

<b>4/01446/18/FUL</b>	<b>TWO-STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO EXISTING DWELLING AND TWO-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO CREATE NEW DWELLING</b>
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>3 HILLSIDE COTTAGES, LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 8QB</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>MR K HARPER, 3 HILLSIDE COTTAGES</b>
<b>Case Officer</b>	<b>Martin Stickley</b>
<b>Referral Committee</b>	<b>to Call-In from Councillor Graham Sutton</b>

## **1. Recommendation**

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**.

## **2. Summary**

2.1 The site is located within Hemel Hempstead proximate to local services and facilities within Leverstock Green. As such, there is strong policy support for the provision of housing under local and national policy in this location.

2.1.1 The development of a three-bedroom end-of-terrace dwelling would not unduly compromise the character and appearance of the terrace row of which it forms a part, and would be acceptable in terms of the appearance of the Leverstock Green Road street scene.

2.1.2 Proposed car parking arrangements are sufficient considering existing conditions at the site. When reviewing the acceptability of the proposed parking provision, the site's location should be considered, particularly its proximity to the local centre of Leverstock Green and the availability of local bus services.

2.1.3 It is acknowledged that the common along Leverstock Green Road in front of the terrace can be heavily parked, however this harm has not been evidenced by the highway authority with respect to the proposal, and therefore would not be of significant harm to outweigh the benefit of the provision of one additional home.

2.1.4 The proposal is therefore acceptable in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF, Policies CS1, CS4, CS8, CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy and saved Policies 10, 18, 21, 51, 54 and 58 of the Local Plan.

## **3. Site Description**

3.1 The application site is currently occupied by a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling located on the south-western side of Leverstock Green Road (A4147). The terrace row is prominent in this street scene due to its forward position relative to nearby dwellings, open landscaped frontage, and its white-painted exterior which sets it apart from the predominantly brick faced surrounding development. Specifically, the application site and subject dwelling located at the north-western end of the terrace is highly visible in the street scene, particularly its front and exposed side elevations. The terrace is of simple and consistent proportions save for a later two-storey side addition on the application site.

3.1.1 A wide strip of grassed land identified as waste of the manor land exists immediately in front of the application site and the terrace row. It appears there are few driveways which cross this land providing vehicle access to residential properties beyond. Importantly, this land contributes significantly to the spacious and landscaped character of the area. It is understood that the application site benefits from a right of access easement via an existing established vehicle crossover and part constructed driveway off Leverstock Green Road.

## **4. Proposal**

4.1 Planning permission is sought for a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling comprising three bedrooms, and a two-storey rear extension to the existing dwelling. No additional bedrooms are proposed in the existing property.

4.1.1 The proposed dwelling would match the existing terrace in terms of appearance and would create two car parking spaces immediately to the flank.

4.1.2 The two-storey rear extension to the existing dwelling would project in line with the rear wall of the proposed dwelling. The allocated private garden areas to both the existing and proposed dwellings would be located to the rear of the respective dwellings with minimum depths of 11.5m.

## **5. Relevant Planning History**

5.1 Historical records confirm under plan number 3477 that additions were carried out in 1951.

5.1.1 Aerial photographs dating back to 1970 confirm that the terrace has existed in its full length since this time. The available 1940 aerial is inconclusive.

5.1.2 For further background, it is also noted that three three-bedroom houses were granted at Nos. 1-2 Hillside Cottages (north-west of the application site) in 1976 (under 1378/75D), identified as Nos. 1, 2 and 3a Hillside Cottages.

4/00937/16/FUL CONSTRUCTION OF ONE 3-BED DWELLING AND TWO-STORY REAR EXTENSION  
Refused  
07/09/2017

The above application was refused at committee in 2016. The decision was appealed and dismissed (see APP/A1910/W/17/3189814) for the following reasons:

- (a) that the development would provide sufficient parking for existing and future occupiers of the existing and proposed dwellings; and
- (b) that it would not give rise to undue parking congestion in the area.

## **6. Policies**

### **6.1 National Policy Guidance**

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

### **6.2 Adopted Core Strategy**

Policies NP1, CS1, CS4, CS8, CS11, CS12, CS17, CS18, CS25, CS27, CS29, CS31, CS32, CS35

### **6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan**

Saved Policies 10, 13, 18, 21, 51, 57, 58, 99, 100, 101, 119  
Saved Appendices 3 and 5

### **6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents**

- Environmental Guidelines (May 2004)
- Area Based Policies (May 2004) - Residential Character Area HCA27: Leverstock Green Central
- Energy Efficiency & Conservation (June 2006)
- Accessibility Zones for the Application of car Parking Standards (July 2002)

## **6.5 Advice Notes and Appraisals**

- Sustainable Development Advice Note (March 2011)

## **7. Constraints**

- 15.2M AIR DIR LIMIT
- CIL3

## **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
- Layout and density
- Impact on traffic, access and car parking
- Impact on heritage assets
- Impact on visual amenity
- Impact on residential amenity
- Landscaping

### Policy and Principle

9.2 The site lies within a designated and established residential area within Hemel Hempstead, where appropriate residential development is encouraged under Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy. The NPPF sets out housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

### Layout and Density

9.3 The layout and associated plot subdivision would generally follow the regular pattern of development and grain displayed along the terrace row of which the application site forms a part.

9.3.1 The site would benefit from the existing vehicle access off Leverstock Green Road. There are currently two dedicated off-street parking spaces for the existing dwelling situated to the

flank. These would be removed as part of the proposed layout. Two new spaces would be situated to the side of the new property.

9.3.2 Garden depths and sizes would be acceptable for both the existing and proposed dwellings, noting they would exceed the minimum 11.5m standard set out under saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan.

9.3.3 In density terms, the proposal is considered acceptable. Saved Policy 21 states that densities for residential development will generally be expected to be in the range of 30 to 50 dwellings/ha. Higher densities will generally be encouraged in urban areas at locations where services and/or workplaces can be reached without the need for motorised travel or which are served well by passenger transport, for example at town and local centres. Proposals which have a density of below 30 dwellings per hectare net should be avoided.

