

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 4/01635/18/FHA | CAR PORT WITH GARDEN STUDIO ABOVE |
| Site Address | THE HOIST, 2 MASONS YARD, CHAPEL STREET, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 2EA |
| Applicant | Mrs Cossins, The Hoist |
| Case Officer | Rachel Marber |
| Referral to Committee | Contrary views of Berkhamsted Town Council |

1. Recommendation

- 1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**

2. Summary

2.1 The proposed car port with first floor studio through size, position and design would not adversely impact upon the visual amenity of the existing locally listed buildings, immediate street scene, conservation area, or the residential amenity of neighbouring residents. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendices 3, 5 and 7 and Policies 57, 58, 99, 100, 118, 119 and 120 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS4, CS8, CS11, CS12, CS27 and CS31 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2018).

3. Site Description

3.1 The application site is located on Masons Yard, accessed via the north side of Chapel Street. The site comprises locally listed terraced, loft styled dwellings which fall within the designated Berkhamsted Conservation Area.

3.2 The application site was an old warehouse which was converted into a residential unit in 1992 (4/00158/92/FUL). This planning permission included the construction of three additional dwellings. Masons Yard is accessed through the carriage way at the right end of the front range.

4. Proposal

4.1 The application seeks permission for a three bay car port with studio above.

4.2 The proposal would also result in the demolition of two sheds and trees.

5. Relevant History

4/00480/16/FHA ROOF ALTERATIONS TO ACCOMMODATE DISABLED ACCESS LIFT AND BALCONY
Granted
10/05/2016

4/00158/92/FUL CONVERT WAREHOUSE TO FORM 2 RESIDENTIAL UNITS & ERECTION OF THREE DWELLINGS (REVISED SCHEME)
Granted
14/05/1992

4/01417/91/4 CONVERT WAREHOUSE TO 2 RESIDENTIAL UNITS, DEMOLITION OF

| | |
|--------------|---|
| | OUTBUILDINGS,ERECT 3 DWELLINGS & ALTERATIONS TO ACCESS Granted 19/12/1991 |
| 4/01418/91/4 | DEMOLITION OF OUTBUILDING Granted 26/11/1991 |
| 4/01480/90/4 | CHANGE OF USE FROM STONEMASONS YARD TO OFFICES (USE CLASS B1), ALTERATIONS, EXTENSIONS & CAR PARKING Granted 10/01/1991 |
| 4/02101/89/4 | CONTINUED USE OF PREMISES FOR MONUMENTAL MASONS YARD Granted 05/04/1990 |

6. Policies

6.1 National Policy Guidance (2018)

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

6.2 Adopted Core Strategy – (2013)

CS4 – Selected Small Villages in the Green Belt
CS8 - Sustainable Transport
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS27 - Quality of the Historic Environment
CS31 – Water Management

6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004)

57 - Provision and Management of Parking
58 - Private Parking Provision
99- Preservation of trees, hedgerows and woodlands
100- Tree and Woodland Planting
118 - Important Archaeological Remains
120 - Development in Conservation Areas
Appendix 3 - Layout and Design of Residential Areas
Appendix 5 – Parking Provision
Appendix 7 - Small-scale House Extensions

6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

Old Mill (BCA4) Berkhamsted Residential Character Area (2004).

7. Constraints

- Residential Area of Berkhamsted
- Adjacent to Locally Listed Buildings
- Area of Archaeological Significance

- Berkhamsted Conservation Area

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 Street Scene and conservation area
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Impact on Trees and Landscaping
- Impact on Highway Safety
- Archaeology
- Flood Risk
- Consultation Responses
- Community Infrastructure Levy

Policy and Principle

9.2 The application site is located within a residential area, wherein accordance to Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy (2013) the principle of a residential extension is acceptable subject to compliance with the relevant national and local policies outlined below. The main issues to the consideration of this application relate to the impact of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance on the existing dwellinghouse, immediate street scene, conservation area and residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

Effect on Appearance of Local Listed Building and Conservation Area

9.3 Saved Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS11, CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2018) all seek to ensure that any new development/alteration respects or improves the character of the surrounding area and adjacent properties in terms of scale, massing, materials, layout, bulk and height.

