

4/03165/18/FHA	REPLACE EXISTING GARAGE AND SUMMER HOUSE WITH OUTBUILDING TO PROVIDE NON-HABITABLE ANNEX WITH GARAGE AND HOBBY ROOM
Site Address	32 STOCKS ROAD, ALDBURY, TRING, HP23 5RU
Applicant	MR BAUMARD
Case Officer	Nigel Gibbs
Referral to Committee	Due to the contrary view of Aldbury Parish Council and Councillor Stan Mills

1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**

2. Summary

2.1 The proposal will replace an existing summerhouse and garage providing a non habitable outbuilding providing a garage and hobby room to serve no. 32. There are no objections in principle to this domestic ancillary outbuilding. The design would be compatible with the Conservation Area and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There would be no harm to the residential amenity of the locality arising from its domestic non residential use. There are no other planning objections.

The development would accord with Policies CS7, CS12, CS24 and CS27 of Dacorum Core Strategy.

3. Site Description

3.1 No. 32 forms part of a terrace of 2 two storey 200 year old cottages (nos 22 to 36 even) located parallel with but substantially set back from Stocks Road. The dwellings feature elongated front gardens with frontage hedging. Nos 32, 34 and 36 until recently featured a large communal type rear garden. No. 32 now features a fenced rear garden separating it from the other gardens with the exception of a gap near to the back of the dwellings. The fence was constructed under 'permitted development' and therefore not requiring an application for planning permission.

3.2 Nos . 32, 34 and 36 units are served by a roadway/ combined with a bridleway linking Stocks Road with a rear parking and bin storage area. No. 32 is served by a garage and parking space. The roadway also serves other more modern dwellings in the immediate area.

4. Proposal

4.1 This is for a shallow pitched slate roof 'reverse 'L' shaped timber clad outbuilding to replace the existing garage and summerhouse. It would be positioned on the footprint of the existing summerhouse and garage .The building would measure 9.5m in length and 3.5m in depth for the main part, with 'L' shape end / 'tail' 5.5m. Its ridge level would be 2.8m with the roof featuring two conservation type rooflights.

4.2.The garage part would be used for the storage of bikes , a classic car and lawn mower. The hobby room would be used for drawing and painting, to play table tennis or any other similar hobby.

5. Relevant Planning History

5.1 Refusal 4/02084/17/FHA. This was for a single storey slate gable roof timber clad truncated 'L' shaped outbuilding to replace the existing garage and summerhouse located on part of their respective footprints. It would have provided a garage and non-commercial art studio, with an associated toilet and boot room. The building would have measured about 13.2m in length and 3.6m depth for the main part, with 'L' shape end / 'tail' about 5.6m. Its ridge level would have been 3.3m with the roof featuring three conservation type rooflights.

5.2 The reason for refusal was:

'The proposed outbuilding by virtue of its scale, bulk, height and site coverage would be overly prominent, out of keeping, and detrimental to the pattern of development of adjacent properties and the surrounding area. As such the proposed development would fail to comply with Policies CS11(b), CS12 (f), and CS12 (g) (iii-vi) of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (September 2013)'.

5.3 This decision was made by the Committee. The officer recommendation was to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a planning obligation under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The following Heads of Terms for the planning obligation were recommended :

- The building shall only be used for a non commercial / domestic hobby room / study/ art studio and domestic garage incidental to the enjoyment of the existing dwelling house.
- The building shall at no time be used for any residential purposes.
- No planning application shall be submitted to convert / adapt the building to a self contained residential unit.

5.4. Planning Application 4/03174/18/FHA. This is for the replacement of the existing summerhouse with a sectional timber framed outbuilding also scheduled for consideration at this meeting.