9.3.4 The numerical density for the proposal would equate to approximately 41 dwellings per hectare. This density figure may seem on the high end of the scale, however it is important to note that the site is unusual as it does not have a front garden and the green and access have not been included within the calculations of the site area. Whilst this figure could be used as indicative of the amount of development on the site; other factors set out above should be taken into consideration as noted under guidance of Environmental Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidance. This includes sufficient garden space and area commensurate with surrounding and like properties, and achieving local space standards, following the pattern of development of the area in terms of site coverage and amount of building (assessed in further detail below), the proposal would not result in an overdevelopment of the site.

9.3.5 It follows the proposal would not raise any concerns with respect to layout and density when considered in its context, and would therefore accord with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

#### Impact on Traffic, Access and Car Parking

9.4 The highway authority has raised no objection with respect to highway safety in terms of the existing access, traffic generated by the proposed development, and proposed parking provision. In providing their comments it is understood that the highway authority considered that the common land fronting the property may be used for vehicle parking.

9.4.1 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy requires, amongst other things, the provision of sufficient parking for new development. Appendix 5 of the Local Plan contains the Council's standards for parking and states that for 3 bedroom dwellings this should be between 2 and 2.25 on-site spaces (depending on the accessibility zone it falls within).

9.4.2 The previously dismissed appeal (see 4/00937/16/FUL and APP/A1910/W/17/3189814) provided 1 space for both dwellings. The current scheme would provide 2 off-road parking spaces for the proposed house but as before, none would be provided for the existing dwelling. The Planning Inspector stated, "no evidence has been supplied detailing the frequency of local buses or their destination, or the proximity of the site to facilities relating to education, healthcare, sport and recreation. In view of this, I am unable to conclude that a wide range of services and facilities are within easy walking or cycling distance of the site and/or whether they are accessible by public transport. I have as a consequence concluded that future occupiers would be car-dependent and that a lower level of off-road parking provision has not been sufficiently justified." The applicant has submitted a supporting statement with further information on this.

9.4.3 The site is located within walking distance to the local centre of Leverstock Green, Hemel Hempstead and proximate to local public transport facilities (bus network). The urban nature of the site means that occupiers would be within walking and cycling distance from a local retail

centre, public houses and employment opportunities (Maylands Business Park). In light of the above, it is considered that the application site is considered to benefit from a sustainable location where flexibility of parking standards could be applied. The addition of one new dwelling is not considered to result in adverse levels of parking stress and highway safety above existing conditions.

9.4.4 The applicant has laid grasscrete to ensure that the verge is not damaged by vehicles accessing the parking spaces. However, it should be noted that the deed of easement (Paragraph 3.1.1.3), which allows vehicular access to the site across the common land, does not allow for parking in this area.

9.4.5 The application site is considered to benefit from a sustainable location where flexibility of parking standards could be applied. It is noted that other dwellings fronting the green do not have private parking provision however the addition of one new dwelling is not considered to result in adverse levels of parking stress and highway safety above existing conditions.

9.4.6 The condition suggested by the highway authority requiring the submission of a Construction Management Plan would be reasonable and shall be attached if planning permission is granted.

9.4.7 In summary, the proposal would accord with the aims of Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy 58 of the Local Plan.

#### Impact on Heritage Assets

9.5 Policies relating to the protection of heritage assets are only relevant as the application site and the terrace row as a whole is considered as being of historical and architectural merit. It is however noted that the terrace row (including the application site) is not statutorily listed and does not fall within a designated Conservation Area. Given the historical and architectural merit of the terrace row, it would be reasonable to apply the objectives of Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy 119 of the Local Plan in assessing the proposal.

9.5.1 Based on the comments from Conservation and Design, the proposals would represent a sympathetic addition to the terrace in terms of form and detailing. The terrace displays consistent punctuation, aperture and chimney separation at its south-eastern end. However, at the opposite end on the application site it differs slightly.

9.5.2 The proposed end-of-terrace feature that would continue the principal building elevation would generally reinstate proportions, particularly wall-to-window ratios and design that is evident at the terrace's other end. Due to the length of the terrace the replicated punctuation within the main part of the development may not be readily appreciated as a whole, however the addition would provide an appropriate, and improved termination to the north-western end of the terrace compared with the existing addition, and adopting this design detail is commended.

9.5.3 Any development to the side of the terrace given its prominence should be carefully considered. The proposed north-western side elevation would mimic the gable of the existing property in terms of scale, but would provide an additional modest two-storey extension to the rear. Consideration of the exposed side elevation is important due to its prominence, and therefore any development to the side of the building

9.5.4 The cumulative impact of additions to the terrace would not raise any concerns, as the main consideration in assessing the impact on heritage assets is the design and external appearance of the development relative to the terrace, particularly in the context of the surrounding later residential development.

9.5.5 The character of the rear of the terrace would be significantly different to the front and side elevations and has been subject to various extensions and alterations over its length. In terms of overall form and proportions this would not detract from the building group or affect the more prominent elevations of the terrace.

9.5.6 Conservation and Design comments set out that the proposals would have a minimal to low impact on the value of the terrace and in light of the design and external appearance of the development as described above, when considered also in the context of policy support for new residential development, the proposal would be acceptable on this basis in accordance with Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy 119 of the Local Plan.

#### Impact on Visual Amenity

9.6 Based on the assessment above, the proposal is considered to represent an appropriate addition within the street scene of Leverstock Green Road and surrounding public vantage points. It is important to note that the proposed dwelling that would continue the main terrace in terms of form and design detail would achieve a suitable level of integration with the street scene and surrounding area.

9.6.1 As set out above, the exposed side elevation of the building is particularly prominent on the approach to the application site from the roundabout with St Albans Road, Breakspear Way and Maylands Avenue (from the north) and the forms of the development would be acceptable when viewed in the context of this street scene. The rear element would be appropriately set back and the main gable outline of the terrace would be appreciated in its majority.