9.4 The specific historic environment policies within the NPPF (2018) are contained within paragraphs 189-202. Paragraph 192 of the NPPF states that in determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets. In similar regard Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policy 120 of the Local Plan (2004) seek to preserve the setting and distinctiveness of heritage assets.

9.5 S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBA) requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

9.6 The properties at Nos. 1-5 Masons Yard are locally listed due to the following reasons:

- Architectural Significance: *“Nos. 1,2,3,4 & 5 Masons Yard consists of a tall 2 storey late C19th range fronting Chapel Street and a rear range converted in 1990s to residential use, extending to rear left side and accessed through carriage way at right end of front range.”*

- Local Historic Interest: *“Chapel Street is composed principally of elegant, modest late C19th semi-detached or terraced housing, but punctuated by individual exceptions which are reminders of Berkhamsted’s industrial heritage.”*

9.7 The proposed car port would not be overtly visible from the street scene of Chapel Street or Bridge Street or the wider conservation area, as such the impact to the visual amenity of the immediate area would be negligible.

9.8 The DBC conservation officer was consulted on the proposal and provided the following original comments:

- In principle a car port may be acceptable however it seems particularly bulky at roof level due to the mansard roof form and is approximately 6 metres high, a more modest scale outbuilding would be more appropriate.
- Views of the structure would be limited within the street scene although it will be partly visible when looking from Chapel Street down Masons Yard.
- Consideration should also be given to the possibility of future applications of this type from neighbouring properties on Masons Yard and any cumulative impact.

9.9 The proposed plans have been amended to reduce both the bulk and scale of the proposed car port by removing the proposed dormer windows, changing the mansard roof with that of a simple pitch and reducing the height of the proposed development by 0.5 metres. These amendments overcome the concerns raised by the conservation officer whom provided the following amended comments:

“The application plans have been amended with the roof form simplified to a gable roof with the ridge height lowered slightly and the roof dormers omitted. This has resulted in a garage building of reduced bulk and a more traditional design and form, the proposal is now considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Berkhamsted Conservation Area.”

9.10 Moreover, it is not considered that the proposal would detriment the character and appearance of the existing locally listed buildings due to being of marginal scale and clearly subordinate in relation to the dwellings at Masons Yard. Material detail has been recommended by way of condition.

9.11 Consideration to the potential cumulative impact of such an application will be considered in the assessment of the further application, should a similar application come forward. A refusal of this application cannot be substantiated on the basis that an application for further car ports may, or may not, come forward in the future.

9.12 Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon the historic and architectural features of the properties at Masons yard and would preserve the character and appearance of the Berkhamsted conservation area and wider street scene.

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.13 The NPPF (2018) outlines the importance of planning in securing high standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact to neighbouring properties and their amenity space. Thus, the proposed should be designed to reduce any impact on neighbouring properties by way of visual intrusion, loss of light and privacy.

9.14 The proposed car port would be located 20 metres approximately away from the rear elevations of properties on Bridge Street. In addition to this separation distance the car park structure would only be 5 metres in depth, reducing the prominence of the structure to neighbouring residents further. It is important to note that Dacorum does not have any side to rear policy separation distance standards.

9.15 The proposed car port would also be located 15 – 30 metres approximately away from side/rear elevation of properties at Masons Yard which is also considered acceptable.

9.16 No flank elevation windows are proposed on the car port structure and as a result no loss of privacy to neighbouring residents would result. The proposed car park has been amended to omit the dormer windows and rear platform in order to reduce overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring residents at Masons Yard and Bridge Street.

9.17 The proposed car port would accommodate a single room garden studio at first floor. A condition has been recommended ensuring that the structure remains in ancillary use to the parent property.

9.18 In sum, the proposed extension work would not detrimentally impact the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, beyond existing site circumstance.

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.19 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.

9.20 An arboricultural report has been submitted alongside the planning application. This highlights tree protective fencing to be erected around retained trees in order to prevent damage during construction. Trees T6 and T8 would be removed as a result of the proposal however, these are B and C classification due to being small scale and of low amenity value to the conservation area. A TCA application will be required to fell these trees, notification of this has been added by way of informative.

Impact on Highway Safety

9.21 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision. Paragraph 39 of the NPPF (2012) states that if 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. Policies 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.

