them to believe that the application is not as extensive as it is.”*

The Local Planning Authority is satisfied with the description used. Planning application 4/00419/19/FHA does indeed include internal alterations to the existing property.

- *“Notwithstanding the potential structural adverse impact that may be caused by close excavations, insufficient information has been provided within the application as to the extent of excavation works and the type of foundations proposed and what steps shall be taken to protect the neighbouring property. This extremely important detail which needs to be confirmed prior to the application being considered since the type may have adverse effects on the surrounding land and properties.”*

This level of information is not relevant to the planning application currently being considered as it is covered by other legislation – i.e. Party Wall Act and Building Regulations.

- *“The application does not include a Design and Access Statement, which we feel has an obstructing significance on the effectiveness of such an application. A Design and Access Statement illustrates, explains and justifies the form of the development, addressing both design and access and demonstrating how each informs the other.*

Absence of such document therefore raises the questions whether such procedure have been followed, considered and taken into account.”

The application site does not fall within a conservation area and is not a major application. As a result, a Design and Access Statement is not a statutory validation requirement.

- *“No construction traffic management plan has been provided. Concern is expressed regarding the usage of the single carriageway for the purpose of building material delivery and spoil excavation removal. The CTMP is a document integral to the granting of planning permission for the traffic management protocol and without it the application is null and void and possible health and safety issue. Concern is further expressed in this regard since the road goes into one lane thereby the presents of large construction vehicles block the view of the road users.”*

The scale of the development is limited and therefore a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) is not considered to be necessary. CTMPs are typically only sought for large scale development such as housing estates, or basement development where considerable soil excavation would be taking place. Additionally, the Highway Authority has been consulted but have not requested a CTMP.

- *“Policy CS12 (g vii) states ‘the development must respect adjoining properties in terms of materials.’ It is noted that the front elevation windows are not identical to those of the adjoining property. Furthermore, a new style front roof porch is proposed which is not corresponding with the neighbour. It is also noted that the rear extension shall be rendered, whilst the adjoining properties elevation brickwork is painted and not rendered. The development is therefore neither in keeping with the character and makeup of the subject/adjoining property and is in direct contradiction to your guidelines, in particular Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011 adopted 21 April 2004 Appendix 3 – A3.1, A3.6 (iv) Appendix 7 - A7.2 i (a, c and d), ii (b, c), (v).”*

Concern was raised in connection with the visual appearance of the front elevation of the proposed dwelling. In response, the dimensions of the windows have been altered to match those of no. 2 Nunfield and the two-storey forward projecting gable has been removed in order to ensure that the new dwelling satisfactorily integrates with the existing semi-detached dwellings – i.e. nos. 2 and 4 Nunfield.

- *“Neither the application, nor the proposed drawings provide any informative information on how the additional rainwater shall be drained from the additional proposed roof. Location of guttering, downpipes are underground drainage network has not been specified. We consider that due to the proximity of the surrounding properties and neighbouring fields, this matter should be provided within the planning application.”*

This is a matter for building control and does not fall within the remit of planning. The grant of planning permission does not discharge the applicant’s responsibilities to comply with other regulatory regimes.

- *“It is considered that the approval of this substantial development may nurture further successive development which will put the character of the area at radial risk which may eventually result in cramped forms of development which will greatly reduce the outlook and landscape amenity currently afforded to the existing residents.”*

Each case is judged on its own merits. It does not stand to reason that other

applications in the area would be deemed acceptable.

- *“It should be noted the applicant's property is situated in a quiet secluded village and therefore the opposition to this development may not be as vocal when compared to a more highly densely populated town such a Hemel Hempstead etc. This should be taken into account when considering this application.”*

Objections have been received and will be given due consideration.

CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy)

9.11 Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on 1 July 2015. This application is CIL liable.

10. Conclusions

10.1 The proposed dwelling has been carefully designed to integrate with the existing dwelling and its counterpart (no. 4 Nunfield). As demonstrated by the BRE daylight / sunlight assessment, there would be no adverse impacts on receiveable light to The Paddocks. The site is not prominent within the street and therefore would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. Sufficient and convenient off-road parking would be provided on-site. Taking all the above into account, it is considered that the proposal broadly complies with the relevant planning policies and thus permission should be granted.