9.6.2 As a result of the design and siting of the development, the main terrace would remain prominent from the perspective of the street scene as appropriate. The proposal has therefore demonstrated that the development would respond well to this aesthetically-sensitive and prominent site.

9.6.3 If planning permission is granted, it shall be subject to conditions requiring materials to match those of the existing dwelling and for further details to be supplied to ensure the suitable integration of the development within the terrace.

9.6.4 As such, the proposal would accord with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy with respect to its impact on the street scene.

#### Impact on Residential Amenity

9.7 The application site has four directly adjoining properties, including the adjoining mid-terrace dwelling at No. 4 Hillside Cottages, two dwellings immediately to the rear at Nos. 52 and 71 Crossfell Road, and No. 3a Hillside Cottages shares the boundary at the western corner of the application site. Further west of the application site is No. 2 Hillside Cottages from which the development area would be visible. Each shall be discussed in turn.

9.7.1 The daylight and sunlight tests normally used by Local Planning Authorities are set out in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) document ‘Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to good practice (2011)’. The BRE guide gives two helpful rules of thumb (25° or 45° tests) which determine whether or not further detailed daylight and sunlight tests are required. No. 4 Hillside Cottages has been extended to the rear at single-storey level, and therefore the proposed two-storey rear extension to the existing dwelling would not result in adverse levels of visual intrusion or loss of light from the nearest ground floor habitable room windows. The building of the proposed new dwelling would be located on the far side of the site relative to this neighbouring property and would not give rise to any concerns relating to residential amenity of No. 4. It is considered that there would be no significant loss of daylight or sunlight to the neighbouring properties.

9.7.2 The proposed development would exceed the minimum 23m separation under saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan between the rear walls of the proposed dwelling and extension relative to the main rear walls of the semi-detached properties at Nos. 52 and 71 Crossfell Road. This would ensure that although the building and two-storey wall would be extended and brought closer to these properties, there would be sufficient separation and visual relief to address matters relating to overlooking, visual intrusion or loss of light. It is also important to note that the proposed dwelling and extension would be sited on the same level as the terrace row which is below rear garden level. This would also assist in reducing the impact of development from the perspective of neighbours to the rear. The width of the two nearest dwellings on Crossfell Road would further serve to mitigate against the impact of the development.

9.7.3 The neighbouring dwelling at No. 3a Hillside Cottages is located to the south-west of the site, angled slightly towards the development area however its main outlook is also directed down the established shared driveway towards Leverstock Green Road. Similarly, the proposed development, in particular the rear projecting element of the new dwelling would achieve a minimum 23m separation to the nearest windows of No. 3a which would be sufficient in avoiding unreasonable levels of overlooking or visual intrusion. At this distance the development would not raise any concerns with respect to loss of light.

9.7.4 No. 2 Hillside Cottages has its main outlook towards the established hedge marking the frontage of the staggered terrace, however the application site is visible with periphery views available looking in an easterly direction from this neighbour's windows. The separation distance between the development and this property is further increased beyond that of its neighbours at No. 3a Hillside Cottages and Nos. 52 and 71 Crossfell Road, therefore the proposed buildings would not give rise to any unacceptable overlooking, visual intrusion or loss of light from this perspective.

9.7.5 It is acknowledged that the properties at Nos. 2 and 3a Hillside Cottages enjoy an element of open outlook created by the gap to the side of the existing dwelling at No. 3 Hillside Cottages (the application site), and that the proposed development would result in a greater amount of building that would be readily visible from within these dwellings. However, the amount and siting of development proposed at the application site would not result in significant additional visual bulk above existing conditions and the development therefore would not be unacceptably harmful in this regard.

9.7.6 It follows that the proposed development would not harm the residential amenities of surrounding neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

9.7.7 If planning permission is granted in the interests of safeguarding the residential amenity of the locality it would be reasonable to remove permitted development rights relating to Classes A and B for extensions and roof extensions, respectively.

### Landscaping

9.8 Every effort should be made to retain as much boundary vegetation on the northern side boundary which is prominent in the street scene particularly approaching the site from the north along Leverstock Green Road. As such, if planning permission is granted, it would be subject to a landscaping condition requiring further details of tree protection and any planting to offset vegetation loss.

### Response to Neighbour comments

9.9 These points have been addressed above.

### Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.10 The application is CIL liable if it were to be approved and implemented. 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.

9.10.1 The Charging Schedule clarifies that the site is in Zone 3 within which a charge of £100 per square metre is applicable to this development. The CIL is calculated on the basis of the net increase in internal floor area. CIL relief is available for affordable housing, charities and Self Builders and may be claimed using the appropriate forms.

## 10. Conclusions

10.1 The proposal to provided a new end-of-terrace dwelling and extend the existing property would represent appropriate development. The proposed scheme in its context and would not compromise the characteristics of the locality and would not give rise to significant highway safety concerns. Proposed car parking arrangements are sufficient considering the sites proximity to the local centre and other services. There would be no serious impacts on visual or residential amenity. As such, the development would be in accordance with the aims of the NPPF, Policies CS1, CS4, CS8, CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2006-2031, saved Policies 10, 18, 21, 51, 54 and 58 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011 and the other associated guidance mentioned within this report.