9.22 The proposed car port would be located on the three existing parking spaces serving number 2. These parking spaces would be retained as part of the proposed development therefore the proposal will not impact upon available parking provision or highway safety.

Archaeology

9.23 Saved Policy 118 requires that the County Archaeological Group will be consulted on all planning applications affecting areas of archaeological significance and archaeological potential. Hertfordshire Archaeology were consulted on the proposed application and confirmed that the development is unlikely to have a significant impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest.

Flood Risk

9.24 Policy CS31 of the Core Strategy (2013) seeks to minimise the risk of flooding. With regard to the nature of the development and as the application site is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3 it is not considered that the proposal would be susceptible to flooding or increase the overall risk of flooding in the area. The application site is located in close proximity to Flood Zones 2 and 3 as a result of being in close proximity to both the River Bulbourne and Grand Union Canal. As such, the relevant consultees (Canal and River Trust and NATS Safeguarding Team) were notified and raised no objection to the proposed development.

Consultation Responses

9.25 *Loss of light/ overshadowing to properties at Bridge Street* – This has been addressed within the residential amenity section above. Due to approximate 20 metre separation distance of the car port structure to the rear elevations of the properties on Bridge Street it is not considered that the proposal would result in a loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring habitable rooms. It is acknowledged that a marginal loss of light may result in the early hours of the morning, to the very rear garden of properties at Bridge Street as a result of the proposal however, this would be in no way significant to warrant a refusal of the application.

9.26 *Loss of privacy*- This is addressed within the residential amenity section above. A temporary loss of privacy would result for the short period that the staircase is utilised to access the studio room.

9.27 *Loss of outlook to residents on Bridge Street*- This is addressed within residential amenity section.

9.28 *Visually out of character with conservation area and locally listed buildings*- this has been addressed within the visual amenity section above and the application has been subject to consultation from the DBC conservation officer who has raised no objection.

9.29 *Use of space in the future*- A condition restricting the use of the structure for purposes ancillary to the main property has been recommended. This condition is to provide for avoidance of doubt and to clarify the use permitted under this application. A planning application will be required in the future if this use was to be changed.

9.30 *Noise and disturbance*- It is not considered that an internal garden studio will result in significant noise and disturbance given the nature of use and built up residential surrounds.

9.31 *Removal of trees*- This has been addressed within the Impact on Trees and Landscaping Section above.

9.32 *Requirement for studio space and car port* – The assessment of need and requirement is not a key planning material consideration.

Community Infrastructure Levy

9.33 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 not CIL Liable due to resulting in less than 100m² of additional floor space

10. Conclusion

10.1 The proposed car port with first floor studio through size, position and design would not adversely impact upon the visual amenity of the existing locally listed buildings, immediate street scene, conservation area, or the residential amenity of neighbouring residents. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendices 3, 5 and 7 and Policies 57, 58, 99, 100, 118, 119 and 120 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS4, CS8, CS11, CS12, CS27 and CS31 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

| 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 | <p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:</p> <p>PA01 01 PA01 02.B Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement 14th June 2018 DS/20318/AC Design & Access Statement with Planning and Heritage Statement</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p> |
| 3 | <p>No development shall take place above damp proof course level 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the Conservation Area; in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013).</p> <p>Informative</p> <p>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> |
| 4 | <p>The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as The Hoist, 2 Masons Yard.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the car port structure is not severed from the main dwelling to provide a self-contained dwelling unit, since this would be out of character with the area, and contrary to the provisions of policy CS4, CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013).</p> |
| 5 | <p>In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.</p> <p>(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998: 1989 Recommendations for Tree Work.</p> <p>(b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.</p> <p>(c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area; in accordance with Saved Policies 99 and 100 of the Local Plan (2004).</p> <p>Informative</p> <p>Any tree works will require a tree application to be submitted, including the felling of trees outline within this application.</p> <p>Article 35 Statement</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 and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.</p> |
|--|

Appendix A

Consultation responses

NATS LTD Safeguarding Team

The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.

However, please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NATS (that is responsible for the management of en route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly consulted.

If any changes are proposed to the information supplied to NATS in regard to this application which become the basis of a revised, amended or further application for approval, then as a statutory consultee NERL requires that it be further consulted on any such changes prior to any planning permission or any consent being granted.

