

4/01003/18/FUL	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING OUTBUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW DETACHED DWELLING.
Site Address	4 CHURCH STREET, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 5AD
Applicant	HEATHER BLACKWOOD, 4 CHURCH STREET
Case Officer	Sally Robbins
Referral to Committee	Called in by Councillor Fisher on the grounds of overdevelopment, shortage of parking in the area and harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**

2. Summary

2.1 The principle of residential development in this location is considered acceptable. The proposal comprises a modest two-bedroom infill dwelling that would sit comfortably within the application site. The design of the proposed dwelling is considered to be acceptable within the architecturally varied street scene. In addition, the proposed dwelling will not have a significant impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposed development therefore complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (2018), Policies CS1, CS4, CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS17 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policies 10, 18, 21, 58, 99 and 100 and Appendices 3 and 5 of the Local Plan (2004), and the Highfield (HCA20) Character Area Appraisal (2004).

3. Site Description

3.1 The application site is located on the northeast side of Church Street in the Old Town area of Hemel Hempstead. The site is situated to the rear of 4 Church Street, which comprises a two storey detached dwellinghouse, two detached outbuildings and a car port. The surrounding area is characterised predominantly by two storey terraced dwellinghouses along Church Street, semi-detached dwellinghouses on Chapel Street and relatively new residential development comprising houses and flats to the rear of the site on Honeypot Close. The character of the area is fairly mixed in terms of age of property, style of dwelling and material finish.

4. Proposal

4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing outbuildings and the construction of a detached two storey, two-bedroom dwelling and associated parking.

5. Relevant Planning History

5.1 None

6. Policies

6.1 National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

6.2 Adopted Core Strategy

NP1, CS1, CS4, CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS17

6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policies 10, 18, 21, 58, 99 and 100; Appendices 3 and 5

6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

- Area Based Policies (May 2004) - Residential Character Area HCA20: Highfield
- Accessibility Zones for the Application of car Parking Standards (July 2002)

7. Constraints

7.1 None

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

Main issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Policy and principle
- Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Impact on residential amenity
- Amenity space
- Impact on parking and highways safety
- Other

Policy and Principle

9.2 Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS1 states that Hemel Hempstead will be the focus for homes and Policy CS4 states that appropriate residential development within residential areas in the Towns and Large Villages is encouraged. Furthermore, within the Core Planning Principles outlined in the NPPF (2018) there is heavy emphasis on the planning system's responsibility to deliver more homes. Paragraph 59 of the NPPF stresses this further, seeking to boost the supply of housing and paragraph 118 promotes and supports the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would

help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively. Paragraph 68 of the NPPF states that decision makers should give great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes. Additionally, Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan (2004) also seeks to optimise the use of available land within urban areas.

9.3 Taking all of the above into account, the proposal is acceptable in principle and would make a small but valuable contribution to the Borough's existing housing stock (in accordance with Policy CS17). The development would be located in a sustainable location and would seek to optimise the use of urban land. The proposal is in accordance with policies CS1, CS4 and CS17 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan (2004) and the NPPF (2018).

Impact on Character and Appearance of Surrounding Area

9.4 Core Strategy Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 highlight the importance of high quality sustainable design in improving the character and quality of an area, seeking to ensure that developments are in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of scale, mass, height and appearance. This guidance is supported by Saved Local Plan Policies 10, 18, 21 and Appendix 3. Furthermore, paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that permission should be refused for developments of poor design that fail to take opportunity available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. The Highfield Character Area Appraisal (2004) states that infilling may be acceptable according to the Development Principles, which state that the design should respect the characteristics and architectural themes of nearby and surrounding development. It also states that all types of dwelling are acceptable.

9.5 The surrounding area is predominantly characterised by terraced two storey dwellinghouses with examples of development from a variety of eras. To the rear of the application site is the relatively newly built residential development of Honey Pot Close, part of the Behive Public House re-development, which comprises a mixture of houses and flats. Towards the south of the application site are a row of Victorian terraced properties (89-95 Chapel Street). Many of the plot sizes within the immediate vicinity are modest with rear garden depths ranging from 6m (97 and 99 Chapel Street) to 14m (89 and 91 Chapel Street).

9.6 The proposed dwelling would be situated to the rear of 4 Church Street in what is currently the rear garden. The dwelling would utilise an existing private access road off Church Street that leads to a communal parking area. The plot would be sub-divided to provide a 13m deep garden to 4 Church Street and a wrap-around garden for the proposed dwelling measuring 16.5m wide and 4.2-11.5m deep.

9.7 The dwelling would measure 8m deep and 9m wide with an eaves height of 4m and a maximum ridge height of 6.8m. The main roof would feature a traditional gable end, whilst the secondary lower roof structure would be half hipped and would comprise a small crowned section. At first floor level windows would be concentrated on the front and rear elevations and would include half dormer windows. Hanging tile detailing is

proposed within the gable end structures of the roof, dormer windows and front porch. Further articulation is proposed around the ground floor windows and doors, including flat brick arches. The dwelling would be finished in red facing bricks, slate roof tiles and timber framed windows and doors. The architectural detailing and window fenestrations of the proposed unit would remain congruous with the surrounding area. Two car parking spaces are proposed to the front of the dwelling, with the remainder of the site to provide private amenity space. Two new car parking spaces would also be provided to the rear of 4 Church Street.

9.8 It is considered that the layout and architectural style and built form of the proposed dwelling would not result in a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore complies with Policies 10, 18, 21 and Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), the NPPF (2018) and Nash Mills Character Area Appraisal (2004).

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.9 The NPPF outlines the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy, seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact upon the neighbouring properties and their amenity space. Thus, proposals should be designed to reduce any impact on neighbouring properties by way of visual intrusion, loss of light or privacy.

9.10 The proposed dwelling would be situated 14.3m from the main rear wall of 4 Church Street. There are no first floor windows proposed on the west side elevation of the proposed dwelling and as such there will be no significant impact in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy in relation to 4 Church Street. There is an increase in levels of approximately 1.8m from 4 Church Street towards the proposed dwelling. However, it is considered that the separation distance is significant enough that there will not be any significant loss of daylight. Furthermore, the orientation of the site is such that the proposal would be situated to the northeast of 4 Church Street and will therefore have limited impact in terms of sunlight.