11. RECOMMENDATION – That planning permission be **GRANTED** for the reasons referred to above and subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

No	Condition
1	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.</p> <p>Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p>
2	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:</p> <p>01 Rev. F 02 Rev. H 03 Rev. E</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p>
3	<p>No development shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Please do not send materials to the council offices. Materials should be kept on site and arrangements made with the planning officer for inspection.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, in accordance with saved Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.</p>

	<p>Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the Conservation Area, in accordance with Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy.</p>
4	<p>No development (except demolition) shall take place until 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:</p> <p>hard surfacing materials; means of enclosure; soft landscape works which shall include 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 where appropriate; trees to be retained and measures for their protection during construction works; proposed finished levels or contours; car parking layouts and other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.</p> <p>The approved landscape works shall be carried out prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area, in accordance with Policies CS6, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy.</p>
5	<p>The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until the refuse storage facilities shown on drawing nos. 02 Rev. H and 03 Rev. E have been provided. These facilities shall thereafter be permanently retained.</p> <p>Reason: To accord with Policy 129 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.</p>
6	<p>The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until the front and side elevations (excluding the sections annotated as being rendered) have been externally painted in a colour matching no. 2 Nunfield.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area, in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy. Article 35 Statement</p> <p>Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage and during the determination process which lead to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.</p> <p>INFORMATIVES AN1) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the</p>

<p>Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx or by telephoning 0300 1234047.</p> <p>AN2) Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx or by telephoning 0300 1234047.</p> <p>Mud on highway AN3) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx or by telephoning 0300 1234047.</p>
--

Appendix A

Consultation responses

Thames Water Utilities	No comments received.
DBC Strategic Planning	No comment.
DBC Building Control	No comments received.
DBC Conservation	<p>The existing dwellings are a pair of mid 20th century houses. They are two storey painted brick with a tiled roof and monopitch porches. In general they have a simple form and lack elaboration or detailing. The adjacent area contains planting and trees. The site is not within the conservation area but is located adjacent to it.</p> <p>The proposed rear extension would not impact on the character of the conservation area.</p> <p>The proposed new dwelling is of a similar scale and proportion to the existing dwellings. However there is a forward projection containing a hall, bathroom and bedroom. It would be recommended that the design detail of this be reconsidered and simplified to match the existing cottages. The porch should be changed to a monopitch, the barge boards removed and the first floor bedroom window should match the proportions of the original dwelling. It would also be recommended that the brick corbled details below the eaves be copied from the original</p>

<p>Hertfordshire Highways</p>	<p>building and added to the proposed new dwelling. We believe that these changes would allow the proposed building to sit quietly in the background and not impact on the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>Our bigger concern would be the impact on the landscape to the frontage. We believe that this needs to alter as little as possible and retain planting to the frontage. The drives should be of a high quality material perhaps a bound gravel. To reflect the character of the area. Planting including tree planting is welcome and should be covered by condition.</p> <p>Recommendation We would not object to the proposals but would recommend that the design be reviewed and that if the alterations are considered acceptable that materials and in particular the landscaping are conditioned.</p> <p><u>16/04/18</u></p> <p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.</p> <p>Informative:</p> <p>I recommend inclusion of the following advisory note to ensure that any works within the highway are to be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the highway Act 1980.</p> <p>Storage of materials AN1) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx by telephoning 0300 1234047.</p> <p>Obstruction of the highway</p> <p>AN2) Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website</p>
--------------------------------------	---

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Mud on highway AN3) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Planning Application

Proposal is for demolition of existing detached garage and flat roof side extension and erection of a 3 bedrooms dwelling. This application is to be assessed in conjunction with two storey rear extension house holder application

Site and Surrounding

The site is located at no 2 Nunfield in Chipperfield. This is an unclassified local access road some 160m in length. The site is located at the corner plot of Nunfield and Kings Lane. Kings Lane is also an unclassified local access road.

Accessibility

The application site is not within a sustainable location but it is within the residential neighbourhood.

Vehicular Access and parking

There is existing on-site car parking provision at present linked to the existing development site. The existing vehicle crossover is from Kings Lane nearer to its junction with Kings Close. The applicant proposal appears to provide new parking and Vehicle Crossover as part of the two storey rear extension of the house holder application. Hence the proposal is to utilise the existing parking and vehicle crossover to the current application for the erection of 3 bedroom house.

Both VXOs are to be from Kings Lane. The parking layout such as for one car to be parked behind the other is not ideal, but the road is low traffic local residential road. In view of the above the highway authority does not wish to raise any objection.