6. Policies

6.1 National Policy Guidance

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

6.2 Adopted Core Strategy

NP1, CS1, CS7, CS8, CS9, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS24, CS25, CS26, CS27, CS29 and CS32

6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Add

Appendices 3, 5, and 8

6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Environmental Guidelines (May 2004)
- Water Conservation & Sustainable Drainage (June 2005)
- Energy Efficiency & Conservation (June 2006)
- Landscape Character Assessment (May 2004)
- Chilterns Buildings Design Guide (Feb 2013)
- Chilterns Management Plan

6.5 Advice Notes and Appraisals

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

7. Constraints

- Rural Area
- Small Village
- Conservation Area
- Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- Area of Archaeological Importance
- Former Land Use
- Air Limits, including the Halton Black Zone

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.
- Compatibility with the historic environment and landscape.
- Impact upon the residential amenity of the immediate locality.
- Access implications.

Policy and Principle

9.2 Under Dacorum Core Strategy Policy CS7 (Rural Area) small scale development will be permitted for the replacement of existing buildings for the same use. This is

provided that:

- (i). It has no significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside; and
- (ii). It supports the rural economy and maintenance of the wider countryside.

9.3 The building is of greater floorspace space (42.5 sqm) than the existing buildings (15.7 sqm) which the proposal is to replace the garage and summerhouse. As explained below the proposal will accord with criterion (i) and criteria is not considered to be directly relevant.

9.4 Therefore the proposal is acceptable in principle.

Layout, Design, Scale, etc/ Impact on Street Scene / Conservation Area / AONB

9.5 Although larger than the existing buildings its design would be compatible with both the Conservation Area and AONB according with Policies CS7, CS24 and CS27, with no objections from the Conservation & Design Team, being commensurate with the size of the residential curtilage/ rear garden. A substantial part of the rear garden would remain undeveloped.

Impact on adjoining neighbours

9.6 This is with reference to the expectations of Dacorum Core Strategy Policies CS12 and CS32, Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan and the NPPF regarding residential amenity.

9.7 Domestic outbuildings have been ubiquitously associated with residential gardens, longstandingly recognised through 'standard Class E development ' under the General Permitted Development Order and its predecessors. This is clearly reflected by the existing garage and summerhouse. These can include garages and hobby rooms.

9.8 The consideration of this application is for domestic purposes incidental/ ancillary to the enjoyment of no.32. It needs to be taken into account that the provision of the boundary fencing separating much of the residential curtilage of no. 32 from the previous communal garden has changed local conditions. There is no objection to the use and no apparent harm to the residential amenity of adjoining/ nearby dwellinghouses in terms of its physical impact and privacy.

Impact on Highway Safety

9.9 Hertfordshire County Council Highways previously advised upon Planning Application 4/02084/17/FHA and and have done so for this application, raising no objections. This would have taken into account the existing access road to the site and that the building is not to be used for residential purposes.

9.10 There would be not be a case to refuse the application based upon the highway safety implications. Any use for residential purposes would otherwise require the separate consideration by Herfordshire Fire & Rescue Service, given the use, the suitability of the roadway (width, method of construction) and the availability of fire

hydrants.

9.11 It is unlikely that the construction of the building would put major pressures upon the use of the roadway/ bridleway. The application could not be refused due to this issue.

Other Material Planning Considerations

9.12 With due regard to site conditions, the relevant policies and the previous consideration of Planning Application 4/02084/17/FHA there are no apparent ecological, arboricultural, crime prevention/ security, drainage, contamination, archaeological or exterior lighting objections, subject to, where necessary the imposition of conditions.

Response to Neighbour comments

9.13 Most of the matters have been addressed above. There is no planning reason to withhold the grant of permission based upon the applicant's own residence of the dwellinghouse and can be rented to other people.

9.14 In response to the representations received the Applicant has provided an updated plan showing, the site's relationship with the access road to Foxwood. On this basis it is understood that submitted Certificate A confirming land ownership is correct in the Applicant's opinion. With this clarification any subsequent boundary issues are a civil / legal matter and should not be a reason to withhold a decision upon the application. The LPA has not notified neighbours or the Parish Council upon this as the change is limited to ensuring the boundary is correct regarding ownership.

9.15 With regard to two applications being simultaneously submitted, each has to be considered upon its individual merits. If permission is granted for both it will be the developer's decision (whether the Applicant or any future land owner) as to which is implemented.