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

### Conditions

No	Condition
1	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.</p> <p>Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p>
2	<p>Construction of the dwelling hereby permitted shall not commence until the following details have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority:</p> <p>Materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building, including bricks, chimneys, roof tiles, rainwater goods;</p> <p>Design details including brick bond, window heads, cills and eaves details which can be provided at a metric scale of 1:20;</p> <p>Joinery work and finishes.</p> <p>Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the character and appearance of the building group in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013 and saved Policy 119 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.</p>
3	<p>The materials (bricks, roof tiles, rainwater goods) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match in size, colour and texture those used on the existing building at No. 3 Hillside Cottages.</p> <p>Design details of the building shall also match those of the existing building including</p>

	<p>brick bond, window heads, cills and eaves details. New joinery work shall match the materials, dimensions and profiles of existing work within the existing dwelling.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the character and appearance of the building group in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013 and saved Policy 119 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.</p>
4	<p>No construction works (excluding groundworks) shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include:</p> <p>details for all external hard surfaces within the site, including roads, drainage detail and car parking areas;</p> <p>means of enclosure;</p> <p>soft landscape works which shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate;</p> <p>trees to be retained and measures for their protection during construction works including boundary vegetation;</p> <p>provision of additional planting to offset vegetation removal; and</p> <p>proposed finished levels or contours across the site.</p> <p>The approved landscape works shall be carried out prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy and saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.</p>
5	<p>Any tree or shrub which forms part of the approved landscaping scheme which within a period of five years from planting fails to become established, becomes seriously damaged or diseased, dies or for any reason is removed shall be replaced in the next planting season by a tree or shrub of a species, size and maturity to be approved by 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 Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013 and saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.</p>
6	<p>Prior to the commencement of the site works the applicant shall submit a Construction Management Plan setting out details of on-site parking for all contractors, sub-contractors, visitors and delivery vehicles, storage of materials to be approved in writing by the local planning authority and that area shall be maintained available for use at all times during the period of site works.</p> <p>Reason: To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway particularly the classified road (Leverstock Green Road) and noting the site constraints and land ownership of the green immediately in front of the site and associated parking restrictions, in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS9 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013.</p>
7	<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 further development of the dwelling hereby permitted falling</p>

	<p>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 and B</p> <p>Reason: To enable the local planning authority to retain control over the development in the interests of safeguarding the residential and visual amenity of the locality in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013.</p>
8	<p>The proposed parking spaces shall have measurements of at least 2.4m x 4.8m. Such spaces shall be maintained as a permanent ancillary to the development shall be paved and shall be used for no other purpose.</p> <p>Reason: The above condition is required to ensure the adequate provision of off-street parking at all times in order to minimise the impact on the safe and efficient operation of the adjoining highway in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013 and to ensure the adequate and satisfactory provision of off-street vehicle parking facilities in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013 and saved Policy 58 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.</p>
9	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:</p> <p>02 03 04 05 06 07 08</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p> <p><b>Article 35 Statement</b></p> <p>Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted proactively through positive discussion with the applicant during the determination stage which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted proactively in line with the requirements of the NPPF (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015.</p> <p><b>Ecology Informatives</b></p> <p>The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (section 1), it is an offence to remove, damage, or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built. Planning consent for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act.</p> <p>Trees and scrub within and immediately surrounding the site may contain nesting birds between 1st March and 31st August to early September inclusive. Works to trees or which may have an impact on trees including any approved vegetation clearance or construction of boundary fencing or retaining walls should be undertaken outside of the bird breeding season during the dates above.</p> <p><b>Construction of Access Informatives</b></p>

Separate consent may be required if works, particularly hardstanding over the green, would impede access to common land or for works for the resurfacing of land. If this applies, consent must be sought from the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. Further guidance can be obtained via the following link:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/carrying-out-works-on-common-land>

#### Highways Informatives

AN1. 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.

AN2. Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website: <http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

#### Thames Water Informatives

#### Waste Comments

Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0800 009 3921. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

Legal changes under The Water Industry (Scheme for the Adoption of private sewers) Regulations 2011 mean that the sections of pipes you share with your neighbours, or are situated outside of your property boundary which connect to a public sewer are likely to have transferred to Thames Water's ownership. Should your proposed building work fall within 3 metres of these pipes we recommend you email us a scaled ground floor plan of your property showing the proposed work and the complete sewer layout to [developer.services@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:developer.services@thameswater.co.uk) to determine if a building over / near

	<p>to agreement is required.</p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>Construction Informatives</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1). Noise on Construction/Demolition Sites - The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Control of Pollution Act 1974 relating to the control of noise on construction and demolition sites.</li> <li>2). Construction Hours of Working – (Plant &amp; Machinery) - In accordance with the councils adopted criteria, all noisy works associated with site demolition, site preparation and construction works shall be limited to the following hours: 0730hrs to 1830hrs on Monday to Saturdays, no works are permitted at any time on Sundays or bank holidays.</li> <li>3). Construction Dust - Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or by carrying out other such works that may be necessary to suppress dust. Visual monitoring of dust is to be carried out continuously and Best Practical Means (BPM) should be used at all times. The applicant is advised to consider the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance, produced in partnership by the Greater London Authority and London Councils.</li> </ol>
--	--

## **Appendix A**

### **Consultation Responses**

#### Trees and 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.

#### Leverstock Green Village Association

The LGVA has reviewed this application and is strongly opposed to this latest proposal to construct a two-storey side extension to the existing terrace of cottages. These character dwellings are an important part of the heritage of Leverstock Green and are located in a highly prominent location as you enter the village. Consequently, the LGVA believes that the proposal would constitute an unsuitable and incongruous over-development of the site.

The design of the extension includes a 'car port' under the end of the building. We consider that this feature is totally inappropriate and would seriously detract from the character appearance of the cottage. Furthermore, we are not convinced that the extension would sufficiently match the existing terrace.

The lack of suitable parking for the existing cottages continues to be a major problem. The occupants have habitually parked their cars on the common land between the cottages and the A4147. In wet weather, particularly during the winter, the grassed area becomes badly damaged

and rutted which is both unsightly and creates a mud hazard on the footpath leading to the village centre and the school in Green Lane.

Although the ‘car port’ would provide parking for up to two cars, the overall parking provision for the existing cottages would not be improved. The Planning Inspector rejected the previous application because the parking situation was unsatisfactory, and the application does not adequately redress this deficiency.

In summary, the LGVA believes that the new application constitutes inappropriate over-development in a conspicuous area of the village and should be rejected. Moreover, the LGVA concludes that the basis on which the Planning Inspector rejected the previous application has not been materially changed and consequently his decision should be upheld.

#### Comments on amended plans

The LGVA has examined the proposed changes, and we consider that the amended drawings do not significantly change the situation. The extension to the terrace of cottages remains an inappropriate and incongruous over-development of the site.

However, most importantly, the overall parking situation is still inadequate, and the basis of the Planning Inspector’s rejection of application 4/00937/16/FUL continues to apply.

In summary, the LGVA remains strongly opposed to this planning application and recommends that it should be refused.

#### Herts Property Services

Herts Property Services do not have any comments to make in relation to financial contributions required by the Toolkit, as this development is situated within Dacorum CIL Zone 3 and does not fall within any of the CIL Reg123 exclusions. Notwithstanding this, we reserve the right to seek Community Infrastructure Levy contributions towards the provision of infrastructure as outlined in your R123 List through the appropriate channels.

I trust the above is of assistance if you require any further information please contact me or the planning obligations team ([growth@hertfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:growth@hertfordshire.gov.uk)).

#### Conservation and Design

The car port element would not be acceptable, as it would be completely out-of-keeping with the character of the row of terraced houses. This would be detrimental to the entrance to Leverstock Green. If they wanted a 2-bedroom property, rather than the 3-bed, they could, in my view, achieve it with the parking adjacent. In effect, an additional matching terraced house could be added and I do not feel we would object.

#### Comments on amended plans

I can confirm that the revised proposals with the car parking to the side would be acceptable. I would recommend that the materials, joinery details and finishes are conditioned to match the existing.

#### Hertfordshire Highways

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 subject to the following conditions:

Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not object to the development, subject to the conditions and informative notes below.

#### CONDITIONS:

1. The proposed parking spaces shall have measurements of 2.4m x 4.8m. Such spaces shall be maintained as a permanent ancillary to the development shall be paved and shall be used for no other purpose.

Reason: The above condition is required to ensure the adequate provision of off-street parking at all times in order to minimise the impact on the safe and efficient operation of the adjoining Highway.

2. Before the premises are occupied all on site vehicular areas shall be surfaced in a manner to the Local Planning Authority's approval so as to ensure satisfactory parking of vehicles outside highway limits. Arrangements shall be made for surface water from the site to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge into the highway.

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction, and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the premises.

3. Prior to the commencement of the site works the applicant shall submit a construction management plan setting out details of on-site parking for all contractors, sub-contractors, visitors and delivery vehicles, storage of materials to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority and that area shall be maintained available for use at all times during the period of site works.

Reason: - To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway

The Highway Authority would ask that the following note to the applicant be appended to any consent issued by the local planning authority: -

#### 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 application is for permission for the construction of a two-storey rear extension to existing dwelling and addition of two-storey side extension to create a new dwelling.

#### ACCESS

The response to question 6 in the application form indicate that there is no proposal to alter any vehicular or pedestrian access.

The design and access statement says that 'Cyclists and pedestrians will have immediate access from the existing public footpath which runs parallel to the cottages. Vehicle access is permitted to the plot across the green via a Deed of Easement and an agreed design will be negotiated with the appropriate authority'.

The applicant has not provided any evidence of either the easement or who the appropriate authority is. At present the highway recommendation is based on the details provided in the application.

## PARKING

Constructing the new property will remove the existing off road parking for the property. Two spaces would be created for the new property. It is noted that no parking existed at the time of the previous 2016 scheme (see 4/00937/16/FUL). A parking area has subsequently been added following the refusal of this application.

The Manual for Streets states in paragraphs 8.3.48 to 8.3.58. p110 that the recommended dimensions of off-street parking bays are that they are laid out as a rectangle at least 4.8 m long by 2.4 m wide for the vehicle, along with additional space as set out in DfT document Inclusive Mobility.

Appropriate parking levels are within the remit of the LPA.

## SITE AND SURROUNDING

The site is located in large play/amenity area known as Leverstock Green. There is an existing crossover to provide vehicular access to Sheppesey Cottages. There is another dropped kerb and hardstanding up to a footpath which runs across the green and parallel to existing vehicular access to Sheppesey Cottages.

The local residents have confirmed that the dropped kerb has been in place over a number of years. The crossover and the short hardstanding may have originally been used for grounds maintenance and grass cutting of the green and not to provide vehicular access to the cottages.

Leverstock Green Road, which runs adjacent to the green, is A4147 which is a main distributor road (principle road) and the County Council's policy 5 in its Local Transport Plan is not to permit new access from a principle "A" Road.

## CONCLUSION

Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority considers the proposal would not have a severe residual impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways, subject to the conditions and informative notes above.

### Councillor Graham Sutton

There is ongoing concerns about this development so, if you are minded to approve this application I would like it to be called in to give the concerned residents the opportunity to voice their views.

## Appendix B

### Neighbour Notification/Site Notice Responses

## **Objections**

### Ridgefield, Leverstock Green Road, Hemel Hempstead, HP3 8QD

This re-application is not materially different from the previous application.

Indeed the rewording now states the application is for 'a two storey side extension' rather than the previous '3 bed dwelling'. This is pure semantics and does not alter the fact that there will be insufficient parking spaces for all vehicles without driving across the grass verge and/or result in aggravating the existing parking congestion.

It is not clear from the application how many parking spaces are ADDITIONAL to the two existing.

In conclusion, I consider all of the comments and objections made against the previous application still apply.

### Wenscot, Leverstock Green Road, Hemel Hempstead, Herts HP3 8QD

I object to the development proposed because :

- there remains insufficient parking facility, within the bounds of the site. Use of the common land in front of the development is not a permitted use and cannot be assumed to be allowed
- the design and construction and materials of the proposed building does not match or even become sympathetic with the buildings to which the development will be attached.