Conclusion

The Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of

this needs to alter as little as possible and retain planting to the frontage. The drives should be of a high quality material perhaps a bound gravel. To reflect the character of the area. Planting including tree planting is welcome and should be covered by condition.

Recommendation We would not object to the proposals but would recommend that the design be reviewed and that if the alterations are considered acceptable that materials and in particular the landscaping are conditioned.

HCC - Dacorum Network Area	No Objection
<p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.</p> <p>Proposed amendments have no impact on the access and parking arrangement. The highways response is same as the previous response.</p>	

Appendix B

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

Objections

Address	Comments
<p>The Paddock, Kings Lane, Chipperfield</p>	<p>I'm concerned at the scale of the proposed development. The addition of such a large extension will significantly reduce the amount of light coming into our property, particularly our patio and conservatory area.</p> <p>The addition of an extra property adjacent to our own will hugely reduction our privacy.</p> <p>Also given the property is a semi detached building its vital that aesthetically the look of this development matches the existing style remaining in keeping with the semi detached side of the property that is not being developed. I'm concerned the symmetry of the existing property will be lost and the building will end up looking an eye sore. The plans seems to indicate the development isn't going to match the remaining property not under development. This is going to look unattractive and incongruous with the rest of the Nunfield housing estate.</p>
<p>Simon Levy Associates, Link House, 49 Theobald Street, Borehamwood (on behalf of The Paddock)</p>	<p>My firm acts for Mr & Mrs Crabtree, the resident owners to The Paddock, Kings Lane Chipperfield Kings Lane WD4 9EW, situated adjacent to 2 Nunfield which forms the subject of the above described planning applications for the demolition of the existing detached garage and construction of a three-bed dwelling and substantial rear two storey extension</p> <p>1 OBSERVATIONS AND OBJECTION</p> <p>1.01 Firstly, it should be noted that there are several</p>

discrepancies contained within the application. For ease I list these as follows:

- My client's property is not correctly illustrated on the drawings appended to the application i.e. the applicant has omitted the side extension and rear conservatory. This maybe have been done to their advantage in order to achieve the statutory 45° sight line.
- The proposed plans have falsely illustrated the properties to be parallel, whilst in fact they are not. We feel the submitted drawings and therefore unacceptable in their current state and misleading.
- It is noted that the applicant has submitted two separate planning applications, however the drawings contained with the application 4/00419/18/FUL has incorporated the rear extension which is subject of approval under application 4/00421/18/FHA. This is a well-known planning tactic in order to confuse the local authority. The applications should be updated to reflect and illustrate the existing arrangement. Furthermore, it should be noted that my client only received notification concerning Planning Application 4/00421/18/FHA.
- The application refers to 'internal alterations.' From reviewing the drawings provided, the internal alterations are minor in nature, the content of which will not require planning permission. It is considered that this terminology has been used in order to deter the Local Authority leading them to believe that the application is not as extensive as it is.

1.02 Notwithstanding the potential structural adverse impact that may be caused by close excavations, insufficient information has been provided within the application as to the extent of excavation works and the type of foundations proposed and what steps shall be taken to protect the neighbouring property. This extremely important detail which needs to be confirmed prior to the application being considered since the type may have adverse effects on the surrounding land and properties.

1.03 The application does not include a Design and Access Statement, which we feel has an obstructing significance on the effectiveness of such an application. A Design and Access Statement illustrates, explains and justifies the form of the development, addressing both design and access and demonstrating how each informs the other. Absence of such document therefore raises the questions whether such procedure have been followed, considered and taken into account.

1.04 No construction traffic management plan has been provided. Concern is expressed regarding the usage of the single carriageway for the purpose of building material delivery and spoil excavation removal. The CTMP is a document integral to the granting of planning permission for

the traffic management protocol and without it the application is null and void and possible health and safety issue. Concern is further expressed in this regard since the road goes into one lane thereby the presents of large construction vehicles block the view of the road users.

1.05 We believe that both applications contradict numerous policies outlined in your Core Strategy 2006 - 2031 (Adopted 25th September 2013) in particularly CS6, CS10, CS11 and CS12. As example of this is Policy CS12 which explicitly states that the development should *'integrate with streetscape character.'* The proposed development does not reflect the characteristic of the surrounding area, particularly the older and well established residential street (Nunfield Leading to Havensfield) where traditional forms of 2 semi-detached frontages prevail. In this circumstance, the development will create a new terrace style frontage thus not in matching character or aesthetics of the existing street scene or surrounding area. By approving this development, the Local Authority will be making a precedent to alter the appearance of the original street design in other close by areas which cannot be retracted and will ultimately lead to the destruction of the distinctiveness attraction and go against superior ruling and Chipperfield Village Design Statement. It is surprising to learn how Chipperfield Parish Council have supported this application as it goes against their own guidelines.

