

4/02075/18/FHA	DEMOLITION OF CONSERVATORY AND CONSTRUCTION OF A REAR EXTENSION AND A SIDE EXTENSION OVER GARAGE AND COMPLETE CHANGE OF ROOF TILES.
Site Address	3 OAKWOOD, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3NQ
Applicant	Mr K and Mrs S Gossal, 3 Oakwood
Case Officer	Elsbeth Palmer
Referral to Committee	Due to contrary view of Berkhamsted Town Council

1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**.

2. Summary

2.1 This householder application seeks planning permission for demolition of a rear conservatory, construction of a rear single storey extension and a first floor side extension over the garage, replacement external cladding, replacement windows, glazed balcony to bedroom 1 and change of roof tiles.

2.2 The site is located within a designated residential area of Berkhamsted wherein the principle of development is acceptable in accordance with Policies CS4 of the Core Strategy (2013).

2.3 Policies CS 11 and 12 seek to ensure quality in neighbourhood and site design. There would not be an adverse impact to neighbouring properties as a result of the proposals and satisfactory parking is provided on site. The design and form of the development would be contemporary in character within an area which already has some variety of housing types.

3. Site Description

3.1 The application site is located on the western side of Oakwood near to the intersection with Shootersway, Cross Oak Road and Denny's Lane, Berkhamsted. Across Denny's Lane to the east is Shootersway Playing Field.

3.2 The site comprises a large detached two storey dwelling built with brick and white timber cladding at first floor with attached garage. The dwelling is located towards the front of a large plot with adequate parking for at least two vehicles in front of the garage doors and two vehicles inside the garage.

3.3 The dwelling was originally built as part of the Oakwood estate - located to the west and rear of the subject site, however Nos. 1,2 and 3 Oakwood are built outside of the circular Oakwood estate and face onto a varied street scene. Nos. 1 and 2 are both tile hung at first floor in contrast to the white timber cladding of No.3.

3.4 In front of the row of 3 dwellings is an oval piece of amenity land with several trees which forms a barrier between the houses and the busy Shootersway.

4. Proposal

4.1 The householder application seeks planning permission for demolition of rear conservatory, construction of a single storey rear extension and a first floor side extension over the garage, replacement external cladding with vertical black charred timber, replacement windows, glazed balcony to bedroom 1, complete change of roof tiles from red pantiles to slate tiles and sedum roof to rear extension.

5. Relevant Planning History

4/02080/17/TPO WORKS TO TREE
Granted
07/09/2017

4/00307/10/TPO WORKS TO TREE
Granted
08/04/2010

6. Policies

6.1 National Policy Guidance

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

6.2 Adopted Core Strategy

NP1, CS1, CS4, CS11 and 12.

6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policies 10 and 13
Appendix 3,5 and 7.

6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

- Area Based Policies (May 2004) - Residential Character Area BCA 12:Shootersway
- 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

- HALTON DOTTED BLACK
- 10.7M AIR DIR LIMIT
- TREE PRESERVATION ORDER
- AREA OF SPECIAL CONTROL FOR ADVERTS
- CIL1
- Former Land Use

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 character of the dwelling
- Impact on street scene
- Impact on neighbours
- Impact on trees and landscaping
- Parking
- Other

Policy and Principle

9.2 The site is situated within the town of Berkhamsted wherein residential development is acceptable in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy subject to it complying with CS12.

9.3 The Berkhamsted Character Appraisal for this area BCA 12: Shootersway states that development within the plot in terms of extensions and detail is that there are no special requirements.

Impact on character of the dwelling

9.4 The proposed scheme will change the character of the dwelling from that of a more traditional style to a more contemporary design.

9.5 Currently the dwelling has brick at ground floor with white timber cladding to the first floor and pitched roofs to both the main dwelling, porch and single storey attached garage.

9.6 The proposal will result in a contemporary design with flat roofs over single storey extensions and with western red cedar at ground floor level with vertical charred timber cladding at first floor. The style of windows will be changed to a more modern design.

9.7 The proposed extensions are modest in scale and will not upset the balance of the dwelling. The main roof form will remain the same.

Impact on Street Scene

9.8 The proposal is small scale and will not project forward in a way that dominates in the street scene. There will be no increase in ridge height, bulk or scale.