10. Conclusions

10.1 This domestic outbuilding can be successfully accommodated within this sensitive environment without any harm subject to the imposition of appropriate condition.

11. Recommendation - That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

- 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 Notwithstanding the details specified by the submitted drawings and the application form the walls of the building permitted shall be finished in dark stained horizontal weatherboarding.**

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the Rural Area,

Conservation Area and Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in accordance with Policies CS11, CS12, CS24, CS25 and CS27 of Dacorum Core Strategy.

- 3 **The building hereby permitted shall only be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of no. 32 Stocks Road as a dwelling house.**

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenity of adjoining/ nearby dwellinghouses in accordance with Policy CS12 of Dacorum Core Strategy.

- 4 **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) there shall be no external changes to the building hereby permitted.**

Reason To enable the local planning authority to retain control over the development in the interests of safeguarding the residential amenity of the locality and the appearance of the building in the locality in accordance with Policies CS11, CS12, CS24, CS25 and CS27 of Dacorum Core Strategy.

- 5 **No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include assessment of significance and research questions; and:**

1. **The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording**
2. **The programme for post investigation assessment**
3. **Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording**
4. **Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation**
5. **Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation**
6. **Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.**

Reason: To ensure that reasonable facilities are made available to record archaeological evidence and to accord with adopted Core Strategy Policy CS27.

- 6
1. **Any demolition/development shall take place in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under Condition 5.**
 2. **The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 10 and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.**

Reason: To ensure that reasonable facilities are made available to record

archaeological evidence and to accord with Policy CS27 of Dacorum Core Strategy.

- 7 **Subject to the requirements of Condition 2 the development hereby permitted shall only be carried otherwise fully in accordance with the following plans, the materials specified by this plan and the application form:**

L97 01
EB97- 01 Revision A
EB97-02
EB97-03

Reason: To safeguard and maintain the strategic policies of the local planning authority and for the avoidance of doubt.

NOTE 1: ARTICLE 35 STATEMENT

The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme.

The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38 and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

INFORMATIVES

Bats

UK and European Legislation makes it illegal to:

Deliberately kill, injure or capture bats;

Recklessly disturb bats;

Damage, destroy or obstruct access to bat roosts (whether or not bats are present).

Contacts:

English Nature	01206 796666
UK Bat Helpline	0845 1300 228 (www.bats.org.uk)

In the event that bats are unexpectedly found during any stage of the development, work should stop immediately and a suitably qualified ecologist should be contacted to seek further advice'.

Highways

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

3. Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-and-developer-information.aspx>.

Construction Hours of Working – (Plant & 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.

Construction Dust

Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or by 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 Practicable 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.

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.

Appendix A

Aldbury Parish Council

Aldbury Parish Council last night discussed planning application 4/03165/18/FHA last night and would like to OBJECT to the application on the basis of the size and height of the proposed building and particularly in relation to its position and surrounding cottages.

The Council feel the proposed building would be out of keeping. The Council also raised the issue of the topography of the site where the existing summer house and garage have been built up from the original ground level, if this were taken as the base the height would have even more of an impact. Neighbours and affected residents were present at the Council meeting last night and it was raised that another planning application had been simultaneously submitted for this property – 4/03174/18/FHA. The Parish Council haven't been notified of this application and neither have neighbours*.

Borough Cllr Mills will be calling in both these applications to be discussed at the Development Management Committee as both the Parish Council and affected residents are concerned about the impact should either of these be granted.

(* Note: Applications 4/03165/18 and 4/03174/18 were registered at different times resulting in different dates for the Parish Council and neighbour notification,. As documented there has been the necessary consultation with both the Parish Council and neighbours).

Councillor Stan Mills

Initial Response

In view of the local opposition to the about Planning Applications I must enable access for the residents to express their views in the event of you recommending to grant these.

I therefore exercise my right to Call In. Please accept this email as my request.

Additional Response

Further to our earlier telephone conversation I would like to confirm and clarify my previous email concerning my 'Call-In' of the above applications regarding 32 Stocks Road, Aldbury.