9.11 Turning to the properties to the rear of the proposed dwelling (89-95 Chapel Street) the separation distance would be 18m. There are first floor windows proposed on the rear elevation of the proposed dwelling, however the windows would serve bathrooms, which are not considered to be habitable rooms. In accordance with the submitted plans the first floor windows on the rear elevation would be obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7m above floor level. As such, it is not considered that there would be a significant impact in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy in relation to 89-95 Chapel Street. Should planning permission be granted, a condition would be imposed to retain the first floor rear facing windows as obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7m above floor level. There is an increase in levels of approximately 1.7m from the rear of 89-95 Chapel Street to the proposed dwelling. The separation distance of 18m, added to the fact that the proposed dwelling is situated to the north of 89-95 Chapel Street, is

considered sufficient enough that there will not be any significant loss of sunlight or daylight.

9.12 Concerns were raised by the residents of 89 Chapel Street that the proposed dwelling would have an overbearing impact. The plans were subsequently amended to reduce the overall height of the proposed dwelling by 1.1m and a small crown roof was incorporated into the design. The resulting crown roof would be situated at the same height of the main roof of 89 Chapel Street. Taking the amendments into account, as well as the separation distance of 18m, it is considered that the proposal will not have a significant overbearing impact on the residents of 89, 91 and 93 Chapel Street.

9.13 The side elevation of the proposed dwelling would be situated 15m from the rear elevation of 1 and 2 Honeypot Close. There are no first floor windows proposed on the side elevation other than two small roof lights that would serve a study, which is not considered to be a habitable room. As such it is not considered that there would be a significant impact in terms of loss of privacy or overlooking in relation to 1 and 2 Honeypot Close.

9.14 Concerns have been raised by the residents of 3 Honeypot Close in relation to loss of light, privacy and being visually overbearing. 3 Honeypot Close comprises a terrace area with a 2m high privacy screen running halfway along the southwest elevation. The proposed dwelling would be visible from the terrace, however at an oblique angle. Furthermore, taking into account the fall in levels from 3 Honeypot Close towards the application site it is not considered that the dwelling would be visually overbearing or result in a significant loss of light. No first floor windows are proposed on the side elevation of the application dwelling and as such there will be no significant loss of privacy.

9.15 Taking all of the above into account, it is considered that the proposed development will not detrimentally impact the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, or future occupiers, thus is considered acceptable in terms of the NPPF (2018), Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Amenity Space

9.16 Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan states that private gardens should normally be positioned to the rear of dwellings and have an average minimum depth of 11.5 m. However, a reduced rear garden depth may be acceptable for small starter homes. Saved Appendix 3 does allow some flexibility for infill developments where garden depths are below 11.5m but of equal depth to adjoining properties. Generally, all gardens should be of a width, shape and size to ensure the space is functional and compatible with the surrounding area.

9.17 In terms of the garden being functional, the proposed dwelling would have an L

shaped south and east facing garden that wraps around the property, with an area measuring 101 sqm. This is considered to be a functional layout and area, which is compatible in size with surrounding properties. For example, the garden area for 2 Honeyplot Close is 52 sqm, for 1 Honeyplot Close is 51 sqm, 87a Chapel Street is 70 sqm, 87b Chapel Street is 83 sqm and 87c Chapel Street is 119 sqm.

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.18 Saved Policies 99 and 100 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seek to ensure that retained trees are protected during development and that new planting is a suitable replacement for any removed trees.

9.19 There is established vegetation on the site, including a mature Cypress hedge along the boundary and trees and bushes within the site. No part of the application site or individual trees within are covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The proposal includes the removal of the mature hedge and a mature tree within the site. The Trees and Woodlands Officer was consulted on the proposal and advised that no trees of significant landscape value or amenity will be detrimentally affected by the development and raised no objection to the application being approved in full.

9.20 The proposed scheme has the potential to provide soft and hard landscaping on site, as well as appropriate screening. Should planning permission be granted a condition would be recommended requesting details of hard surfacing materials, proposed boundary treatment and screening and other soft landscaping details.

9.21 The proposal is considered to accord with Saved Policies 99 and 100 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Impact on Parking & Highway Safety

9.22 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF (2018) states that when setting local parking standards authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport; local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles. Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policies 57, 58 and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004) promote an assessment based upon maximum parking standards.

9.23 The existing dwelling (4 Church Street) comprises three bedrooms, the requirement for which is 2.25 spaces in accordance with Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan. The proposed dwelling would have two bedrooms, which would require 1.5 spaces. The development would provide two car parking spaces each for the existing dwelling and the proposed dwelling (a total of 4 spaces), which meets the requirements set out in Saved Appendix 5. In addition, the application site is considered to be in an accessible location, situated close to the town centre of Hemel Hempstead and in close proximity to local public transport routes. As such, it is not considered that the proposed development would have a negative impact on local parking provision.

9.24 In terms of highways safety, the Highways Authority were consulted and raised no objection to the proposal. Although the application form states that new or altered pedestrian or vehicular accesses from the public highway are proposed, drawing no 7286/01E indicates that the new accesses and parking will be accessed via a private driveway off Church Street. Therefore, no new or altered vehicular or pedestrian access is proposed on the public highway.

9.25 The proposed development will not result in a detrimental impact on local parking provision, nor will it have a severe impact to the safety and operation of the adjacent highway. Thus, the proposal meets the requirements of Policy CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004).

Response to Neighbour comments

9.26 These points have been addressed above other than concerns regarding loss of parking in the adjacent car park. The proposal includes the provision of four car parking spaces wholly within the application site. No changes are proposed to the adjacent car park. Residents raised concerns that they will no longer be able to park on the private driveway outside the application site, however this area is not a designated parking area and as such it is not considered that the application could be refused on these grounds.

CIL

9.27 Policy CS35 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 the 1st July 2015. This application is CIL Liable.

10. Conclusions

10.1 The proposed dwelling through design, scale and material finishes will not adversely impact upon the visual amenity of the immediate street scene or the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendixes 3 and 5 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS4, CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS17 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2018).