1.06 Policy CS12 (g vii) states *'the development must respect adjoining properties in terms of materials.'* It is noted that the front elevation windows are not identical to those of the adjoining property. Furthermore, a new style front roof porch is proposed which is not corresponding with the neighbour. It is also noted that the rear extension shall be rendered, whilst the adjoining properties elevation brickwork is painted and not rendered. The development is therefore neither in keeping with the character and makeup of the subject/adjoining property and is in direct contradiction to your guidelines, in particular *Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011 adopted 21 April 2004* Appendix 3 – A3.1, A3.6 (iv) Appendix 7 - A7.2 i (a, c and d), ii (b, c), (v).

1.07 The application is in direct contravention of Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy (25th September 2013) which states *'respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between the buildings'*. One of the reasons my client bought their property was because it was detached and substantially set away from the neighbouring property. This development will reduce the space between the two properties and does not respect the local context and street pattern, in particular the scale and proportion of surrounding buildings and would be a detriment of the local environment.

1.08 Policy CS12 (c) of the Core Strategy (25th September 2013) states *'avoid the visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding*

properties. As a result of the scale of the proposed development and projection of the rear/side extension, it will inflict unnecessary shading and loss significant daylight to the rear of our clients' garden, patio area and conservatory which we feel will be overbearing and take away its use and current enjoyment of this space. Our client has the benefit of a glazed roof conservatory to allow natural light to enter following discomfort experienced in other properties with insufficient sunlight. They have enjoyed the natural light entering their property and by the proposed application being granted, it will be a severe detriment and take away this enjoyment away and lose their privacy. The Human Rights Act, Protocol 1, Article 1 states that a person has the right to peacefully enjoy all their possessions which includes a home and land. We believe the proposed development would have a dominating impact on my client right to quiet enjoyment. The dwellings should be suitably re-positioned away from the common boundary to ensure the windows in principal elevations are not overlooking the adjoining houses.

1.09 Both applications are overbearing and constitutes over development of the site. This will cause an unacceptable dominance to the detriment of our client's property. The current design is asymmetrical and provides a disproportionate construction bulk design which is substantively at odds with the vernacular and Chipperfield conservation area.

1.10 Whilst it is noted that the applicant's property does not fall in the conservation area, it is noted that it is located on the border and therefore should be considerate to its surrounding areas. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, defines a conservation area as areas of special architectural or historic interest. The subject property holds many unique qualities, the substances of which have not been incorporated in within the development. The proposal is a stock contemporary design which is out of character in comparison with other surrounding properties in the conservation area. Chipperfield is defined under the Core Strategy Document, adopted in 2013 as a Small Village. Policy CS6 states that *'Each development must be sympathetic to its surroundings, including the adjoining countryside, in terms of local character, design, scale, landscaping and visual impact; and retain and protect features essential to the character and appearance of the village'*. The proposed development contravenes this.

1.11 Neither the application, nor the proposed drawings provide any informative information on how the additional rainwater shall be drained from the additional proposed roof. Location of guttering, downpipes are underground drainage network has not been specified. We consider that due to the proximity of the surrounding properties and neighbouring fields, this matter should be provided within the planning application.

1.12 There a number of trees present at the property; however none have been noted on the application. It is possible that these trees have a high amenity value and are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. This should have been taken into account by the applicant and a tree survey undertaken.

1.13 It is considered that the approval of this substantial development may nurture further successive development which will put the character of the area at radial risk which may eventually result in cramped forms of development which will greatly reduce the outlook and landscape amenity currently afforded to the existing residents.

1.14 Part of the application is to introduce a new driveway to serve the new property. Whilst ultimately this may be perceived as being beneficial to the local residents, in due course it will be have an adverse impact on them due to an increased car usage and the lack of existing road parking. Furthermore, due to the location of the proposed development, a new cross over will be formed over the grass verge onto Kings Lane. Due to the presents of a mature tree and the fact that the road goes into a single lane around the bend, this will present an extremely dangerous setting for both pedestrian and road users.