### Comments on amended plans

The revised proposals still does not deal with the fundamentals of why the issue has been previously rejected at all planning levels

Nothing in the proposals deals with any of the reasons upon which rejection has been based

Accordingly I object again to this proposal because:-

- there remains insufficient parking facility, within the bounds of the site. Use of the common land in front of the development is not a permitted use and cannot be assumed to be allowed
- the design and construction and materials of the proposed building does not match or even become sympathetic with the buildings to which the development will be attached.
- the site, in my opinion would become over-developed.

### Amberley, 2 Hillside Cottages, Leverstock Green Road, Hemel Hempstead, HP3 8QB

This latest amended application, is essentially no different from that which was dismissed at Appeal in March 2018.

Again the Developer completely fails to recognise the serious consequences to highway and public safety and amenity.

Were an additional new dwelling constructed it would leave no.3 Hillside Cottages without any allocated parking whatsoever. Moreover, the Developer intends to extend no.3, resulting in the very real likelihood of even more vehicles!

Remarkably, it appears the Developer is seeking to defy the conclusive refusals already formally determined by each of the following three authorities (central to which was the critical issue of unlawful and obstructive parking at the historic 3 to 6 Hillside Cottages):

1. Dacorum Management Committee at its meeting on 17th August 2017 (Planning Application Ref: 4/00937/16/FUL).
2. Appeal Statement of Dacorum Borough Council submitted by Planning Case Officer Mr Martin Stickley in January 2018.
3. The Planning Inspectorate's Appeal Dismissal per Inspector Mr Robert Fallon's report dated 28th March 2018 (Appeal Ref: APP/A1910/W/17/3189814).

May we respectfully suggest that, since the contents of our earlier letters to Planning Case Officer Mr Martin Stickley on 27th June 2017 and 6th August 2018, together with the previous written submissions of other concerned parties, apply equally to this amended application, they should also be taken fully into account.

This latest proposed development is still a direct contravention of the principles of Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan.

We therefore ask that the entire Application finally be refused, on the basis that it does nothing to address, and would in fact exacerbate, the already disruptive and hazardous parking chaos.

Currently the Applicant's three bedroom property, no.3 Hillside Cottages, has in curtilage purpose built vehicle hardstanding (immediately adjacent to the North Western gable) measuring approx. 8.50 metres wide which is able to accomodate up to three cars side by side.

This eminently satisfactory arrangement would be completely lost by an additional three bedroom house built in its place, with its inferior parking provision of just two spaces in tandem. (with all the hazardous manoeuvring difficulties that would present).

Meanwhile no.3 (which the applicant plans to extend) would have lost its entire parking allocation!

This amended planning application does not adequately address the substantive content of the Appeal Statement of Dacorum Borough Council (prepared and submitted by Planning Case Officer Mr Martin Stickley in January 2018) in relation to the previous failed planning application Ref: 4/00937/16/FUL.

As it still does not fulfill the essential needs of Policy: CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004), and to accord with the credibility of the Local Planning Authority it should again be refused.

#### 42 Pancake Lane, Hemel Hempstead, Herts, HP2 4NQ

My objections to this proposal remain the same - namely the impact on highway safety, already inadequate parking and access.

In addition to the above, a new dwelling is not in keeping with the look of the other cottages and will deter immensely from the history of the properties and indeed the village.

#### 2 Hillside Cottages, Leverstock Green Road, Hemel Hempstead, HP3 8QB

With reference to your letter dated 31st July 2018 notifying us of another planning application on

the above site, we have inspected plans and documents as invited, and can see no substantive difference from the previous unsuccessful Application and subsequent Appeal; both of which met with universal condemnation by all respondents. It is effectively the same, and fails to address fully the fundamental reasons for both the Refusal by Dacorum Management Committee on 17th August 2017 and the Appeal Dismissal on 28th March 2018 (References: 4/00937/16/FUL and APP/A1910/W/17/3189814 respectively).

Other than a ‘subtle change’ to the wording of the heading, implying an innocuous... *side extension...*, which is in fact still a new ...*3-Bed Dwelling...* , and the addition of a second parking space there really is no principal difference. The same serious consequences would result.

Moreover, the parking arrangement for the new proposed house would create its own problems due to its tandem layout: when the front vehicle wishes to exit, the second vehicle would have to manoeuvre (most likely reversing) onto the public grass area and pavement, as it would be wholly impracticable and potentially extremely hazardous to attempt to use/block the busy A4147.

We consider the comments, observations and objections contained in our letter to Planning and Regeneration dated 27th June 2017 (Planning Application Ref: 4/00937/16/FUL) remain pertinent and apply equally to this latest Application.

Furthermore, the ‘carport’ style of the latest proposed additional dwelling is architecturally incongruous with the period character of the terrace run of early to mid 19th century cottages.

More importantly both the Appeal Statement of DBC, submitted to the Planning Inspectorate by Mr Martin Stickley in January 2018, and the Appeal Decision by The Planning Inspectorate’s Inspector Mr Robert Fallon dated 28th March 2018, contain detailed and conclusive reasons which highlight the unsuitability of such a development and the unacceptable consequences it would have on its immediate location.