In the event of the above mentioned applications being recommended for approval, I, as Ward Councillor, exercise my right to 'Call-In' both applications on the grounds that they appear to have some Detail inaccuracies in the submission which are of particular concern. For the sake of openness I feel that local residents should have the opportunity to express their opinions in open forum at Committee to enable them,

whatever the result, to feel content that Council had been fair, reasonable and above all Open in coming to a decision.

I hope this solves any issues arising from my previous request.

Conservation & Design

32 Stocks Road forms part of a terrace of 'locally listed' cottages set back from Stocks Road, the properties have long front garden and gardens to the rear. The terrace is considered to make a positive contribution towards the character and appearance of the Aldbury Conservation Area in which it lies. To the rear of the site is a garage (dilapidated) and a summerhouse – both belonging to 32 Stocks Road and accessed from Aldbury bridleway; both structures would be replaced under this application.

A previous application for an outbuilding in this position, which was supported by Conservation, was refused at planning committee.

The current proposal is for a similarly designed single storey outbuilding, comprising a garage and hobby room, however it is not as large as that previously proposed. The outbuilding would be clad in traditional materials (it is suggested dark brown / black stained horizontal weatherboarding would be of more traditional character than vertical boarding) and have a pitched slate roof, timber windows and 2 conservation roof lights.

The reduction in scale of the proposed outbuilding is welcomed and the proposal is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Aldbury Conservation Area, no objection. The use of a dark stained horizontal weatherboarding would be preferred.

Trees & Woodlands

No response.

Scientific Officer

We have no objection to the proposed development in relation to Noise, Air Quality and Land Contamination though the site is on radon affected area where 1-3% of homes are above the action level as well as within 185m of a cemetery or graveyard, Smithy and garage but; the following planning informative are recommend should planning permission be granted.

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.

2). Construction Dust Informative

Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or by 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 Practicable 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.

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.

Hertfordshire County Council: Highways

Proposal

Replace existing garage and summer house with outbuilding to provide non-habitable annex with garage and hobby room.

Decision

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.

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
3. Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-and-developer-information.aspx>.

COMMENTS

This application is for: Replace existing garage and summer house with outbuilding to provide non-habitable annex with garage and hobby room

PARKING AND ACCESS

The site is accessed from Aldbury Bridleway, which is a public right of way. The applicant is advised that this must be kept free of all obstruction at all times of the proposed development.

No new or altered vehicular or pedestrian access is required and no works are proposed in the highway.

CONCLUSION

HCC as highway authority considers that the proposals would not have a severe residual impact upon highway safety or capacity, subject to the informative notes above.

Hertfordshire County Council : Historic Environment

The proposed development site is in Area of Archaeological Significance No.29, as identified in the Local Plan. This denotes the medieval settlement of Aldbury and also includes evidence of later prehistoric occupation and burial.

The proposed new garage and gym studio are less than 100 metres from the site of a Late Iron Age cemetery. At least six burial groups with grave goods were excavated in 1943, by the pupils of Aldbury School [Historic Environment Record No 4242].

However, the proposed garage and studio, though of larger size, will partly occupy the footprints of the existing garage and summerhouse, which would reduce the potential impact of the scheme upon any archaeological remains present.

Therefore that the proposed development is such that it should be regarded as likely to have an impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest and it is recommended that the following provisions be made, should planning permission be granted :

- the archaeological monitoring of groundworks related to the development, including all ground reduction, foundation trenches, service trenches, landscaping, and any other ground disturbance. This should include a contingency for preservation or further archaeological investigation of any remains encountered;
- analysis of the results of the archaeological work with provisions for subsequent production of a report(s) and/or publication(s) of these results & an archive;
- such other provisions necessary to protect the archaeological interests of the site.

These recommendations are both reasonable and necessary to provide properly for the likely archaeological implications of this development proposal. It is further believed that these recommendations closely follow the policies included within Policy 12 (para. 141, etc.) of the National Planning Policy Framework. and the guidance contained in the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide.

In this case three appropriately worded conditions on any planning consent would be sufficient to provide for the level of investigation that this proposal warrants.