1.15 It should be noted the applicant's property is situated in a quiet secluded village and therefore the opposition to this development may not be as vocal when compared to a more highly densely populated town such a Hemel Hempstead etc. This should be taken into account when considering this application.

2.00 SUMMARY

For the above described reasons, the Council are invited to reject the planning application.

I was contacted by Mrs Christine Brown. She is an elderly lady in her 90s living next door at No 4 Nunfield for 70 years plus. She has enjoyed uninterrupted pleasure of the rural aspect and panoramas both front and rear of her property. The proposed development falls within the Conservation area of this small village. The proposal is for a double storey rear extension and a ne 3 bed dwelling. This is a clear case of over development of the plot. The infilling ruins the street scene and blocks out light. It contravenes the contents of the Core Stategy Document, adopted in 2013 which defines Chipperfield as a Small Village. There is no requirement for

	<p>hugely reduction our privacy.</p> <p>Also given the property is a semi detached building its vital that aesthetically the look of this development matches the existing style remaining in keeping with the semi detached side of the property that is not being developed. I'm concerned the symmetry of the existing property will be lost and the building will end up looking an eye sore. The plans seems to indicate the development isn't going to match the remaining property not under development. This is going to look unattractive and incongruous with the rest of the Nunfield housing estate.</p>
<p>THE PADDOCK,KINGS LANE,CHIPPERFIELD,KINGS LANGLEY,WD4 9EP</p>	<p>My firm acts for Mr & Mrs Crabtree, the resident owners to The Paddock, Kings Lane Chipperfield Kings Lane WD4 9EW, situated adjacent to 2 Nunfield which forms the subject of the above described planning applications for the demolition of the existing detached garage and construction of a three-bed dwelling and substantial rear two storey extension</p> <p>1 OBSERVATIONS AND OBJECTION</p> <p>1.01 Firstly, it should be noted that there are several discrepancies contained within the application. For ease I list these as follows:</p> <p>My client's property is not correctly illustrated on the drawings appended to the application i.e. the applicant has omitted the side extension and rear conservatory. This maybe have been done to their advantage in order to achieve the statutory 45° sight line.</p> <p>The proposed plans have falsely illustrated the properties to be parallel, whilst in fact they are not. We feel the submitted drawings and therefore unacceptable in their current state and misleading.</p> <p>It is noted that the applicant has submitted two separate planning applications, however the drawings contained with the application 4/00419/18/FUL has incorporated the rear extension which is subject of approval under application 4/00421/18/FHA. This is a well-known planning tactic in order to confuse the local authority. The applications should be updated to reflect and illustrate the existing arrangement. Furthermore, it should be noted that my client only received notification concerning Planning Application 4/00421/18/FHA. The application refers to 'internal alterations.' From reviewing the drawings provided, the internal alterations are minor in nature, the content of which will not require planning permission. It is considered that this terminology has been used in order to deter the Local Authority leading them to believe that the application is not as extensive as it is.</p> <p>1.02 Notwithstanding the potential structural adverse impact that may be caused by close excavations, insufficient information has been provided within the application as to the extent of excavation works and the type of foundations proposed and what steps shall be taken to protect the</p>

neighbouring property. This extremely important detail which needs to be confirmed prior to the application being considered since the type may have adverse effects on the surrounding land and properties.

1.03 The application does not include a Design and Access Statement, which we feel has an obstructing significance on the effectiveness of such an application. A Design and Access Statement illustrates, explains and justifies the form of the development, addressing both design and access and demonstrating how each informs the other. Absence of such document therefore raises the questions whether such procedure have been followed, considered and taken into account.

1.04 No construction traffic management plan has been provided. Concern is expressed regarding the usage of the single carriageway for the purpose of building material delivery and spoil excavation removal. The CTMP is a document integral to the granting of planning permission for the traffic management protocol and without it the application is null and void and possible health and safety issue. Concern is further expressed in this regard since the road goes into one lane thereby the presents of large construction vehicles block the view of the road users.

1.05 We believe that both applications contradict numerous policies outlined in your Core Strategy 2006 - 2031 (Adopted 25th September 2013) in particularly CS6, CS10, CS11 and CS12. As example of this is Policy CS12 which explicitly states that the development should 'integrate with streetscape character.' The proposed development does not reflect the characteristic of the surrounding area, particularly the older and well established residential street (Nunfield Leading to Havensfield) where traditional forms of 2 semi-detached frontages prevail. In this circumstance, the development will create a new terrace style frontage thus not in matching character or aesthetics of the existing street scene or surrounding area. By approving this development, the Local Authority will be making a precedent to alter the appearance of the original street design in other close by areas which cannot be retracted and will ultimately lead to the destruction of the distinctiveness attraction and go against superior ruling and Chipperfield Village Design Statement. It is surprising to learn how Chipperfield Parish Council have supported this application as it goes against their own guidelines.