9.9 The main impact on the street scene will be the change in character of the dwelling. This must be assessed in terms of the street scene in which No. 3 Oakwood belongs.

9.10 Properties on the circular Oakwood Estate typically feature two dominant and contrasting external materials, usually masonry at ground floor level and boarded cladding at first floor above. The subject site is outside of this area.

9.11 The dwellings adjacent to the site, across the road on Shootersway and near to the intersection of Cross Oak Road all vary in terms of materials and design.

9.12 Close to this intersection is a recently built contemporary dwelling called "Mariners" which has contrasting timber and white render. The Conservation and Design officer made the following comments on the application for "Mariners" in 2012. *"I consider this a well-considered design with good proportions, scale and massing. I fully support this design and consider it excellent contemporary postmodern design."*

9.13 The applicant could paint the existing first floor cladding black and the ground floor brickwork white under their permitted development rights.

9.14 The changes to the single storey roof design from pitched to flat would in themselves be considered small scale and an argument for their refusal would be difficult to sustain.

9.15 The NPPF states that "planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness."

9.16 Core Strategy (2013), Policies', CS1, CS4, CS10, CS11 and CS12 highlight the importance of good design in improving the character and quality of an area; seeking to ensure that developments are in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of size, mass, height and appearance.

9.17 The NPPF also states that "where the design of a development accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision-maker as a valid reason to object to development".

9.18 Finally the NPPF states that "in determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings".

9.19 Based on the above and a review of the streetscape character surrounding the subject site it is considered that the proposed scheme will not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area or the circular Oakwood estate to the west of the site and would therefore comply with the NPPF and relevant Core Strategy Policies.

Impact on neighbours

9.20 The proposal will not be overbearing or result in a significant loss of sunlight and daylight for the only adjacent neighbour No. 2 Oakwood. There are side windows at ground floor of No. 2 facing the first floor extension but due to the relationship of the two buildings and the fact that the room also has windows in the rear elevation there will be no significant loss of sunlight or daylight to this room.

9.21 The proposal has one tall window at first floor facing No. 2 Oakwood but as shown on the plans this window will be obscure glazed below 1.7 m to ensure that there will be no overlooking from this window.

9.22 The proposed balcony to the rear of the dwelling will not result in overlooking of the neighbours to the rear as they are well over the back to back distance required of 23m. The distances between the rear of No. 3 and the neighbours to the rear vary from 54m to 67m.

9.23 It is considered that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on the residential amenity of surrounding homes in terms of overlooking, loss of light or being overbearing. The proposal complies with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.24 No significant trees will be affected by the proposal.

Parking

9.25 The maximum parking standard for a 5 bedroom dwelling in this location is 3 spaces. The site has adequate provision for parking with a double garage and at least two spaces on a driveway in front of the property. There will be provision off street for 4 vehicles.

Other Material Planning Considerations

9.26 Ecology

Hertfordshire Ecology expressed a concern regarding Bats in the area and the impact of the proposal on Bats. After receipt of a Bat Report they are satisfied that an informative on any approval will suffice.

Response to Neighbour comments

9.27 These points have been addressed above and by the applicant in the report submitted on 17th October.

CIL

9.28 Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on 1 July 2015. This application is not CIL liable due to resulting in less than 100m² of additional floor space.

10. Conclusions

10.1 This householder application seeks planning permission for construction of a rear single storey extension and a first floor side extension over the garage, replacement external cladding, replacement windows, glazed balcony, change of roof tiles to slate and sedum roof to rear extension. The proposed scheme is reasonably modest in terms of scale but does change the appearance of the dwelling to a more contemporary design. It is considered in this area of Berkhamsted which has a variety of housing size and design that such a proposal is acceptable. There will be no loss of amenity for the adjacent neighbours as the proposal is reasonably small in scale and set well within the boundary of the site. The proposed scheme complies with CS 4, 12 and Saved Appendix Guidelines on householder extensions.