The following extracts from Paragraphs 9, 10, 11 and 15 of the Inspector’s report, in particular, demonstrate an overwhelming case for this latest Application also to be refused:

Para 9. ...*Although the development would provide off-road parking space for the proposed house, none would be provided for the existing dwelling the applicant proposes to extend. The scheme would accordingly result in a significantly lower level of off-road parking provision than required by Appendix 5...*

Para 10...*Furthermore, I have no evidence before me of any surveys to demonstrate that parking congestion does not exist in front of the terrace and details of where existing and future residents would park their vehicles if the scheme was allowed and additional demands were placed on the grass verge....*

Para 11....*On the basis of the evidence before me, I am not therefore satisfied that it has been demonstrated that the grass verge in front of the terrace does not experience parking congestion, give rise to conflict with other owners of parked cars, and be harmful to the amenities of existing and future residents...*

Para 15...*In view of the above, I have concluded that it has not been demonstrated; - (a) that the development would provide sufficient parking for existing and future occupiers of the existing and proposed dwellings; and (b) that it would not give rise to undue parking congestion in the area. The proposal would as a consequence be harmful to the amenities of future and neighbouring occupiers and not accord with policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan, which collectively seek, amongst other things to ensure that new development*

*provides a sufficient level of parking for new development....*

Whilst writing we should also comment on some of the detail contained within the Applicant's Application:

Application for Planning Permission Form:

Box 3. States: ...*two/three off road parking spaces.. whereas Drawing No 02 shows just two?*

Box 10. States: Total Existing Parking: ...*none...*, in fact there is off road hard standing providing parallel (side by side) parking for two vehicles in the garden to the side of no 3 Hillside Cottages, resulting from work carried out by the Applicant which commenced in November 2017.

This seemed to be an eminently sensible and helpful measure although, unfortunately, the occupants still persist in regularly parking two additional cars on the grass verge. However it would, of course, be completely lost were this application to be approved, leaving the occupants of an enlarged/extended no 3 Hillside Cottages with absolutely no parking whatsoever!

We hope we have provided sufficient helpful information to enable Planning and Regeneration to refuse this inappropriate Application.

3a Hillside Cottages, Leverstock Green Road, Hemel Hempstead, HP3 8QB

We wish to object on the following grounds:-

1. Highway safety, inadequate parking and access.
2. Visual impact and detrimental impact upon residential amenities.

The impact of this application will be the same as the last one which was refused by not only Dacorum Borough Council but the Planning Inspectorate.

Full details of our objections have been submitted to the Planning Case Officer in a letter dated 13 August 2018.

The application would appear to be very similar to that of the last one which was refused in August 2017 which was for a two storey extension to the rear of No. 3 Hillside cottages and the addition of a 3 bed dwelling to the side of No. 3 Hillside Cottages (Ref: 4/00937/16/FUL 9). You will recall that the Dacorum Management Committee refused that application on the same site on 17 Aug 2017 and the subsequent Appeal was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on 28 March 2018 (Ref: APP/A1910/W/17/3189814) because of inadequate off road parking for the existing properties and that of the proposed dwelling. The impact of new proposal will be the same as the refused one of last year and fails to address the fundamental reasons for both the Management Committee's refusal and the Appeal Dismissal .

We find ourselves in the disappointing and frustrating position of having to reiterate the same objections and concerns as we did with the last application.

After carefully considering the plans we wish to make you aware of a number of very strong objections that we have to the proposed two storey side extension to create a new dwelling adjoining 3 Hillside Cottages. As both long standing residents of Leverstock Green and an immediate neighbour of the proposed development, we are of the view that the proposed development will be harmful to our amenities and will have a detrimental impact upon the wider community. Our specific objections are as follows:-

Highway safety, inadequate parking and access

*Core Strategy (Adopted 2013) Policy CS12: Quality of Site Design: "On each site development should: (a) provide a safe and satisfactory means of access for all users; (b) provide sufficient parking and sufficient space for servicing;"*

*Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011 Parking Provision A5.16 Design and Layout: "All parking should be arranged so as not to endanger the safety of pedestrians and other road users."*

We believe the proposed development is a direct contravention of these policies.

The proposed development does not provide sufficient off-road parking spaces to accommodate the additional vehicles associated with a further 3 bed dwelling adjoining the existing three properties, none of which has adequate off-road parking provision. It is important to appreciate the row of terraced cottages as a whole and acknowledge that the proposed off road parking that the application promises, will in fact occupy the current off road parking that has been provided for the existing house (3 Hillside Cottages). Therefore not only will there be no net gain in the number of parking spaces provided, but there will be a significant number of additional vehicles that the new 3 bedroom property will inevitably bring.

The Cottages are located on the busy main road through Leverstock Green (A4147). Owing to the limited off-road parking provision, the current owners of, and visitors to, the existing three cottages park their vehicles on the public grassed verges in front of the cottages and adjacent to the A4147. It is noteworthy that the current owners of No. 3 regularly have to accommodate 4 cars. Where does the applicant plan on parking these vehicles if the proposed development were to go ahead?

The current lack of adequate parking and nuisance this creates should not in our view, be aggravated by additional vehicles this development will bring. The proposed new dwelling does include off-street parking, however this does nothing to alleviate the existing parking and access difficulties and actually creates further problems. The applicant has recently created off road parking (2 spaces) in the garden to the side of no. 3 Hillside Cottages, however there are still regularly a further two vehicles relating to this property, parked on the grass verge adjacent to the A4147, as well as vehicles from the other cottages (Fig. 1 illustrates). Further, the proposed addition of a two storey side extension to create a new dwelling will be located where the off street parking for no.3 has been constructed. So despite the alleged creation of 2 off road spaces, there will, in reality still be **no** off street parking for the inhabitants of no. 3 or no. 4 Hillside Cottages.

Simply put, the row of cottages which share the site do not have sufficient off road parking to support the existing number of vehicles; adding a further dwelling, and the related vehicles this will bring, is therefore entirely inappropriate and unacceptable.

Adding further vehicles to the already heavily congested space in front of nos. 3, 4 and 5 Hillside Cottages will result in an increased danger to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.

Parked vehicles make the task of turning onto the busy A4147 from the driveway to and from Nos. 1, 2 and 3a Hillside Cottages extremely hazardous. On occasions the only way to see if the road is clear is to nose onto the carriageway.

Insufficient parking space will adversely affect the amenity of the surrounding properties through inconsiderate and dangerous parking on grass verges and common land in front of Hillside Cottages.

We believe it is the duty of the Local Authority Planning department to refuse this application in order to prevent the intolerable situation getting any worse.

Visual impact and detrimental impact upon residential amenities

*Core Strategy (Adopted 2013) Policy CS12: Quality of Site Design: “On each site development should: (f) integrate with the streetscape character; and (g) respect adjoining properties in terms of: (viii) landscaping and amenity space.”*

*Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011 Small-scale Housing Extensions A7.2: “Extensions should harmonise with the existing house and the surrounding area in the following respects: .....(ii) Surrounding Area: An extension should maintain the common design characteristics of the row or street within which a house is located, with particular regard to: .....(b) building pattern – if a row of houses of uniform design and building line forms an attractive group in the street scene, then extensions should not detract from this group effect;”*

We believe the proposed development is a direct contravention of these policies.

The existing cottages are an attractive and historic part of Leverstock Green. In our view the proposal to add a two storey side extension to create a new dwelling to the side of 3 Hillside Cottages which features a carport will not be in keeping with the existing row of 19<sup>th</sup> century cottages.

It is our view that the conditions set out in Appendix 7 (Small –scale Housing Extensions) are pertinent to this application and that the addition of a side extension with carport to the row of 19th Century cottages is in direct contravention of this policy.

The existing row of cottages comprises some of the oldest properties in the heart of Leverstock Green. Adding a further, 3 bedroom property will have a detrimental impact on the character of the village, transforming an attractive feature of three cottages into a ‘barracks’ of four dwellings.

The site is small and the proposed additional property would have an oppressive, overbearing and intrusive impact on the surrounding area and properties to the rear and side, with previously secluded and private properties being overlooked.

The erection of an ‘L’ shaped end of terrace house with carport will not harmonise with the original design and character of the existing row of cottages. Attaching a new-build dwelling to a row of cottages of historical interest will have a negative impact on the attractive street scene.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, both the Appeal Statement of DBC, submitted to the Planning Inspectorate by Mr Martin Stickley in January 2018, and the Appeal Decision by The Planning Inspectorate’s Inspector Mr Robert Fallon dated 28th March 2018, contain emphatic reasons for the unsuitability of such a development and the unacceptable impact it would have on its immediate location. I have extracted and quoted below the Appeal Decision:-

*Paragraph 9 - Although the development would provide off-road parking space for the proposed house, none would be provided for the existing dwelling the applicant proposes to extend. The scheme would accordingly result in a significantly lower level of off-road parking provision than required by Appendix 5.*

*Paragraph 10 - The appellant has acknowledged in their appeal statement that off road parking for the terrace is insufficient and that as a consequence, a number of residents park on the grass verge. The appellant says that this results in the verge becoming ‘very muddy’.....Furthermore, I have no evidence before me of any surveys to demonstrate that parking congestion does not exist in front of the terrace and details of where existing and future residents would park their vehicles if the scheme was allowed and additional demands were placed on the grass verge.*

*Paragraph 11 - On the basis of the evidence before me, I am not therefore satisfied that it has been demonstrated that the grass verge in front of the terrace does not experience parking congestion, give rise to conflict with other owners of parked cars, and be harmful to the amenities of existing and future residents.*

*Para 15 - In view of the above, I have concluded that it has not been demonstrated; - (a) that the development would provide sufficient parking for existing and future occupiers of the existing and proposed dwellings; and (b) that it would not give rise to undue parking congestion in the area. The proposal would as a consequence be harmful to the amenities of future and neighbouring occupiers and not accord with policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan, which collectively seek, amongst other things to ensure that new development provides a sufficient level of parking for new development.*

The reasons provided above from the Appeal Decision are applicable to the current application and we do therefore hope that these, along with our other objections will be taken into consideration when deciding this application.

#### Comments on amended plans

The changes proposed do nothing to address the overriding issue of inadequate parking at the site of the row of cottages. Whilst the provision of two spaces to the proposed new house may appear to provide additional parking, the new house actually robs the existing house (number 3) of any off road parking; in effect 'robbing Peter to pay Paul'. The end result will be a new house with two off road parking spaces, but with NO parking provision whatsoever for numbers 3 and 4. Simply put, the site of this row of cottages cannot support the car parking demands of the existing dwellings let alone the additional cars a new dwelling will inevitably bring.

The contents of our previous letter dated 18 August 2018 (apart from references to the 'car port' design of the extension) apply equally to this amended application, and we therefore request they should also be taken fully into account when considering the above application.

#### 52 Crossfell Road

The proposed two storey side extension to create a new dwelling is not in character with a nineteen century cottage. Insufficient parking. A new dwelling would mean no parking provision for No3. Therefore, all cars parked on the grass verge causing concern to residents and pedestrians.

#### **Supporting**

##### 5-6 Hillside Cottages, Leverstock Green Road, Hemel Hempstead, HP3 8QB

I live at the other end of the row of cottages to this application (only 1 door away) and I am in full support of the application. Having lived in these cottages for some time, I take great personal pride in the character of them and having reviewed the plans, I think it will be a fantastic addition and in no way detrimental. The design is considerate and perfectly in keeping, plus the provision of 2 car parking spaces (and access to the rear garden) is more than adequate. Considering I live in such close proximity, I would be impacted more than most by any potential negatives, however I can see no drawbacks and I see no reason why this application should be refused. Please take my comments as strong support of this application.

##### 4 Hillside Cottages, Leverstock Green Road, Hemel Hempstead, HP3 8QB

As additional parking has now been added to the plans we see no reason to object and therefore support the new proposal

##### Leverstock House, Leverstock Green Road, Hemel Hempstead, HP3 8QL

I wish to offer my support to the recent planning application for an additional cottage on the western end of Hillside Cottages on Leverstock Green Road.

The original terrace consisted of four small cottages and the proposed development will still consist of only four cottages (due to No.5 & 6 now being one dwelling) and will retain the same elevations facing Leverstock Green Road.

Why this application has been hindered by the planning process is a mystery to me, since the application follows all existing planning guidelines.

It would be more beneficial if the planning department concentrated more on St Albans Councils development plans for their future housing needs in the Leverstock Green hinterland, than on permitted development areas.