Canal and River Trust

No Comment

Herts Archaeology

In this instance I consider that the development is unlikely to have a significant impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest, and I have no comment to make upon the proposal.

DBC conservation

The application site is located on Masons Yard which is accessed through a carriageway on Chapel Street. The site falls within the designated Berkhamsted Conservation Area.

Nos. 1-5 Mason's Yard are also designated as Locally Listed Buildings due to the following reasons:

- Architectural Significance: *"Nos. 1,2,3,4 & 5 Masons Yard consists of a tall 2 storey late C19th range fronting Chapel Street and a rear range converted in 1990s to residential use, extending to rear left side and accessed through carriage way at right end of front range."*
- Local Historic Interest: *"Chapel Street is composed principally of elegant, modest late C19th semi-detached or terraced housing, but punctuated by individual exceptions which are reminders of Berkhamsted's industrial heritage."*

Saved appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (1991), policies CS11, CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2012) all seek to ensure that any new development/alteration respects or improves the character of the surrounding area, adjacent properties and existing dwelling house in terms of scale, massing, materials, layout, bulk and height. Policies CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013) and saved policy 120 of the Dacorum Local Plan (1991) reinforce this, in addition to stating that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets in considering the impact of proposed developments within a Conservation Area.

The application proposes a car port with garden room above – essentially an open-sided garage with accommodation in the roof, with two very different dormer styles – traditional gabled dormers to the 'rear' (facing Chapel Street) and contemporary style glazed dormer / window to the front along with a balcony area and external stairs.

It is not clear from the application whether the site of the proposed car port is owned by the applicant. It would be useful to see a plan showing the parking arrangements for Masons Yard / a plan clarifying ownership – the Design and Access statement (page 4) only refers to 'a large gravel area situated in the middle of the site which serves as parking for all dwellings on site.' There is a communal garden area beyond this.

In principle a car port may be acceptable however it seems particularly bulky at roof level due to the mansard roof form and is approximately 6 metres high, a more modest scale outbuilding would be more appropriate. Views of the structure would be limited within the street scene although it will be partly visible when looking from Chapel Street down Masons Yard. None the less good design and development of appropriate scale is important in this Conservation Area location. Consideration should also be given to the possibility of future applications of this type from neighbouring properties on Masons Yard and any cumulative impact.

Amended Comments

The application site is located on Masons Yard which is accessed through a carriageway on Chapel Street. The site falls within the designated Berkhamsted Conservation Area.

Nos. 1-5 Mason's Yard are also designated as Locally Listed Buildings due to the following reasons:

- Architectural Significance: "Nos. 1,2,3,4 & 5 Masons Yard consists of a tall 2 storey late C19th range fronting Chapel Street and a rear range converted in 1990s to residential use, extending to rear left side and accessed through carriage way at right end of front range."
- Local Historic Interest: "Chapel Street is composed principally of elegant, modest late C19th semi-detached or terraced housing, but punctuated by individual exceptions which are reminders of Berkhamsted's industrial heritage."

Saved appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (1991), policies CS11, CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2012) all seek to ensure that any new development/alteration respects or improves the character of the surrounding area, adjacent properties and existing dwelling house in terms of scale, massing, materials, layout, bulk and height. Policies CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013) and saved policy 120 of the Dacorum Local Plan (1991) reinforce this, in addition to stating that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets in considering the impact of proposed developments within a Conservation Area.

The application plans have been amended with the roof form simplified to a gable roof with the ridge height lowered slightly and the roof dormers omitted. This has resulted in a garage building of reduced bulk and a more traditional design and form, the proposal is now considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Berkhamsted Conservation Area. The application refers to clay tiles to the roof and clay tile hanging with timber doors which seems appropriate. The roof lights should be of a conservation style and sit flush with the roof slope.

The application proposes the removal of tree T8, a box elder. It is a semi-mature tree and in fair condition according to the arboricultural report. T6 is also due to be felled.

There are a number of other trees within the garden area to the rear of the Masons Yard site.

Trees, either singly or in groups are generally considered to contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and this is the case within this site.

The majority of the trees within the site are due to be retained and only the removal of tree T8 and tree T6 proposed which are adjacent to the parking area and on the site of the area proposed for the new garage / garden building.