NATS

The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect

and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.

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

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

Ministry of Defence

There are no air safeguarding implications.

Appendix B

Response to Neighbour Notification/ Publicity

Foxwood (1)

4/03165/18/FHA application for Non habitable annex with garage and hobby room; No 32 Stocks Road Aldbury, dated 18/07/2018.

Objection 1. Application on neighbour's plot. The planned annex with garage and hobby room oversteps into the property of Foxwood (our house). The planned development is on our property to which the applicant does not have title. The applicant when approached had no explanation why he has applied for planning permission for an annex partly proposed to be built about half to a metre inside his neighbours [our] property.

Objection 2. Inconsistent application & plans. The plans lodged with the Dacorum planning office are not consistent. For example, the 'Proposed Floor Plan' shows the dotted outline of the existing garage for comparison with the proposed new building OUTSIDE the existing garage footprint and overstepping the boundary onto Foxwood property. On the 'Proposed elevation - north & south elevation' the dotted line of the existing garage shows the proposed new building INSIDE the footprint of the existing garage along the boundary line with Foxwood (our property). Which edge of new building is the applicant proposing? It is impossible to determine what is the proposed footprint of the planned property. There is inconsistency here and is it designed to mislead? The application declaration is dated 18/07/2018 with no explanation of the pre-date.

The applicant agreed the existing boundary between Foxwood (our property) and No 32 Stocks (applicant's property) with Hertfordshire Community mediation on 12

December 2018 following 6 months of disputing and on 18 December 2018 put in this planning application to build over the boundary line he agreed four days previously. When approached the applicant has no explanation for this lack of good faith.

Objection 3. Limited vehicle access and parking. The applicant has told me [as a neighbour] they are using the existing cottage as a holiday let on Air B'n'B. This is a change of use from domestic to holiday letting business. The applicant advised us to expect an increase in traffic due to his rental customers. This is not in keeping with the access up a shared bridle path or the limited parking available. The access into Stocks Road is congested with on street parking and limits the ability of the existing householders to move into and out from the bridle path which is to be the access to this proposed development.

Objection 4. Non compliant with development guidelines for this type of site. The proposed annex is out of scale, bulk, height and site coverage, and would be overly prominent out of keeping and detrimental to the cottage garden setting in a village conservation area. The proposal increased the built footprint by of over 3 times to 61m². The development is 'garden infill' and increasing the urban density of the residential area. The proposed annex fails to comply with Policies CS11(b), CS12(f) and CS(g) (iii & iv) of Dacorum Core Strategy 2013.

Commentary;

The applicant has also put in another planning application for No 32 Stocks Road Aldbury (4/03174/18/FHA) on the same date for a timber framed building on the same site. I asked the applicant why two applications were put in and his response was "to try and get one through".

Foxwood (2)

Objection 1. The planned garage hobby room oversteps into the property of Foxwood (our house). The planned development is on our property to which the applicant does not have title.

Objection 2. The plans lodged with the Dacorum planning office are not consistent. For example, the 'Proposed Floor Plan' shows the dotted outline of the existing garage for comparison with the proposed new building OUTSIDE the existing garage footprint and overstepping the boundary onto Foxwood property. On the 'Proposed elevation - north & south elevation' the dotted line of the existing garage shows the proposed new building INSIDE the footprint of the existing garage along the boundary line with Foxwood (our property). Which edge of new building is the applicant proposing? It is impossible to determine what is the proposed footprint of the planned property. There is inconsistency here and is it designed to mislead?

The applicant agreed the existing boundary between Foxwood (our property) and No 32 Stocks (applicant's property) with Hertfordshire Community mediation on 12 December 2018 following 6 months of disputing and on 18 December 2018 put in this planning application to build over the boundary line he agreed four days previously.

Objection 3. The applicant has told me they are using the existing cottage as a holiday let on Air B'n'B. This is a change of use from domestic to holiday letting business. The applicant advised us to expect an increase in traffic due to his customers. This is not in keeping with the access up a bridle path or the limited parking available.