1.06 Policy CS12 (g vii) states 'the development must respect adjoining properties in terms of materials.' It is noted that the front elevation windows are not identical to those of the adjoining property. Furthermore, a new style front roof porch is proposed which is not corresponding with the neighbour. It is also noted that the rear extension shall be rendered, whilst the adjoining properties elevation brickwork is painted and not rendered. The development is therefore neither in keeping with the character and makeup of the

subject/adjoining property and is in direct contradiction to your guidelines, in particular Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011 adopted 21 April 2004 Appendix 3 – A3.1, A3.6 (iv) Appendix 7 - A7.2 i (a, c and d), ii (b, c), (v).

1.07 The application is in direct contravention of Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy (25th September 2013) which states 'respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between the buildings'. One of the reasons my client bought their property was because it was detached and substantially set away from the neighbouring property. This development will reduce the space between the two properties and does not respect the local context and street pattern, in particular the scale and proportion of surrounding buildings and would be a detriment of the local environment.

1.08 Policy CS12 (c) of the Core Strategy (25th September 2013) states 'avoid the visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties.' As a result of the scale of the proposed development and projection of the rear/side extension, it will inflict unnecessary shading and loss significant daylight to the rear of our clients' garden, patio area and conservatory which we feel will be overbearing and take away its use and current enjoyment of this space. Our client has the benefit of a glazed roof conservatory to allow natural light to enter following discomfort experienced in other properties with insufficient sunlight. They have enjoyed the natural light entering their property and by the proposed application being granted, it will be a severe detriment and take away this enjoyment away and lose their privacy. The Human Rights Act, Protocol 1, Article 1 states that a person has the right to peacefully enjoy all their possessions which includes a home and land. We believe the proposed development would have a dominating impact on my client right to quiet enjoyment. The dwellings should be suitably re-positioned away from the common boundary to ensure the windows in principal elevations are not overlooking the adjoining houses.

1.09 Both applications are overbearing and constitutes over development of the site. This will cause an unacceptable dominance to the detriment of our client's property. The current design is asymmetrical and provides a disproportionate construction bulk design which is substantively at odds with the vernacular and Chipperfield conservation area.

1.10 Whilst it is noted that the applicant's property does not fall in the conservation area, it is noted that it is located on the border and therefore should be considerate to its surrounding areas. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, defines a conservation area as areas of special architectural or historic interest. The subject property holds many unique qualities, the substances of which have not been incorporated in within the development. The proposal is

a stock contemporary design which is out of character in comparison with other surrounding properties in the conservation area. Chipperfield is defined under the Core Strategy Document, adopted in 2013 as a Small Village. Policy CS6 states that 'Each development must be sympathetic to its surroundings, including the adjoining countryside, in terms of local character, design, scale, landscaping and visual impact; and retain and protect features essential to the character and appearance of the village'. The proposed development contravenes this.

1.11 Neither the application, nor the proposed drawings provide any informative information on how the additional rainwater shall be drained from the additional proposed roof. Location of guttering, downpipes are underground drainage network has not been specified. We consider that due to the proximity of the surrounding properties and neighbouring fields, this matter should be provided within the planning application.

1.12 There a number of trees present at the property; however none have been noted on the application. It is possible that these trees have a high amenity value and are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. This should have been taken into account by the applicant and a tree survey undertaken.

1.13 It is considered that the approval of this substantial development may nurture further successive development which will put the character of the area at radial risk which may eventually result in cramped forms of development which will greatly reduce the outlook and landscape amenity currently afforded to the existing residents.

1.14 Part of the application is to introduce a new driveway to serve the new property. Whilst ultimately this may be perceived as being beneficial to the local residents, in due course it will be have an adverse impact on them due to an increased car usage and the lack of existing road parking. Furthermore, due to the location of the proposed development, a new cross over will be formed over the grass verge onto Kings Lane. Due to the presents of a mature tree and the fact that the road goes into a single lane around the bend, this will present an extremely dangerous setting for both pedestrian and road users.