Whilst the retention of trees is always to be encouraged the loss of T8 and T6 is not considered to detract from the character or appearance of the Berkhamsted Conservation Area.

Berkhamsted Town Council

Objection

The proposed development, in view of its size and bulk, would cause significant loss of amenity in terms of privacy to surrounding neighbours. The structure's design is out of keeping with the Conservation Area.

Appendix B

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

Objections

| Address | Comments |
|---|---|
| 30 BRIDGE STREET, BERKHAMSTEAD, HP4 2EB | 30 Bridge Street Objection (as summarised) Ample space to accommodate an ancillary building/studio in application site without need to be two storeys. The two storey building would infill and alter the landscape character Loss of light/over-shadowing as a result of the proposal. Masons Yard is 400mm above our garden. Loss of privacy Views from development into ground and first floor windows of 17-30 Bridge Street and 6 Chapel Street. Concern about elevated terrace to rear of development. Structure will alter visual amenity Structure will alter amenity of all surrounding gardens and green views. Proposed materials out of character within conservation area. Concerns about use of space in future, such as use for accommodation. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Studio use would result in noise and disturbance. Ridge of structure would be more than 5.5 metres above our garden. Casting shadow of neighbouring gardens. Site section submitted is misleading and an inaccurate reflection of actual land levels. No dimensions on plans to give a sense of scale. Mason Yard and 5 Chapel Street are important buildings within conservation area. Dormer windows on structure would be visible from street scene, would set a dangerous precedence. Mansard roof design of structure is out of character within conservation area. Recently granted small balcony on site has impacted on privacy and amenity of our outside space. Photographic evidence of impact of the structure. Present objects at Berkhamsted Town Council committee meeting. Proposal is in conflict with Berkhamsted Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposal. Applicant's property is locally listed and therefore extra effort should be invested in preserving the character and landscape. Development conflicts with Section 69 of Planning Act 1990 where developments and alterations to the conservation area must 'preserve or enhance' the appearance.</p> |
| <p>25 BRIDGE STREET, BERKHAMSTEAD, HP4 2EB</p> | <p>The proposed plans will infringe on the current privacy enjoyed by our neighbouring home and garden. Not only will our view be restricted, anyone using the studio will also have sight of our property. The carport is not necessary and is only to accommodate a first story building that will affect my family's quality of life.</p> <p><u>Amended Comments</u></p> <p>The amended plans do not alter the fact that the car port proposal is designed to accommodate a 1st floor building that is detrimental to the surrounding area. This area, as part of Berkhamsted's valuable conservation area, needs to be protected.</p> |
| <p>22 BRIDGE STREET, BERKHAMSTEAD, HP4 2EB</p> | <p>The proposed plans will infringe on the privacy of my neighbouring home and garden. Not only will my view be restricted and the amount of sunlight in the garden severely impacted, anyone using the studio will also have sight into my property. I do not object to the carport but the second story studio would seriously impact my property.</p> <p>We object to the proposed development due to the negative effect it will have on the privacy, residential</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>amenity, light and noise levels of our home and garden and those of our surrounding neighbours. Secondly, we feel the development is out of keeping with the character of the conservation area. Thirdly, the proposed structure will stand out adversely as it involves loss of the open aspect of all adjoining gardens. Finally, the size of the development is over-bearing and out-of-scale with the surrounding area, although this is hard to discern from the lack of detail on the plans submitted.</p> |
| <p>6 CHAPEL STREET, BERKHAMSTEAD, HP4 2EA</p> | <p>We object to the planning proposal on the basis that the site plan is not submitted and as such the confirmed position is not clear. Unable to ascertain true ridge height of the proposed building as the ground level is much higher in Masons Yard than in our back garden. We feel that we would have our privacy compromised over our entire garden and into the first level of our house. The structure seems very unnecessary to park three cars when there is ample parking available.</p> |
| <p>5 CHAPEL STREET, BERKHAMSTEAD, HP4 2EA</p> | <p>1. We will suffer a significant loss of light/over-shadowing 2. The second storey windows directly overlook our garden, providing unrestricted views into ground and first floor windows to our property and that of 6 Chapel Street and 17-30 Bridge Street. We will all suffer substantial loss of privacy 3. We are extremely concerned by the presence of 1st floor terrace with seating space 1.1m above the top line of our fence 4. The structure will substantially alter the visual amenity of our property and alter views from all surrounding gardens, dramatically changing what are for most residents entirely "green" aspects 6. A "studio" could quite clearly be used in a manner in which both noise and disturbance could result in-use and there is little preventing this drifting into home office/guest accomm/ domestic use in the future 7. This is an unnecessary and insensitive infill development, altering the landscape character within the Article 4 Berkhamsted High Street East conservation area.</p> <p><u>Amended Comments</u></p> <p>Although the proposed design has been amended to reduce the extent of glazing overlooking the neighbouring gardens, and the ridge height has been lowered somewhat, the gable ends, one of which is tight to our fence-line, is now more intrusive and will cast a greater shadow. The staircase to the first floor accommodation still presents a major loss of amenity to neighbouring gardens. Since the proposal remains a 2-storey structure with first floor accommodation, this also</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>represents an entirely unnecessary and insensitive infill structure, altering the landscape character within the Article 4 Berkhamsted High Street East conservation area, impacting 20 neighbouring properties and setting a dangerous precedent.</p> |
| <p>31 BRIDGE STREET, BERKHAMSTEAD, HP4 2EB</p> | <p>I object to this application. The proposed plans will infringe on the privacy of my home and garden. My view will be restricted and anyone using the studio will also have sight into my property. The second storey is unnecessary and will impact too many properties to be allowed. There is currently ample parking for cars for the property, a car port is not only unnecessary in itself but the second storey is inappropriate development that is not needed. Too many properties on Bridge Street and Chapel Street will be affected and it is unfair to impact so many properties with this development. Roof height can't be ascertained by the current plans either so I wholly object to this application.</p> <p>Strongly object to the planning proposal on the basis that this will impact our privacy in Bridge Street and is an unnecessary development. The site plan is not submitted and as such the confirmed position is not clear. A 2 storey structure is not needed at this site - there is plenty of car parking space and as such is a very unnecessary application. A 2 storey structure will impact my privacy and a lot of others at the back of Bridge Street and Chapel Street and as such should not be permitted development. The structure seems very unnecessary and we have been left with an unsightly false dormer window from a previous application that was permitted here. A 2 storey structure is both unnecessary and over development at this particular site.</p> <p><u>Amended Comments</u></p> <p>Objection again.</p> <p>Photographic evidence of lack of use for car parking or desperate need for more space ('studio space') as The Hoist currently has adequate living space? Resident appears to have 1 car and application appears to show space for 3 cars?</p> <p>Loss of privacy impacting on too many residents of Bridge Street.</p> <p>Conservation area with current neighbours respecting this by not requesting over development on their sites. Car needing 'car port' is modern new car which really doesn't need protecting from the elements?</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>The building would infill and alter the landscape character</p> <p>Loss of light/over-shadowing as a result of the proposal. Views from development into ground and first floor windows of 17-30 Bridge Street and 6 Chapel Street. Structure will alter amenity of all surrounding gardens and green views.</p> <p>Proposed materials out of character within conservation area.</p> <p>Concerns about use of space in future, such as use for accommodation.</p> <p>Mason Yard and 5 Chapel Street are important buildings within conservation area.</p> <p>Recently granted dormer window on site has impacted on privacy and amenity of our outside space and now looks like an ugly addition with leaded covering.</p> <p>Photographic evidence of impact of the structure.</p> <p>Proposal is in conflict with Berkhamsted Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposal.</p> <p>Applicant's property is locally listed and therefore extra effort should be invested in preserving the character and landscape.</p> <p>Development conflicts with Section 69 of Planning Act 1990 where developments and alterations to the conservation area must 'preserve or enhance' the appearance.</p> <p>I can only see this as over development of the site and completely unnecessary. Too many neighbours will be impacted in one of the loveliest areas of the town.</p> |