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

Conditions/Reasons for condition

No	Condition
1	The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. 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.
2	No development shall take place, other than groundworks and demolition, until

	<p>details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to 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 Core Strategy (2013) policy CS12.</p>
3	<p>No development, other than groundworks and demolition, shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include:</p> <p>a) Hard surfacing materials b) Means of enclosure c) Boundary treatment d) Soft landscape works which shall include planting plans, written specifications and schedules of plants trees to be retained and measures for their protection during construction works e) Proposed finished levels or contours f) Car parking layouts and other vehicle and pedestrian access areas g) Refuse storage.</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.</p>
4	<p>The windows at first floor level on the rear (southeast) elevation on drawing ref. 7286/02H of the dwelling hereby permitted shall be non-opening below 1.7m above floor level and shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the amenity of adjoining residents, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS12.</p>
5	<p>Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within the following classes of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written approval of the local planning authority:</p> <p>Schedule 2 Part 1 Classes A, B and C</p> <p>Reason: To enable the local planning authority to retain control over the development in the interests of safeguarding the residential amenity of the surrounding dwellings, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS12.</p>
6	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:</p> <p>7286/01F</p>

	<p>7286/02H</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS12.</p> <p>Article 35</p> <p>Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.</p> <p>INFORMATIVES</p> <p>1. 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: http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/ or by telephoning 0300 1234047.</p> <p>2. 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 http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/ or by telephoning 0300 1234047.</p>
--	--

Appendix A

Consultation responses

1. Strategic Planning & Regeneration:

We do not wish to comment on this application.

2. Thames Water:

Waste Comments:

Thames Water would advise that with regard to waste water network and waste water process infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't reduce capacity, limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

Water Comments:

With regard to water supply, this comes within the area covered by the Affinity Water Company. For your information the address to write to is - Affinity Water Company The Hub, Tamblin Way, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EZ - Tel - 0845 782 3333.

3. Highway Authority:

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.

Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority considers that the proposal would not have an increased impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways and does not object to the development, subject to the informative notes below

INFORMATIVES

1. 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:

<http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

2. 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

<http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

COMMENTS

This proposal is for Demolition of existing outbuildings and construction of a new detached dwelling

PARKING

Four new on-site parking spaces will be provided

ACCESS

Although in section 6 of the application form the applicant has stated that new or altered pedestrian or vehicular accesses from the public highway are proposed, drawing no 7286/01D indicates that the new accesses and parking will be accesses via a private driveway off Church Street. Therefore, no new or altered vehicular or pedestrian access is proposed and no works are required in the highway.

CONCLUSION

The proposals are considered acceptable to the Highways Authority subject to the informative notes above.

4. Conservation & Design:

On the new development, depending on distance and overlooking, the site would appear to be able to accommodate a new dwelling; however, the proposed house appears very cramped on the site. It is also not made clear on the location plan, but it would appear that most of the robust, pleasantly curving cypress hedging, extending up from the historic brick wall to No 4 and incorporating a discrete arched opening to allow vehicular access, will be lost to car parking (both to No 4 and the new dwelling) and to allow views out from the new house. Although the current plan shows two parking spaces for each house, the impact would be even greater if double garages were proposed here in the future.

The design of the proposed house is poor, with little relieving detail apart from slate-hanging to the two half dormers and bracketed porch canopy, and a chimney with offsets. The half-hipped main roof contrasts to the predominantly gabled roof form of the houses in Church Street, while the front gable could be better articulated; the extended lean-to roof to the side is clumsy.

However, it may be that a more sympathetic scheme could be devised. Addressing the fact that this is a backland development to a traditional terraced street, then either a building with a more Victorian 'industrial' feel, or alternatively a more contemporary design, would be appropriate in this location.

5. Trees & Woodlands:

According to the information submitted no trees of significant landscape value or amenity will be detrimentally affected by the development. Subsequently I have no objections to the application being approved in full.

6. Waste Management (Refuse Collection):

There should be storage space for 3 x 240ltr wheeled bins and a kerbside caddy and a

similar space to present them outside their boundary on collection day.

Appendix B

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

Objections

6 Church Street:

We live next to this property, with a car park entrance between us. The only access to the proposed building will be via this car parking area which is busy enough and noisy without a house being built. We are concerned about the extra traffic and where the owners would park as even one more car trying to park would cause problems. The buildings being demolished include a driveway to the current property where there are often two or more cars parked...where will they go? Previous owners of this house had problems when the now Beehive development went ahead, and we think this will only cause major problems, especially with access not only for cars but for deliveries too. Church Street is a very narrow road which at certain times is very busy and extra traffic isn't really needed.

Further comments:

Following your second letter regarding the above, I still have major concerns over this application. The access to the proposed build is a very narrow entrance to a council car parking area which is in constant use. There will be nowhere to store building materials except by using this car park, meaning less spaces for an already overused area. Large delivery vehicles will not be able to access the site for deliveries causing havoc on a narrow road used as a cut through and a mini racetrack. I have lived in this area for most of my life and there has never been a residential property in this space. I would like to know how bulky building materials would be stored and whether the surface of the car park, already quite bad, will be resurfaced after the many extra vehicles using it. I am not trying to create problems but the problems are there and need sorting out before any build is begun.

2 Honeypot Close:

Based on the information we currently have I am objecting as it will be far too close to my garden, we will be completely overlooked, it will block out all our light and therefore impact the value of our property.

87C Chapel Street:

According to these plans, the proposed 2 story house will be crammed into an already busy area of houses. This is too close to the rear of our back garden and will be at an elevated height overlooking our property. It will also block any view of the trees in the background and replace it with a brick wall. The parking on Church Street and Chapel Street is limited already. The proposed property will have a knock on affect to this. A big reason why we bought our property was for its privacy and natural views from the back garden which will disappear if this plan goes ahead.