The proposed development is inconsistent with the conservation area of Aldbury

village. The development is 'garden infill' and increasing the urban density of the residential area.

The applicant has also put in another planning application (4/03165/18/FHA) for No 32 Stocks Road Aldbury on the same date for a single garage on the same site. I asked the applicant why two applications and his response was "to try and get one through". Please do not confuse the two applications.

36 Stocks Road

I wish to object to this application. I fail to see why a 'hobby room' of the size on the proposed plans is necessary as the applicant's main residence is in London. As the footprint of no 32 is 43.4 metres, It seems that the proposed annex will actually be larger than the house. I fear the intention here is for the proposed building to eventually become a dwelling and I believe that the planning authorities should be mindful in this case. It is out of scale and in keeping with the 200 year old cottages and will occupy the width of two gardens.

The plans show a group of trees which would screen this development from my house , but the trees don't actually exist. There is one lilac tree. Also, the plans show shared access but this is private property which belong to Foxwood.

I understand a second application has also been submitted for the same site. 4/03174/18/FHA. I object to that too for the same reasons. Also, access is already very difficult on the bridal way.

34 Stocks Road (1)

Application is partly on land not belonging to the applicant (Foxwood). The plans are inconsistent and date need clarification. Unnecessary infill for a permanent holiday let (applicant does not live in the village) adding additional vehicular access and parking pressure on a side road/bridleway with congestion already preventing regular bin collections and risk to emergency service access. It is detrimental to the historic cottage setting. The proposed annex fails to comply with Policies CS11(b), CS12(f) and CS(g) (iii & iv) of Dacorum Core Strategy 2013. Any additional building on the plot should hold a covenant to prevent business or habitat use (change of use). The applicant has two applications in - In his words to just get whatever he can through - misleading the neighbourhood.

34 Stocks Road(2)

I object to this application for development. It is to replace a small, narrow, low, below-ground flat -roofed tin shed, and a garden summer-house, which each have two completely separate footprints. It is also within a garden which was until recently an open plan cottage garden which the applicant carved up with a '6 foot' fence. The new proposed building is higher than the fence which has been erected.

1. Application extends on to property not owned by the applicant. The planned annex with garage and hobby room oversteps into the property of Foxwood. Planning cannot be granted for land which is either in dispute or does not belong to the applicant.

2. Unnecessary Over-development with a footprint larger than the main residence

making it a development and not an annex. The development has a larger footprint than the main residence. The property is not a main residence but a holiday let therefore a 'hobby room' is not a requirement and the garage is not suitable to actually put a car in so does nothing to support the need for additional parking. This proposal with a single footprint joins the two structures together in a very dominating way, reducing the garden space and creating a very long high elevation to the considerable detriment of my property No. 34 which has already had to suffer the erection of the fence. This new footprint is significantly larger than the original. The present shed lies a good foot below ground level and rises no more than five feet above ground at its highest. These plans will more than double its height. The roof level of the summer-house will also be raised considerably. To know that there would be two or three steps down from the 'Hobby Room' to the garden indicates how the land falls away to the Barrack Row cottages, making the whole project so overbearing.

This property is also a business. Run as a permanent holiday let through AirBnB with an agent running the regular change-overs. The unnecessary infill of a property which is not the applications residence would clearly lend itself to being solely for the purpose of financial gain to the applicant and detriment to all those who live in the area and as such should not be allowed for business or habitable use at anytime now or in the future.

3. Confusing Plans. The new proposals, on the ground plan, add width to the existing footprint of the garage on both sides. This would be beyond the boundary line with Foxwood on the east side. To move the structure over would minimise the space available on the west side, which is the only access route down to No 32 and make it even more dominant to my property, No 34. The application declaration is dated 18/07/2018 with no explanation of the pre-date.

The applicant also has another application in which would appear to be to mislead the neighbours as to what to expect and in the words of the applicant 'to just see whatever he can get through'.