1.15 It should be noted the applicant's property is situated in a quiet secluded village and therefore the opposition to this development may not be as vocal when compared to a more highly densely populated town such a Hemel Hempstead etc. This should be taken into account when considering this application.

2.00 SUMMARY

	For the above described reasons, the Council are invited to reject the planning application.
REDDINGS,CROFT LANE,CHIPPERFIELD,KINGS LANGLEY,WD4 9DU	I was contacted by Mrs Christine Brown. She is an elderly lady in her 90s living next door at No 4 Nunfield for 70 years plus. She has enjoyed uninterrupted pleasure of the rural aspect and panoramas both front and rear of her property. The proposed development falls within the Conservation area of this small village. The proposal is for a double storey rear extension and a ne 3 bed dwelling. This is a clear case of over development of the plot. The infilling ruins the street scene and blocks out light. It contravenes the contents of the Core Strategy Document, adopted in 2013 which defines Chipperfield as a Small Village. There is no requirement for new dwellings or infilling, other than Social Housing. Furthermore the Application shows a new crossover across an established grass verge in a sensitive area of the village. Mrs Brown believes that the Council considers carefully the impact of this Application on her and the surrounding environment.
PARK SLOPE,6 KINGS CLOSE,CHIPPERFIELD,KINGS LANGLEY,WD4 9ES	As a resident in Kings close, I am extremely concerned with this planning application. It would change the look and feel of this sensitive area close to the heart of our beautiful village and really screams over-development for private profit. We do have significant parking issues in Nunfield and at the top end of Kings close and whether this is taken into consideration or not, as a resident it is of significant concern. Visually it would change this tranquil pocket of Chipperfield and could open the floodgates for over-development in this conservation area. It is unnecessary development as it is not social housing and there has been plenty of private homes built with many more due to begin this year in the area behind Simmons nursery. I really strongly feel this would have an overall detrimental effect on the environment and the local area.

Supporting

Address	Comments
The Old Cottage, Kings Lane, Chipperfield	Whilst I appreciate this is a sensitive area of discussion and consideration, I have observed a lack of affordable housing in the village. In just the last year, several families with children at the local school have had to move out of the village. This is problematic for them as it could prevent their younger children obtaining placements at the school in the future
Kingsmead, Kings Lane, Chipperfield	As a resident of Kings Lane, I write in connection to this planning application and wish to offer my support to the proposal, for the reasons outlined below. In my opinion high quality small -scale infill proposals, similar to this proposal, would meet the need for new housing in Chipperfield avoiding the need for many new 'estate' developments. This could avoid the village losing its commercial amenities, which add to the character and

	<p>sustainability of the village.</p> <p>The site for this development has clearly been well chosen. It is nearby to Chipperfields' local services, such as shops, the school, the pub and the village hall.</p> <p>This small-scale development could welcome a first time buyer and/or new family to the area. Recently, St Paul's Primary school (Chipperfield) sought a local consultation to close their Nursery Year class due to being undersubscribed. The village needs new families (in new family homes) to support the local community and its services.</p>
THE VILLAGE HALL, THE COMMON, CHIPPERFIELD, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 9BS	CPC supports this application, subject to DBC case officer being completely satisfied that the 45 deg rule will be correctly applied.
THE OLD COTTAGE, KINGS LANE, CHIPPERFIELD, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 9EN	Whilst I appreciate this is a sensitive area of discussion and consideration, I have observed a lack of affordable housing in the village. In just the last year, several families with children at the local school have had to move out of the village. This is problematic for them as it could prevent their younger children obtaining placements at the school in the future
KINGSMEAD, KINGS LANE, CHIPPERFIELD, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 9EN	<p>As a resident of Kings Lane, I write in connection to this planning application and wish to offer my support to the proposal, for the reasons outlined below.</p> <p>In my opinion high quality small -scale infill proposals, similar to this proposal, would meet the need for new housing in Chipperfield avoiding the need for many new 'estate' developments. This could avoid the village losing its commercial amenities, which add to the character and sustainability of the village.</p> <p>The site for this development has clearly been well chosen. It is nearby to Chipperfields' local services, such as shops, the school, the pub and the village hall.</p> <p>This small-scale development could welcome a first time buyer and/or new family to the area. Recently, St Paul's Primary school (Chipperfield) sought a local consultation to close their Nursery Year class due to being undersubscribed. The village needs new families (in new family homes) to support the local community and its services.</p>

Commenting

Address	Comments
---------	----------