1 Honeypot Close:

We live at 1 Honeypot Close and share a boundary with 4 Church Street at the rear of our Garden. Having given detailed consideration to the proposal and the all plans we feel that the Development should not be permitted. The development would have severe adverse impacts upon our property, including a severe reduction in light levels and an unacceptable loss of privacy. In addition, we feel the proposed development is overbearing, too large for the plot and would lead to overdevelopment of the area and a decrease in the amenity of the neighbourhood. The proposed development is much larger than the outbuilding which currently stands on the plot. (See photograph 1 which shows in the background behind our shed the one story outbuilding currently on the plot) It will be significantly taller and wider which, given its proximity to the mutual boundary (which is delineated currently by the wall of the existing outbuilding) would lead to a general loss of light and serious overshadowing to our property, particularly throughout the afternoon. (Photograph 2 - taken from our back bedroom window - shows light levels in the Garden taken at around 6pm - as you can see the sun will be completely obscured if a structure any taller than the current outbuilding is built on the plot.) In particular, our living room faces out onto the application site and the proposed development would lead to a significant deficit in the natural light the room currently enjoys. This is the most used room in our house and we cannot overstate the negative impact that the proposed development would have on our enjoyment of the property. In addition, the proposed development is very close to the end of our garden and would result in an almost complete block of sunshine in that area - which we feel is unacceptable. (Photograph 3 is a view from our back bedroom window which faces onto the site - on the far right you can see the end of our terrace and the height of the roofline. The proposed new development would be a similar height and you can get a real sense from this photo of how enclosed our property would become if the outbuilding (again visible behind our shed) is replaced by a building of the proposed proportions. The overall intrusiveness of the development were it to go ahead, both on our property and other houses in the immediate vicinity should be clearly apparent.) In our view, the proposed development is over-bearing, out of scale with surrounding properties, far too large for the plot, and far too close to the surrounding properties as a result. (Photograph 4 is taken from our living room through the patio doors and shows how short our garden is and just how close to our house the proposed development would be). I note from the plans that it is not intended that there will be any windows on the side of the development facing our property. Whilst this is welcome, the proximity of the proposed development to our boundary would nevertheless result in a direct loss of privacy due to the short distances involved. As mentioned above, photograph 2 is taken from the window in our back bedroom. As you will see, this room faces out onto the proposed development. Currently this room enjoys good levels of sunlight and far reaching views across the old town. Whilst we acknowledge we have no right to a view, we consider that the proposed development would adversely affect the residential amenity of our property and that of other neighbouring owners to the extent that this should be taken into account when considering permission. In addition, this area is already densely populated. We consider that an additional house, such as the one proposed, would constitute over development, have a negative impact on the character of the neighbourhood and generally affect the open aspect of the neighbourhood currently enjoyed. Finally, we consider that the proposed development is not in line with the National Planning Framework as it constitutes 'garden grabbing'. Taking all of the above into account we feel that the application for planning permission should be denied.

3 Honeypot Close:

I strongly object to this as it will be very close to my terrace and therefore block a lot of light out, and being that close could be very invasive into my property. We bought our property for the views which consequently will be restricted if this planning permission goes forth.

Further comments:

Following the revised plans, which do not appear to have been changed at all, I strongly object. My balcony directly overlooks the garden where the planned building is to take place and I did not buy my property under the impression further buildings would be built in the area, especially that close to me. I believe the planned building would impact my property and its value.

93 Chapel Street:

After looking at proposed plans, we are very concerned about the height & size of the proposed building. This site is elevated and considerably higher than our property in Chapel street, although the upper windows in proposed property are frosted, because of the elevation the downstairs doors & windows will be overlooking at least five properties in chapel street, we also will be overlooking the proposed living room/dining space from our upstairs windows. This proposed building is far too big for the site, & having lived in chapel street for 21 years this proposed building will have a real impact on our every day living & general well being.

Further comments:

I have looked at updated plans for number 4 Church street . the previous issues regarding our objection still remain. The change in property type application ,although smaller in bedroom size & foot print is slightly smaller this still gives us the same issues. The rear elevation because of the difference in height between our property (Chapel street) & proposed new property in Church street will still be a impact on our privacy, we will still be able to look into ground floor windows & visa versa. Proposed new house will overlook properties on three sides with the exception of the side elevation which has no windows is the side that faces the applicants house, number 4 Church street.

11 Church Street:

Dear Sally, we live at 11 Church Street, a road of old Victorian houses built before cars were around. The street being so narrow, parking of residents cars is restricted to only one side of the street. Most houses have two or more cars and often have to park in the car park or neighbouring streets. The car park from which the proposed dwelling will be accessed will mean the loss of at least two car parking spaces within the car park. Number 4 has 'unrestricted' right of way to cross the car park but this proposal will effectively mean a loss to the car park itself which is a restriction to other residents. This is over-development in an already crowded area.

Further comments:

Church St is a road of old Victorian houses built before cars were around. The street being so narrow, parking of residents cars is restricted to only one side of the street.

Most houses have two or more cars and often have to park in the car park or neighbouring streets. The car park from which the proposed dwelling will be accessed will mean the loss of at least two car parking spaces within the car park. Number 4 has 'unrestricted' right of way to cross the car park but this proposal will effectively mean a loss to the car park itself which is a restriction to other residents despite the plans reading 'Existing Parking Court Unaltered' this is not the case as vehicle access to No4 will effectively take up two residents places. Currently residents from Chapel St also park in Church St and on amenity land in Chapel St. This second proposal is only slightly smaller and one bedroom less but a 'study' added. This is over-development in an already crowded area.

91 Chapel Street:

I strongly object to this Planning Proposal. It will cause overdevelopment to a very small site which will impact on all the properties around it and create a huge visual intrusion. It is exceptionally close to my home and because of the elevation of the land rising from my house up towards the site, the new property will overlook my garden and house, causing loss of light and privacy. In this elevated position the windows on the ground floor will look directly into the windows of my dining room, bedroom and bathroom. To illustrate this I have attached photographs showing our existing view of the site and drawings (to scale) which show the dominance it will have over my home at 91 Chapel Street and to my neighbours in 89 and 93 Chapel Street. The redevelopment of the Beehive site has already caused a severe impact on this neighbourhood by its scale and it is ironic that the previous owner of 4 Church Street took his objection of overlooking to Planning Appeal level. Another concern is that the proposal is for a three double bedroomed property, which could mean six extra vehicles accessing this site. Residents of both Chapel Street and Church Street are already having to cope with the additional parking created from the homes at the top of Chapel Street (part of the Beehive development). One of the main reasons I was attracted to my garden when I first bought the property was the feeling of openness and light. This will be destroyed by this development.