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 constructed in accordance with the materials specified on the approved drawings.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with CS 12.</p>
3	<p>The tall window at first floor level in the north side elevation of the extension hereby permitted shall be non opening and shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass below 1.7 metres from the finished floor level.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the amenity of adjoining residents namely to avoid any overlooking towards No. 2 Oakwood and to comply with CS 12.</p>
4	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:</p> <p>SITE LOCATION PLAN PROPOSED BLOCK PLAN Existing Ground Floor PLAN GEB5 /02.A Existing First Floor PLAN GEB5 /03.A Existing Elevations PLAN GEB5 /04.A Existing Side Elevations PLAN GEB5 /05 Proposed Ground Floor PLAN GEB5 /06.A Proposed First Floor PLAN GEB5 /07.A Proposed Elevations PLAN GEB5 /08.A Proposed Side ElevationsPLAN GEB5 /09 3D Sketch Visual PLAN GEB5 /10 Area of development PLAN GEB5 /11.A</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p> <p>Article 35 Statement</p> <p>Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.</p> <p>Informatives:</p> <p>Ecology</p> <p>If bats or evidence for them is discovered during the course of any works, work must stop immediately and advice sought on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England.</p> <p>Contaminated Land</p> <p>1). Construction Hours of Working – (Plant & Machinery) Informative 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.</p> <p>2). Construction Dust Informative Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or by</p>

<p>carrying out of 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.</p> <p>3). Noise on Construction/Demolition Sites Informative 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.</p> <p>4). Un-expected Contaminated Land Informative In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority with all works temporarily suspended because, the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.</p>

Appendix A

Consultation responses

Appendix B

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

Objections

Address	Comments
6 OAKWOOD, BERKHAMSTED,, HP4 3NQ	<p>I object to the plans for No3 Oakwood for two reasons:</p> <p>1. The proposed balcony will threaten mine and everybody else privacy opposite the property as it will give anyone on that balcony a clear line of sight over the fences into everyone's houses and bedrooms. For us it will be a problem mostly in the winter when the leaves fall from the trees. Oakwood houses are quite close to one another which, I believe, is why there are no balconies on the Oakwood houses.</p> <p>2. Secondly, the design of the building with charred black timber is not in keeping with the Oakwood Estate. Part of the charm and appeal of Oakwood is that it is an estate and benefits from the houses being different yet complementary as they are sympathetic to one another in style & colour . The design at no1 is entirely different, will jar with the rest of the buildings and, if permitted, will set s president that will stop Oakwood from continuing to be an estate in the future.</p> <p>I wish the new owners lots of health & happiness in their new home and hope that they make a beautiful, modern home for themselves, but I think the Oakwood Community would benefit</p>

	<p>if their architects' designs complemented the estate rather than jarred with it regarding the balcony and overall rendering.</p>
<p>8 OAKWOOD, BERKHAMSTED,, HP4 3NQ</p>	<p>Planning Application ref 4/02075/18/FHA 3 Oak Wood, Berkhamsted, HP4 3NQ</p> <p>We are writing in response to your letter of 21 August 2018 regarding the above planning application.</p> <p>We wish to register our objections to the plans as currently proposed for two main reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed architectural treatment is out of keeping with the rest of the Oak Wood estate and we believe the reference to other buildings in the Chilterns AONB is misleading and not relevant. 2. The introduction of a balcony to the rear of the building will cause a serious intrusion into the privacy of our property as the balcony has a direct line of sight from first floor level into our back garden. <p>With reference to the Design and Access Statement we would make the following comments;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 The DAS refers to the desire to update the external aesthetic but the proposed architectural treatment is completely out of keeping with the rest of the Oak Wood estate. 1.5 The DAS refers to an "...upgrade and enhancement..." to the "streetscene" but we feel it will be a harsh contrast to the adjacent properties 2.4 The DAS implies that the proposal reflects the existing weatherboard cladding but the proposed black timber cladding is a completely different aesthetic to the white boarding or tile hanging of the adjacent properties. 2.5 The DAS cites Mariners at the top of Cross Oak Road as a precedent however we feel that this is completely irrelevant. The houses in Cross Oak Road are all individual with no two properties being of a similar style. There is no visual link between Mariners and 3 Oak Wood and the proposed re-styled building sits directly alongside two houses that harmonise with the rest of Oak Wood. Other properties that have been altered and extended in Oak Wood and the adjacent roads have generally retained the general look of the estate and used sympathetic materials. 2.6 The DAS states that it has been "... strongly informed by...the existing building and wider setting...." however there are no other buildings in the immediate vicinity that have a similar aesthetic to that proposed. 3.1 States that there is a desire to update the layout and aesthetic but we believe the proposed scheme is completely out of context with neighbouring properties.

	<p>3.3 Refers to a modern interpretation of the black timbered barns of the Chilterns but we do not feel that has any relevance in this location.</p> <p>3.4 The DAS describes the sedum roof and the benefits it brings however the area is minimal and this seems to be a prime example of "green-wash" to give credibility to the application. There is no mention of any more meaningful examples of sustainable design such as low or zero carbon aspects of the scheme that would minimise energy consumption.</p> <p>3.6 The reference to the new balcony conveniently ignores the fact that it will overlook our property and those adjacent to us. We acknowledge there is an existing window in this location but a balcony will encourage people to dwell in that area which looks down into our garden.</p> <p>4.1 The DAS states that the scheme ".....is not detrimental to neighbouring properties...." but the scheme does not harmonise with adjacent properties and directly overlooks our garden.</p> <p>4.2 States that there will be "....no loss of privacy...to the adjacent properties." and this is patently incorrect - the new balcony in particular looks down into our garden.</p> <p>4.1 Makes reference to the fact that it "...reflects... the surrounding context.....including.... the immediate neighbouring dwellings and materials....." This is patently incorrect.</p> <p>4.4 Makes reference to ".....building forms found throughout the Chiltens....." but we feel that has no relevance to the immediately adjacent properties - in Oak Wood in particular.</p> <p>5.3 States the scheme "....has no negative impact on the existing surroundings..." We strongly disagree with this statement and believe that it is not supported by the facts.</p> <p>In view of the above comments we trust that you will reject the application.</p>
<p>9 OAKWOOD,BERKHAMST ED,,,HP4 3NQ</p>	<p>We wish to register our objections to the plans for two main reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed architectural design is not in keeping with the rest of the Oakwood estate, and there is no precedent for a drastic change in the appearance of one property in the estate; 2. The addition of a rear balcony on the first floor will intrude into the privacy of our property as the balcony has a direct line of sight into our back garden.

	<p>We have reviewed the Design and Access Statement (DAS), and make the following observations:</p> <p>Sections 1.2, 1.5 and 2.4: The proposed architectural treatment is completely out of keeping with the rest of the Oakwood estate. The proposed charred timber does not reflect the existing aesthetic style of the neighbouring properties (white boarding or hanging tiles). it does not 'add a high quality upgrade and enhancement to the streetscene' (1.5).</p> <p>Sections 2.5, 2.6: The DAS cites the Mariners property at the top of Cross Oak Road as a precedent for the architectural design. In our view, this comparison is ill-conceived. Mariners sits on its own, and its neighbouring properties are not visible when regarding the property. Number 3 Oakwood has two adjacent properties which will not sit well with the proposed conflicting colour scheme/ choice of materials, and nor do the proposals match the styles of the remaining approx. 37 properties in the rest of the Oakwood estate.</p> <p>Sections 3.6, 4.1, 4.2: The references to the new balcony in these sections ignores the fact that the balcony will overlook our property and those adjacent to us. This is detrimental to the neighbouring properties (which flatly contradicts a claim in 4.1). The statement in 4.2 is false: there is a loss of privacy as the balcony has a direct overview of our garden (this exists throughout the year, but will be more acutely felt in winter when there is less foliage on trees etc.).</p> <p>Sections 3.3, 4.1, 4.4: Various statements are incorrect in our view. There are references that the proposals reflect a modern interpretation of barns based in the Chilterns, that the property, while acknowledging it is not situated in an AONB, it is described as a 'gateway' to AONB Chilterns. This is a property in a residential development of 40 or so similar and complementary properties. References to AONB Chilterns are irrelevant and misleading. The proposed materials are incongruous to the neighbouring dwellings and the Oakwood estate.</p> <p>Section 5.3: The statement that the proposals have 'no negative impact on the existing surroundings' is not borne out by the facts.</p> <p>While we may be sympathetic to the new owners' wishes to modernise their property, we strongly oppose the proposals as they are drafted and trust that they will be rejected by DBC.</p>
<p>BERKHAMSTED TOWN COUNCIL, CIVIC CENTRE, 161 HIGH STREET, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3HD</p>	<p>Objection.</p> <p>The timber cladding, although contemporary, is out of character with the street scene. (This decision was reached following a vote. Cllr I Reay abstained.)</p> <p>CS12.</p>

<p>7 OAKWOOD,BERKHAMST ED,,HP4 3NQ</p>	<p>Response to planning application for 3 Oakwood, Berkhamsted, HP4 3NQ</p> <p>Dear Ms Palmer</p> <p>I am writing in response to your letter sent 21.08.2018 regarding planning application for the above property. I have several concerns and misgivings regarding the design of this proposal which I would like to outline. My house backs directly onto No. 3 and so will be affected more than most.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The materials being proposed are inappropriate. All the houses in Oakwood differ from each other and many have been modernised and extended over the years but all have retained the overall character. They are all part brick, some have white fascia, some terracotta tiles but there is a uniformity and a cohesion to the road. The design for No. 3 runs counter to every other house. It is apparent that exotic timbers and avant garde/modern materials have been specifically chosen with no regard as to how it 'sits' in amongst other houses in the road. There is plenty of scope for redevelopment of a house without choosing something that will look so out of place and incongruous. 2. My house will overlook the back of No. 3 and anyone standing on the proposed balcony will look directly into my bedrooms. 3. The beech hedge that separates us will shed its leaves in winter giving me full view of this gloomy looking house. 4. A sedum roof can look most attractive at the point of creation but requires regular maintenance and application of fertiliser. We get a great deal of leaf fall in autumn which will impact the attractiveness of the roof and I'm inclined to think that this is 'fancy' design which will look a mess as time goes by. 5. I draw your attention to a Dacorum council document titled 'Development in residential areas' - 2.1.4, 2.1.5, 2.1.6 and 2.1.7 which most specifically mentions:- '.....retaining the basic structure of the area and certain elements of its character'. 'Use is often made.....do not harmonise with area character'. 'However, as we are dealing with broad principles, the area policy statements may seek to encourage good detailed design which harmonises with other styles where this is a strong and attractive feature of area character'. 'However, in many areas, schemes should not be so imaginative that new proposals completely deviate from the stated policy. Area character must be respected where required'. <p>In conclusion, I feel that the new owners of No. 3 Oakwood are desirous of a unique, bespoke house and should have bought somewhere 'stand alone' where their individual design would have been appreciated.</p>

	<p>Trying to achieve their wants in an established area with an existing character would create a property that would look seriously out of place and affect the look and the marketability of the surrounding houses.</p> <p>Allowing this proposal to stand with its current design would send a message to all other developers and, before too long, the character of the road would be changed beyond all recognition.</p> <p>To quote the Dacorum document, harmony is the keyword. This proposed design is disharmonious.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely</p> <p>J. Brennan 7 Oakwood Berkhamsted HP4 3NQ</p>
<p>6 OAKWOOD,BERKHAMSTED,,HP4 3NQ</p>	<p>In response to No.3's additional supporting information on their planning application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site context: You can draw lots of circles on different parts of the map but it won't change the fact that No.3 Oakwood is a part of the Oakwood estate. It's at the boundary of the estate but within that boundary. The oakwood estate has 4 different styles of houses but all are designed with complementary features externally. The current designs for No.3 jar with oakwood style houses on multiple levels. 2. Berkhamsted Character Area (see 1 above re no.3 being part of the oakwood estate). 3. Dacorum Adopted Core Strategy. None of the houses referred to in either Berkhamsted or Northchurch are part of existing estates. (See 1 above) 4. Proposed materials. Interesting that you have sited houses around the area that use different materials that you have included in your design. More notable is that your design is that different to the entire area that you have to site 4 or more houses as examples of your different materials. There is no house anywhere near No.3 (on or off the Oakwood estate) that is designed similarly. Hence, it is going to stand out as being at odds with its surroundings. 5. Colour. I'm a little confused by this section as you say "Whilst we appreciate this is not the actual existing colour of the dwelling, it must be given weight when considering the notion of 'remaining in keeping' with the street scene as the materials proposed excluding their colour do not otherwise fundamentally differ from those already prevalent in the surrounding area". It's odd to exclude the colour in a section talking about the colour. You also include a mock up of the property which doesn't reflect the designs you've put forwards where there is significantly more black. In fact, the majority of houses at the back will only see black because the only

	<p>white/cream is appearing in sections below the fence.</p> <p>6. Style. I don't understand why you cannot achieve a contemporary aesthetic in a way that is complementary to the rest of oakwood. You talk about an 'evolution' of the current property, yet your designs demonstrate a revolution.</p> <p>7. Privacy. I don't know why the view is only drawn looking to the left or straight ahead. Although the doors to the balcony are inset, the proposed balcony itself is flush with the back of the house. Therefore, anyone standing on the balcony will have a clear view across to all the gardens from No.6 to No.9. Also, many of the mature trees referred to here are deciduous and this aerial photograph was taken over the summer months. I can see the balcony site from my garden and my house - so No.3 can see me.</p> <p>I am sure that the owners of No.3 will be able to achieve their modern dream house in a way that complements the rest of the Oakwood estate. I just don't think black charred timber and a balcony overlooking all our houses is the way to achieve it. Giselle</p>
<p>BERKHAMSTED TOWN COUNCIL, CIVIC CENTRE, 161 HIGH STREET, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3HD</p>	<p>The objection expressed previously is sustained. In the meantime and following discussions with the planning officer and receipt of a further consultation letter and information, this application will now be considered at the meeting on 29 October 2018</p>
<p>8 OAKWOOD, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3NQ</p>	<p>PROPOSED ALTERATIONS TO 3 OAKWOOD PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE 4/02075/18/FHA COMMENTS ON ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION</p> <p>In general we would echo the comments recently posted on line by 6 Oak Wood objecting to this application.</p> <p>In addition we would make the following specific comments;</p> <p>1 Site Context The aerial shot seeks to argue that numbers 1 to 3 Oak Wood are not part of the Oak Wood estate in general however our view is that they are part of a group of similar houses that are united by their rear elevations at the very least. We are in one part of the estate where the houses back on to one another and the views across our gardens is important to us and relevant.</p> <p>The harmony of the group of houses is an important feature and that is presumably why there are restrictive covenants on the properties controlling any redevelopment.</p> <p>2 Berkhamsted Character Area The houses in Shooters Way and Cross Oak Road have been built on individual plots and are in a wide range of architectural styles. The point of our previous comments is that No 3 is already part of a homogenized group of properties.</p>

3 Dacorum Adopted Core Strategy

The reference to No 3 as a "gateway" site is in our view tenuous and there are no buildings in the vicinity that use black timber cladding that would tie in visually with the suggested architectural treatment.

There is reference to 1 South Bank Road which is less obtrusive than the black timber cladding proposed for 3 Oak Wood and also does not sit amongst a group of similarly styled properties.

The view up Cross Oak Road, adjacent to Mariners, and looking towards 3 Oak Wood is in our view rather contrived and does not represent the more usual view of No 3 in its normal streetscape.

4 Proposed Materials

The properties that are referred to as providing a precedent for the choice of materials do indeed illustrate the use of white render however none of them uses black timber cladding or creates a harsh visual contrast with the adjacent properties.

As noted above, although the larger part of the Oak Wood Estate is not visible when looking at the front elevation of No 3, the rear elevations of numbers 1 to 9 at least are seen as a group.

5 Colour

The argument that number 3 could be painted black and white is in our view fatuous. Also the illustration of what that would look like does not justify the proposed elevations that are illustrated in the Planning Application.

The proposed modification to number 3 increases the area of the front elevation and the larger part of that proposal is black or cedar cladding. The mock-up illustration of a re-painted number 3 shows a much smaller proportion in black and the greater area of white render gives a lighter feel than the proposal. It does not in our view justify the proposal.

6 Style

3 Oak Wood does not sit in an individual plot and we feel that the argument on style is outweighed by the link to the wider Oak Wood Estate.

7 Privacy

The statement that the proposed balcony is "...set away from and oblique to all the adjacent properties" is in our opinion misleading. If the arrow that is drawn perpendicular to the rear elevation is extended it can be seen that this represents a direct line of sight to the rear of our property in general and to our garden and patio in particular.

The suggestion is that the "..heavily landscaped..." boundary

	<p>will mitigate the intrusion caused by the balcony however the planting to the left of the arrow, running up to Denny's Lane is predominantly deciduous and will not provide any screening for much of the year.</p>
<p>9 OAKWOOD,BERKHAMSTED,,HP4 3NQ</p>	<p>Comments on Additional Information for Planning Application reference 4/02075/18/FHA</p> <p>We share the views in the comments recently posted by neighbours objecting to this application and make the following specific comments:</p> <p>1 Site Context The aerial shot wishes to portray that Numbers 1 to 3 Oakwood are not part of the Oakwood development. In addition to sharing a common address, Numbers 1 to 3 are also part of a group of similar houses of complementary styles. Numbers 1 to 3 are united to the other houses by their rear elevations. The harmony of the group of houses is an important feature for the Oakwood development.</p> <p>2 Berkhamsted Character Area The houses in Shootersway and Cross Oak Road have been built on larger individual plots and are in a wide range of architectural styles. No 3 Oakwood is already part of an estate with similar and complementary styles of housing comprising approximately 40 properties. The stark contrast between the properties at 1 and 2 Oakwood with the proposals for Number 3 are more relevant. The proposals as contended in the submitted application do not 'add a high quality upgrade and enhancement to the streetscene'.</p> <p>3 Dacorum Adopted Core Strategy In our view, the reference to No 3 as a "gateway" site is unconvincing. There are no other properties nearby which use black timber cladding that would tie in visually with the suggested architectural treatment.</p> <p>In reference to 1 South Bank Road, this is a standalone property which does not sit amongst a group of similarly styled properties. In addition, the cladding on 1 South Bank Road is less harsh than the black timber cladding proposed for 3 Oakwood. Mariners on Cross Oak Road is another stand alone property on a larger plot, away from neighbouring properties, and where the neighbouring properties are individually different. The photograph taken adjacent to Mariners property, and looking towards 3 Oakwood is misrepresentative and obfuscates the fact that No 3 is part of a group of 40 similarly harmonious properties.</p> <p>4 Proposed Materials The properties that are referred to as providing a precedent for the choice of materials include white render however none of them uses black timber cladding or creates a harsh visual contrast with the neighbouring properties. Number 3 Oakwood has two adjacent properties which will not sit well with the</p>

	<p>proposed conflicting colour scheme or the choice of materials. As noted above, although the larger part of the Oakwood development is not visible when looking at the front elevation of No 3, the rear elevations of numbers 1 to 9 at least are seen as a group.</p> <p>5 Colour The mock-up of what the building would look like does not justify the proposed elevations in the planning application. The mock-up has not portrayed the actual Planning Application accurately. The mock-up shows a much smaller proportion of the elevations in black and a greater area of white render than in the actual planning application. On closer examination of the planning application (namely, the drawing with DBC website title "Elevation plans") the proposed modification to number 3 increases the area of the front elevation and the larger part of that proposal is black or cedar cladding. The colours are incongruous with the neighbouring properties in both the mock-up and the actual submitted planning application.</p> <p>6 Style It was previously argued that the proposals reflect a modern interpretation of barns based in the Chilterns, that the property, while acknowledging it is not situated in an Area Of Natural Beauty, it is described as a 'gateway' to AONB Chilterns. It is suggested now that the proposed style should be compared with individual houses on larger plots on Shootersway or Cross Oak Road. The new line of argument that the style comparison should be made with individual plots on Shootersway or Cross Oak Road is weak in our view. The proposed materials are incongruous to the two adjacent dwellings and the rest of the Oakwood development. As stated before, this is a property in a residential development of 40 or so similar and complementary properties.</p> <p>7 Privacy The assertion that the proposed balcony is "...set away from and oblique to all the adjacent properties" is misleading in our view. The view from the balcony represents a direct line of sight to the rear of our property and garden. The distances of the balcony from the neighbouring properties are also misleading. There is a loss of privacy from the boundary of the neighbouring plots, and so the distances to the property boundaries are much shorter than those to the neighbouring residences. The suggestion is that the "...heavily landscaped property boundaries' to screen the balcony from neighbouring properties ignores the fact that the plants and trees are deciduous and do not provide any screening for a large part of autumn and winter.</p>
<p>BERKHAMSTED TOWN COUNCIL, CIVIC CENTRE, 161 HIGH STREET, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3HD</p>	<p>29-10-18 TP Committee - Objection The committee thanks the architect for the additional information submitted together with the sample of cladding provided. Although the committee has no objection to the proposed structural changes it remains of the opinion that the</p>

	cladding is out of keeping with the street scene. CS11, CS12.
--	--

Supporting

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

Commenting

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

Appendix C

Response to objections prepared by applicant.