| <p>24 BRIDGE STREET, BERKHAMSTE D,,,HP4 2EB</p> | <p>The proposed large elevated terrace and open staircase directly overlook our property, and will provide unrestricted views into both our garden and our ground and first floor windows. We will therefore suffer a significant and unacceptable loss of privacy.</p> <p>The Design & Access Statement states the intention that the structure would be incidental to the main dwelling house and not permanently occupied to mitigate this (Section 3, page 14). However this is simply an expression of the applicant's intention at the present time, and we will suffer a significant loss of privacy in the event of any change in the nature of use of the structure.</p> <p>The size of the structure will also be visually intrusive from our property.</p> <p>We would have little or no objection to a single storey car port structure, which would mitigate the majority of the issues that would impact us directly.</p> <p>Further Comments</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Main concerns relate to scale and massing of the proposed structure and unacceptable overlooking from the open staircase and the first floor terrace directly into our garden.</p> <p>Little reason to propose an elevated structure of this scale due to lack of site area. Question adequacy of the remaining parking space for the other residents of Masons Yard.</p> <p>Large elevated terrace and open staircase directly overlook our property and garden.</p> <p>Future use of structure may change in future.</p> <p>Alter visual amenity.</p> <p>Structure would be visually intrusive and alter view from garden.</p> <p>Use as studio questioned.</p> <p>Studio would result in noise and disturbance.</p> <p>Proposal would alter landscape within Article 4 area and conservation area.</p> <p>No objection to a single store car port.</p> |
| <p>23 BRIDGE STREET, BERKHAMSTEAD, HP4 2EB</p> | <p>I object to the proposed plans for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The documents provided do not give detailed measurements to show the exact position in relation to boundary fences and also the actual height /elevation /overall scale of the building 2) The proposal of stairs leading to a terrace on the 1st floor studio will give unrestricted views into ground & first floor windows, and what are currently private gardens, severely impacting on privacy. This is unnecessary when there is a large garden within which to position a studio for occasional use 3) The plans suggest a significant impact on sunlight into the rear of both mine and other properties. 4) The plans also suggest a scale of building that will give a drastic change in outlook. My property will have the full size of the structure parallel with the rear boundary fence and be visually intrusive 5) The Design & Access statement refers to the intended use, however any changes to this in the future would further impact on privacy. <p><u>Amended Comments</u></p> <p>The revised plans continue to present the same issues for the properties in the vicinity of the car port and garden studio.</p> <p>The plans continue to show a staircase and entrance to the garden studio that will give unrestricted views into garden and ground floor space of mine and other properties</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>The plans show a slightly amended design in regard to some aspects of the overall size in relation to other buildings further away to my property, however still do not show any specific measurements.</p> <p>The design would still be visually intrusive and would align fully with my back perimeter fence. This would represent a significant change to the visual amenity of my property and for the conservation area.</p> <p>The revised plans do not change the objections in relation to the impact on noise, privacy and light. As raised previously, any change to usage in the future would further impact on these issues</p> <p>A single storey car port could be built without all the adverse impact on surrounding properties and the visual amenity of the conservation area.</p> |
| <p>20 BRIDGE STREET, BERKHAMSTEAD, HP4 2EB</p> | <p>We would strongly object to this development, as it would materially impact our quality of life and that of our neighbours.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) We would experience a significant loss of light/overshadowing to ours & our neighbours' properties 2) We would incur a substantial loss of privacy as the large 1st floor terrace/seating area & windows would directly overlook our property & garden; the line of sight is well above our fence line 3) Size & dimensions of proposed development not fully provided 4) A two storey structure is unnecessary given the existing size of the property & garden 5) Our views from our property would be dramatically altered from the green views we currently enjoy 6) Serious concerns over the purpose the studio would be used for, both now & in the future - this could be used in a number of ways which could cause significant noise & light disruption to us and our neighbours 7) Out of keeping with the Conservation Area <p><u>Amended Comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) We would still be overlooked by this development, as would our neighbours, materially impacting on our privacy 2) The plans appear to include the removal of trees close to our boundary fence, spoiling the green views we currently enjoy 3) We question the need for a two storey structure, as there appears to be ample living space & parking already |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>on the property</p> <p>4) Concern that the first floor studio may in time become a residential unit, which would impact adversely on light, noise & privacy</p> <p>5) This is a conservation area, and the proposed development is out of keeping with this.</p> |
|--|---|

Supporting

| Address | Comments |
|--|---|
| STONEMASONS,1 MASONS YARD,CHAPEL STREET,BERKHAMSTE D,HP4 2EA | <p>As a resident of Masons Yard I would like to offer my support for this proposal.</p> <p>Having examined the updated submission, I have no concerns with the design, positioning or potential future use of this development.</p> |