Further comments:

I again strongly object to this Planning Proposal. The amended plans show a building that is still overbearing, out of scale in its location and a clear example of 'garden grabbing' which will increase the density and overdevelopment of this small site. It is still exceptionally close to my home and because of the elevation of the land rising from my house to the new property it will overlook my garden and house, causing loss of light and destroying my privacy. I note in the new proposal that the patio doors have been moved to the east elevation, but that the windows on the rear elevation remain at the same height and will therefore still overlook my garden and house. To illustrate this, I again attach photographs showing our existing view of the site and drawings (to scale) which show the dominance that this ugly building will have over my home and my neighbours. The concern about the parking remains, as for the original proposal, as it would mean potentially 4 extra vehicles.

87B Chapel Street:

We strongly object. This will be a gross over-development of the land. It will be built on an incline so our back garden and the back of our house will be totally overlooked, not only by the upstairs windows but also by the downstairs patio door and windows. This

will affect our privacy and have an impact on our every day life. The overall size and the sheer height of the proposed development is massively larger than the existing outbuildings and will cause a drastic loss of light.

The approach road to the property is merely a one lane entrance to a car park which is always over crowded with cars and is very busy with traffic going in and out. The parking in Church Street and Chapel Street is a major problem now without a three bedroom house being built with potentially more cars. Noise and disturbance will be an issue. Trees and hedging will be lost having a negative impact on wildlife which will not be compensated by a few bird boxes. This will be detrimental to the whole area.

Further comments:

After viewing the amended plans we still strongly object. It is clear that the design has not massively changed. This means that the new property will still be an over development of the land. The development is much too big for the small garden is it planned for. The new design is still much larger than the current buildings on the plot. All properties around will still be overlooked due to the elevation and light will be blocked. There will still be a major issue with parking as this is a built up area and parking is at a premium. This new design will still be detrimental to the area and the neighbouring properties as stated before.

6A Church Street:

We write to submit our objections to the proposed development at 4 Church Street - reference 4/101003/18/FUL. After consideration to the proposed development we consider this will have a detrimental effect to the adjacent and nearby dwellings. Due to the elevated situation of the proposed development the front facing upper floor windows will be in clear unobstructed view of the rear of 6, 6a,8,8a Church street, where at present none of the dwellings are overlooked, this was also a consideration of the development at Honeypot Close prior permission being granted (Ref: 4/00187/11/MFA). In addition, parking is very limited for the residence of both Church Street and Chapel Street with a high number of residence now having to park some distance from their homes at the rear of 6,6a,8,8a Church Street. I note from the plans that the existing facility to parking four vehicles will remain, however two parking spaces will be relocated for use by 4 Church Street, these new relocated parking spaces will be positioned adjacent to spaces where residents are now able to parallel park. The proposal does not allow for this existing parking, the two relocated parking spaces at 4 church street would need to use the whole width of the road to be able to manoeuvre in and out of their spaces, thus actually reducing the parking at the rear of 6, 6a,8, 8a Church Street and for the residence of Church Street by at least 2 spaces. After taking all of the above into account we feel that the application for planning permission should be denied

4 Honeypot Close:

We write to submit our objections to the proposed development at 4 Church Street - reference 4/101003/18/FUL. We live at 4 Honeypot Close. We feel that the Development should not be permitted. The development would have severe adverse impacts upon our property, including a severe reduction in light levels in our kitchen (that already has a limited access to natural light) and an unacceptable loss of privacy we currently enjoy in our garden. In addition, we feel the proposed development is overbearing, too large for the plot and would lead to over-development of the area and a decrease in the amenity of the neighbourhood. The proposed development is much larger than the

outbuilding which currently stands on the plot. We consider that the proposed development is not in line with the National Planning Framework as it constitutes 'garden grabbing'.

89 Chapel Street:

The plans show a house that is overly large for the site area, resulting in very small garden area. The site is at a higher level than the houses in Chapel Street, although the survey drawing does not show the existing levels of the adjacent properties, nor does the proposed layout show the intended levels. The proposed plans are therefore inadequate in that they do not show the true relationship with existing houses. They do not show that the proposal will not have a detrimental effect on 89 and other adjacent houses. There is only some 4m distance from the rear elevation to the southern boundary that abuts 89 Chapel Street (and 87C - 95). This will result in the building being overbearing and result in a loss of outlook. The plans show a large patio door immediately behind no 89. Because the site is at higher level than the houses in Chapel Street the door will be above fence level and this will result in overlooking and loss of privacy. You are invited to view the proposal from 89 Chapel Street, please contact me if you wish to arrange access.

Further comments:

I have viewed the amended plans and note that they still do not show proposed site levels. The revised plans do not make any material change to the impact on 89 Chapel Street and therefore my previous objections still stand. Again I would ask that the case officer makes an appointment to view the proposal from my property.

8A Church Street:

The new proposals show a slight reduction in the size of the proposed building, it does not remove any of the concerns raised by the objectors from the initial proposal. Therefore all the previous objections should still be considered as valid in respect of the amended plans. Parking and over development being my main concerns for this application

7 Honeypot Close:

Object to the proposed plans of erecting a property.

11 CHURCH STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AD	Dear Sally, we live at 11 Church Street, a road of old Victorian houses built before cars were around. The street being so narrow, parking of residents cars is restricted to only one side of the street. Most houses have two or more cars and often have to park in the car park or neighbouring streets. The car park from which the proposed dwelling will be accessed will mean the loss of at least two car parking spaces within the car park. Number 4 has 'unrestricted' right of way to cross the car park but this proposal will effectively mean a loss to the car park itself which is a restriction to other residents. This is over-development in an already crowded area.
--	---

<p>11 CHURCH STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AD</p>	<p>Church St is a road of old Victorian houses built before cars were around. The street being so narrow, parking of residents cars is restricted to only one side of the street. Most houses have two or more cars and often have to park in the car park or neighbouring streets. The car park from which the proposed dwelling will be accessed will mean the loss of at least two car parking spaces within the car park. Number 4 has 'unrestricted' right of way to cross the car park but this proposal will effectively mean a loss to the car park itself which is a restriction to other residents despite the plans reading 'Existing Parking Court Unaltered' this is not the case as vehicle access to No4 will effectively take up two residents places. Currently residents from Chapel St also park in Church St and on amenity land in Chapel St. This second proposal is only slightly smaller and one bedroom less but a 'study' added. This is over-development in an already crowded area.</p>
<p>6 CHURCH STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AD</p>	<p>We live next to this property, with a car park entrance between us. The only access to the proposed building will be via this car parking area which is busy enough and noisy without a house being built. We are concerned about the extra traffic and where the owners would park as even one more car trying to park would cause problems. The buildings being demolished include a driveway to the current property where there are often two or more cars parked...where will they go? Previous owners of this house had problems when the now Beehive development went ahead, and we think this will only cause major problems, especially with access not only for cars but for deliveries too. Church Street is a very narrow road which at certain times is very busy and extra traffic isn't really needed.</p>
<p>6 CHURCH STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AD</p>	<p>Following your second letter regarding the above, I still have major concerns over this application. The access to the proposed build is a very narrow entrance to a council car parking area which is in constant use. There will be nowhere to store building materials except by using this car park, meaning less spaces for an already overused area. Large delivery vehicles will not be able to access the site for deliveries causing havoc on a narrow road used as a cut through and a mini racetrack. I have lived in this area for most of my life and there has never been a residential property in this space. I would like to know how bulky building materials would be stored and whether the surface of the car park, already quite bad, will be resurfaced after the many extra vehicles using it. I am not trying to create problems but the problems are</p>

	there and need sorting out before any build is begun.
4 HONEYPOT CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5ZG	<p>We write to submit our objections to the proposed development at 4 Church Street - reference 4/101003/18/FUL.</p> <p>We live at 4 Honeypot Close.</p> <p>We feel that the Development should not be permitted. The development would have severe adverse impacts upon our property, including a severe reduction in light levels in our kitchen (that already has a limited access to natural light) and an unacceptable loss of privacy we currently enjoy in our garden.</p> <p>In addition, we feel the proposed development is overbearing, too large for the plot and would lead to over-development of the area and a decrease in the amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The proposed development is much larger than the outbuilding which currently stands on the plot.</p> <p>We consider that the proposed development is not in line with the National Planning Framework as it constitutes 'garden grabbing'.</p>
7 HONEYPOT CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5ZG	Object to the proposed plans of erecting a property.
1 HONEYPOT CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5ZG	<p>We live at 1 Honeypot Close and share a boundary with 4 Church Street at the rear of our Garden.</p> <p>Having given detailed consideration to the proposal and the all plans we feel that the Development should not be permitted. The development would have severe adverse impacts upon our property, including a severe reduction in light levels and an unacceptable loss of privacy. In addition, we feel the proposed development is overbearing, too large for the plot and would lead to overdevelopment of the area and a decrease in the amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The proposed development is much larger than the outbuilding which currently stands on the plot. (See photograph 1 which shows in the background behind our shed the one story outbuilding currently on the plot) It will be significantly taller and wider which, given its proximity to the mutual boundary (which is delineated currently by the wall of the existing outbuilding) would lead to a general loss of light and serious overshadowing to our property, particularly throughout the afternoon.</p> <p>(Photograph 2 - taken from our back bedroom window - shows light levels in the Garden taken at around 6pm - as you can see the sun will be completely obscured if a structure any taller than the current outbuilding is built on the plot.)</p> <p>In particular, our living room faces out onto the</p>

application site and the proposed development would lead to a significant deficit in the natural light the room currently enjoys. This is the most used room in our house and we cannot overstate the negative impact that the proposed development would have on our enjoyment of the property.

In addition, the proposed development is very close to the end of our garden and would result in an almost complete block of sunshine in that area - which we feel is unacceptable. (Photograph 3 is a view from our back bedroom window which faces onto the site - on the far right you can see the end of our terrace and the height of the roofline. The proposed new development would be a similar height and you can get a real sense from this photo of how enclosed our property would become if the outbuilding (again visible behind our shed) is replaced by a building of the proposed proportions. The overall intrusiveness of the development were it to go ahead, both on our property and other houses in the immediate vicinity should be clearly apparent.)

In our view, the proposed development is over-bearing, out of scale with surrounding properties, far too large for the plot, and far too close to the surrounding properties as a result. (Photograph 4 is taken from our living room through the patio doors and shows how short our garden is and just how close to our house the proposed development would be).

I note from the plans that it is not intended that there will be any windows on the side of the development facing our property. Whilst this is welcome, the proximity of the proposed development to our boundary would nevertheless result in a direct loss of privacy due to the short distances involved.

As mentioned above, photograph 2 is taken from the window in our back bedroom. As you will see, this room faces out onto the proposed development. Currently this room enjoys good levels of sunlight and far reaching views across the old town. Whilst we acknowledge we have no right to a view, we consider that the proposed development would adversely affect the residential amenity of our property and that of other neighbouring owners to the extent that this should be taken into account when considering permission.

In addition, this area is already densely populated. We consider that an additional house, such as the one proposed, would constitute over development, have a negative impact on the character of the neighbourhood and generally affect the open aspect of the neighbourhood currently enjoyed.

Finally, we consider that the proposed development is not in line with the National Planning Framework as it constitutes 'garden grabbing'.

	<p>Taking all of the above into account we feel that the application for planning permission should be denied.</p>
<p>1 HONEYPOT CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5ZG</p>	<p>Planning Objections - 4/101003/18/FUL We write to submit our objections to the proposed development at 4 Church Street - reference 4/101003/18/FUL.</p> <p>We live at 1 Honeypot Close and share a boundary with 4 Church Street at the rear of our Garden.</p> <p>Having given detailed consideration to the proposal and the all plans we feel that the Development should not be permitted. The development would have severe adverse impacts upon our property, including a severe reduction in light levels and an unacceptable loss of privacy. In addition, we feel the proposed development is overbearing, too large for the plot and would lead to overdevelopment of the area and a decrease in the amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The proposed development is much larger than the outbuilding which currently stands on the plot. (See photograph 1 which shows in the background behind our shed the one story outbuilding currently on the plot) It will be significantly taller and wider which, given its proximity to the mutual boundary (which is delineated currently by the wall of the existing outbuilding) would lead to a general loss of light and serious overshadowing to our property, particularly throughout the afternoon.</p> <p>(Photograph 2 - taken from our back bedroom window - shows light levels in the Garden taken at around 6pm - as you can see the sun will be completely obscured if a structure any taller than the current outbuilding is built on the plot.)</p> <p>In particular, our living room faces out onto the application site and the proposed development would lead to a significant deficit in the natural light the room currently enjoys. This is the most used room in our house and we cannot overstate the negative impact that the proposed development would have on our enjoyment of the property.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed development is very close to the end of our garden and would result in an almost complete block of sunshine in that area - which we feel is unacceptable. (Photograph 3 is a view from our back bedroom window which faces onto the site - on the far right you can see the end of our terrace and the height of the roofline. The proposed new development would be a similar height and you can get a real sense from this photo of how enclosed our property would become if the outbuilding (again visible behind our shed) is replaced by a building of the proposed proportions. The overall intrusiveness of the development were it to go ahead, both on our property and other houses in the immediate</p>

	<p>vicinity should be clearly apparent.)</p> <p>In our view, the proposed development is over-bearing, out of scale with surrounding properties, far too large for the plot, and far too close to the surrounding properties as a result. (Photograph 4 is taken from our living room through the patio doors and shows how short our garden is and just how close to our house the proposed development would be).</p> <p>I note from the plans that it is not intended that there will be any windows on the side of the development facing our property. Whilst this is welcome, the proximity of the proposed development to our boundary would nevertheless result in a direct loss of privacy due to the short distances involved.</p> <p>As mentioned above, photograph 2 is taken from the window in our back bedroom. As you will see, this room faces out onto the proposed development. Currently this room enjoys good levels of sunlight and far reaching views across the old town. Whilst we acknowledge we have no right to a view, we consider that the proposed development would adversely affect the residential amenity of our property and that of other neighbouring owners to the extent that this should be taken into account when considering permission.</p> <p>In addition, this area is already densely populated. We consider that an additional house, such as the one proposed, would constitute over development, have a negative impact on the character of the neighbourhood and generally affect the open aspect of the neighbourhood currently enjoyed.</p> <p>Finally, we consider that the proposed development is not in line with the National Planning Framework as it constitutes 'garden grabbing'.</p> <p>Taking all of the above into account we feel that the application for planning permission should be denied.</p>
<p>3 HONEYPOT CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5ZG</p>	<p>I strongly object to this as it will be very close to my terrace and therefore block a lot of light out, and being that close could be very invasive into my property. We bought our property for the views which consequently will be restricted if this planning permission goes forth.</p>
<p>3 HONEYPOT CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5ZG</p>	<p>I strongly object to this as it will be very close to my terrace and therefore block out a lot of light. Being that close would be very invasive into my property. We brought our property for the views which consequently will be restricted if this planning permission goes forth.</p>
<p>3 HONEYPOT CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5ZG</p>	<p>Following the revised plans, which do not appear to have been changed at all, I strongly object. My balcony directly overlooks the garden where the planned building is to take place and I did not buy my property under the impression further buildings would be built in the area, especially that close to me. I believe the planned building</p>

	would impact my property and it's value.
2 HONEYPOT CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5ZG	Based on the information we currently have I am objecting as it will be far to close to my garden, we will be completely overlooked, it will block out all our light and therefore impact the value of our property.
2 HONEYPOT CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5ZG	<p>Having checked the amended plans it really isn't clear that anything has actually changed.</p> <p>Are you able to detail what the actual changes are to 4 Church Street.</p> <p>Based on what we have viewed online I am still rejecting the application as per my previous rejection. It still appears to be a two storey building and therefore no changes have been made.</p>
89 CHAPEL STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AE	<p>The plans show a house that is overly large for the site area, resulting in very small garden area. The site is at a higher level than the houses in Chapel Street, although the survey drawing does not show the existing levels of the adjacent properties, nor does the proposed layout show the intended levels. The proposed plans are therefore inadequate in that they do not show the true relationship with existing houses. They do not show that the proposal will not have a detrimental effect on 89 and other adjacent houses.</p> <p>There is only some 4m distance from the rear elevation to the southern boundary that abuts 89 Chapel Street (and 87C - 95). This will result in the building being overbearing and result in a loss of outlook.</p> <p>The plans show a large patio door immediately behind no 89. Because the site is at higher level than the houses in Chapel Street the door will be above fence level and this will result in overlooking and loss of privacy.</p> <p>You are invited to view the proposal from 89 Chapel Street, please contact me if you wish to arrange access.</p>
89 CHAPEL STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AE	<p>I have viewed the amended plans and note that they still do not show proposed site levels.</p> <p>The revised plans do not make any material change to the impact on 89 Chapel Street and therefore my previous objections still stand.</p> <p>Again I would ask that the case officer makes an appointment to view he proposal from my property.</p>
87C CHAPEL STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AE	According to these plans, the proposed 2 story house will be crammed into an already busy area of houses. This is too close to the rear of our back garden and will be at an

	<p>elevated height overlooking our property. It will also block any view of the trees in the background and replace it with a brick wall.</p> <p>The parking on Church Street and Chapel Street is limited already. The proposed property will have a knock on affect to this.</p> <p>A big reason why we bought our property was for its privacy and natural views from the back garden which will disappear if this plan goes ahead.</p>
<p>93 CHAPEL STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AE</p>	<p>After looking at proposed plans, we are very concerned about the height & size of the proposed building. This site is elevated and considerably higher than our property in Chapel street, although the upper windows in proposed property are frosted, because of the elevation the downstairs doors & windows will be overlooking at least five properties in chapel street, we also will overlooking the proposed living room/dining space from our upstairs windows.</p> <p>This proposed building is far too big for the site, & having lived in chapel street for 21 years this proposed building will have a real impact on our every day living & general well being.</p>
<p>93 CHAPEL STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AE</p>	<p>Dear Sally</p> <p>I have looked at updated plans for number 4 Church street . the previous issues regarding our objection still remain.</p> <p>The change in property type application ,although smaller in bedroom size & foot print is slightly smaller this still gives us the same issues.</p> <p>The rear elevation because of the difference in height between our property (Chapel street) & proposed new property in Church street will still be a impact on our privacy, we will still be able to look into ground floor windows & visa versa.</p> <p>Proposed new house will overlook properties on three sides with the exception of the side elevation which has no windows is the side that faces the applicants house, number 4 Church street.</p> <p>Kind regards Robert & Rosie Houston</p>
<p>91 CHAPEL STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AE</p>	<p>I strongly object to this Planning Proposal. It will cause overdevelopment to a very small site which will impact on all the properties around it and create a huge visual intrusion.</p> <p>It is exceptionally close to my home and because of the elevation of the land rising from my house up towards the site, the new property will overlook my garden and</p>

	<p>house, causing loss of light and privacy. In this elevated position the windows on the ground floor will look directly into the windows of my dining room, bedroom and bathroom. To illustrate this I have attached photographs showing our existing view of the site and drawings (to scale) which show the dominance it will have over my home at 91 Chapel Street and to my neighbours in 89 and 93 Chapel Street.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the Beehive site has already caused a severe impact on this neighbourhood by its scale and it is ironic that the previous owner of 4 Church Street took his objection of overlooking to Planning Appeal level.</p> <p>Another concern is that the proposal is for a three double bed roomed property, which could mean six extra vehicles accessing this site. Residents of both Chapel Street and Church Street are already having to cope with the additional parking created from the homes at the top of Chapel Street (part of the Beehive development). One of the main reasons I was attracted to my garden when I first bought the property was the feeling of openness and light. This will be destroyed by this development.</p>
<p>91 CHAPEL STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AE</p>	<p>I again strongly object to this Planning Proposal. The amended plans show a building that is still overbearing, out of scale in its location and a clear example of 'garden grabbing' which will increase the density and overdevelopment of this small site. It is still exceptionally close to my home and because of the elevation of the land rising from my house to the new property it will overlook my garden and house, causing loss of light and destroying my privacy. I note in the new proposal that the patio doors have been moved to the east elevation, but that the windows on the rear elevation remain at the same height and will therefore still overlook my garden and house. To illustrate this, I again attach photographs showing our existing view of the site and drawings (to scale) which show the dominance that this ugly building will have over my home and my neighbours. The concern about the parking remains, as for the original proposal, as it would mean potentially 4 extra vehicles.</p>
<p>87B CHAPEL STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AE</p>	<p>We strongly object. This will be a gross over-development of the land. It will be built on an incline so our back garden and the back of our house will be totally overlooked, not only by the upstairs windows but also by the downstairs patio door and windows. This will affect our privacy and have an impact on our every day life. The overall size and the sheer height of the proposed development is massively larger than the existing outbuildings and will cause a</p>

	<p>drastic loss of light.</p> <p>The approach road to the property is merely a one lane entrance to a car park which is always over crowded with cars and is very busy with traffic going in and out. The parking in Church Street and Chapel Street is a major problem now without a three bedroom house being built with potentially more cars. Noise and disturbance will be an issue.</p> <p>Trees and hedging will be lost having a negative impact on wildlife which will not be compensated by a few bird boxes.</p> <p>This will be detrimental to the whole area.</p>
<p>87B CHAPEL STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AE</p>	<p>After viewing the amended plans we still strongly object. It is clear that the design has not massively changed. This means that the new property will still be an over development of the land. The development is much too big for the small garden is it planned for. The new design is still much larger than the current buildings on the plot. All properties around will still be overlooked due to the elevation and light will be blocked. There will still be a major issue with parking as this is a built up area and parking is at a premium. This new design will still be detrimental to the area and the neighbouring properties as stated before.</p>
<p>6A CHURCH STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AD</p>	<p>We write to submit our objections to the proposed development at 4 Church Street - reference 4/101003/18/FUL.</p> <p>After consideration to the proposed development we consider this will have a detrimental effect to the adjacent and nearby dwellings. Due to the elevated situation of the proposed development the front facing upper floor windows will be in clear unobstructed view of the rear of 6, 6a,8,8a Church street, where at present none of the dwellings are overlooked, this was also a consideration of the development at Honeypot Close prior permission being granted (Ref: 4/00187/11/MFA). In addition, parking is very limited for the residence of both Church Street and Chapel Street with a high number of residence now having to park some distance from their homes at the rear of 6,6a,8,8a Church Street. I note from the plans that the existing facility to parking four vehicles will remain, however two parking spaces will be relocated for use by 4 Church Street, these new relocated parking spaces will be positioned adjacent to spaces where residents are now able to parallel park. The proposal does not allow for this existing parking, the two relocated parking spaces at 4 church street would need to use the whole width of the road to be able to manoeuvre in and out of their spaces, thus actually reducing the parking at the rear of 6, 6a,8, 8a Church Street and for the residence of Church Street by at least 2 spaces. After</p>

	<p>taking all of the above into account we feel that the application for planning permission should be denied</p>
<p>6A CHURCH STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AD</p>	<p>We write to submit our objections to the proposed development at 4 Church Street - reference 4/101003/18/FUL.</p> <p>In addition, parking is very limited for. After consideration to the proposed development we consider this will have a detrimental effect to the adjacent and nearby dwellings. Due to the elevated situation of the proposed development the front facing upper floor windows will be in clear unobstructed view of the rear of 6, 6a,8,8a Church street, where at present none of the dwellings are overlooked, this was also a consideration of the development at Honey Pot Close prior permission being granted (Ref: 4/00187/11/MFA)</p>
<p>6A CHURCH STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AD</p>	<p>We write to submit our objections to the proposed development at 4 Church Street - reference 4/101003/18/FUL.</p> <p>After consideration to the proposed development we consider this will have a detrimental effect to the adjacent and nearby dwellings. Due to the elevated situation of the proposed development the front facing upper floor windows will be in clear unobstructed view of the rear of 6, 6a,8,8a Church street, where at present none of the dwellings are overlooked, this was also a consideration of the development at Honey Pot Close prior permission being granted (Ref: 4/00187/11/MFA)</p>
<p>8A CHURCH STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5AD</p>	<p>The new proposals show a slight reduction in the size of the proposed building, it does not remove any of the concerns raised by the objectors from the initial proposal. Therefore all the previous objections should still be considered as valid in respect of the amended plans. Parking and over development being my main concerns for this application</p>