4. Parking and Access. I have the parking space alongside the applicant and I am concerned that the new structure will cause parking issues in the already constrained turning space and I am concerned that the single-width track/bridle-way will be overloaded, more than already, During any construction there is little or no access to the site as it will be trespassing on my parking space or blocking the single track and shared access to Foxwood. There are no passing places other than private property, off-lane parking is not available. If holiday letting or Air B'n'B turn the property into a business, extra vehicles will not be possible on this site. At present a single vehicle fills the resident's space. Stocks Road itself already has a full load of parking problems and access for Emergency vehicles and Dustbins etc are constantly a concern.

The proposed structure is overly huge and a higher footprint than the main cottage, out of keeping and detrimental to the adjacent properties and the surrounding area. I believe it fails to comply with the content of Dacorum Core Strategy of September 2013.

As the direct Neighbour of the applicant I have tried to accommodate and be understanding of their wish to run a business at the property and tolerate the ugly obstructive fence which does not prevent the applicants dog from roaming and blocks considerable light from my garden.

I reiterate my statement that this is unnecessary over-development of the most uncaring kind for a country village Conservation Area situation.

Hope Cottage

I wish to object to this planning application on the following grounds.

The property referred to as "Lowood" in the plans is referred to below by its correct name, "Foxwood".

Submission of concurrent applications: This is one of two applications submitted for the same site at the same time, creating confusion as to what the applicant is attempting to achieve.

Boundaries: The plans appear to show that the applicant intends to build on a neighbour's land. The applicant agreed the existing boundary between Foxwood and 32 Stocks Road through Hertfordshire Community mediation on 12 December 2018.

Not in keeping with the area: This development is not in keeping with existing structures and will be detrimental to both the Conservation Area and historic property of Barrack Row. The previous application for this build was refused on the basis of being "out of keeping and detrimental to the pattern of development of adjacent properties and the surrounding area" (decision notice dated 18 April 2018)

Size of the structure: This application is a modified version of a previous application by the same applicant which was refused by the Council. Many of the issues of concern have still not been adequately addressed in this new proposal.

Dimensions are not clearly listed; the size and scale of the build represents a considerable increase to anything that has previously existed on this site. As the owner of Hope Cottage this is of particular concern to me since the plans show that the height of the structure will obscure light from the west side ground floor of my property where the top height of the windows is 2.8 metres. The plans indicate that the new building will be at least 3 metres, and no mention is made of the foundations that a building of this size will require. The existing structures are sunk quite deeply into the ground and no indication is offered as to the starting height of the build.

The previous application for this build was also refused because "its scale, bulk, height and site coverage would be overly prominent" (decision notice dated 18 April 2018).

Access to the building site: The lane is only one car wide with no passing places. This raises the question of how the applicant intends to access a building site with materials and machinery without causing substantial disruption to residents. There is no alternative access route for Foxwood, Hope Cottage, Inglewood or Odd Spring. Services such as bin collection are easily disrupted by parking on Stocks Road which means that parking vehicles there is also an unviable solution; in addition, cars parked at the bottom of the lane prevent safe vehicle access into Stocks Road. Finally, heavy goods vehicles being transported up and down the lane could cause damage to the utilities which run beneath it, including the mains water. The issue of responsibility for damage to the lane and those utilities needs to be explicitly outlined prior to any decision.

The plans incorrectly refer to the driveway perpendicular to the lane as "shared access", inferring that the applicant has a right of way here. He does not, this is privately owned land and in use throughout the day by the residents of Foxwood and Hope Cottage.

Purpose of the build: Further to this, the applicant has indicated to the neighbours that he intends to rent this property rather than reside in it (and it is not currently their primary residence). Is a notification of a change of purpose required?

The inclusion of parking spaces for multiple cars where currently there is only space for one car suggests an increase of traffic up and down the lane, which is already a tight bottleneck for residential access to the Foxwood, Hope Cottage, Inglewood and Odd Spring and will cause congestion of the lane for full time residents and potential damage due to heavier usage.

I would request an undertaking by the Planning Department that this building will not be repurposed or let separately from the main house, as per the decision made on application 4/01089/14/FHA (decision date 04 July 2014) that the new building "shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling".