

<b>4/01558/19/FHA</b>	<b>TWO STOREY SIDE, FRONT AND REAR EXTENSION</b>
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>26 ASHTREE WAY, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP1 1QS</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Mrs K Waterman, 26 Ashtree Way</b>
<b>Case Officer</b>	<b>Briony Curtain</b>
<b>Referral to Committee</b>	<b>Called in by Cllr Allen</b>

## **1. Recommendation**

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**

## **2. Summary**

2.1 The proposed two storey front, side and rear extensions are large, and different in their design such that they will change the appearance of the host dwelling, however they will not be detrimental to the overall appearance of the property or detract from the wider street scene. Moreover there are several existing examples of similar two storey front/side extensions in the immediate street scene such that the proposal will successfully integrate. The height, size and siting of the extensions respect adjacent buildings and their design replicates common features exhibited in the existing street scene. The development would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of light, privacy or visual intrusion. The site is sufficient in size to provide acceptable parking and amenity space to serve the resulting larger dwelling. The proposal is therefore in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013.

## **3. Site Description**

3.1 The application site is located to the northern side of Ashtree Way and comprises a residential dwelling with associated parking and gardens. The area is characterised by medium to large detached dwelling of varying designs many of which have been extended and altered.

## **4. Proposal**

4.1 Planning Permission is sought for the construction of a two storey side, front and rear extension. The proposal has been amended during the course of the application to set it away 500mm from the common boundary with No. 30. The plans have also annotated to illustrate a 45 degree line to neighbouring habitable windows.

## **5. Relevant Planning History**

None.

## **6. Policies**

### **6.1 National Planning Policy**

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

## 6.2 Adopted Core Strategy –

NP1, CS1, CS4, CS8, CS9, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS29, CS30, CS31, and CS32.

## 6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policies 10, 13, 18, 21, 51, and 58  
Appendices 3, 5 and 7.

## 6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Environmental Guidelines (May 2004)
- Area Based Policies (May 2004) - Residential Character Area HCA 8:Counters End.
- Water Conservation & Sustainable Drainage (June 2005)
- Energy Efficiency & Conservation (June 2006)
- Accessibility Zones for the Application of car Parking Standards (July 2002)

## **7. Constraints**

- 45.7M AIR DIR LIMIT
- Residential Character Areas
- SSSI IMPACT RISK ZONES
- CIL3

## **8. Representations**

### Consultation responses

8.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix 1

### Neighbour notification/site notice responses

8.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix 2

## **9. Considerations**

### Main issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Policy and principle
- Visual impact on property / street scene
- Impact on residential amenities of adjoining properties
- Impact on Highway Safety
- Other

### Policy and Principle

9.2 The application site is located within the town of Hemel Hempstead wherein

appropriate residential development is encouraged in accordance with Policy CS1 and CS4 of the Core Strategy 2013. The principle of the extensions is thus acceptable.

#### Impact on appearance of existing property

9.3 The existing dwelling is simple and whilst the extensions are large and different in their design, which will undoubtedly alter the appearance of the property, they will not be detrimental. The size and scale are considered compatible with the existing built form and the plot is large enough to accommodate them without appearing cramped or overdeveloped. The continuation of the existing ridge to the side extension would be acceptable and the front gable is slightly set down to sit comfortably and tie together the existing dwelling and new side extension. The design of the two storey rear extension is unfortunate and a reduction in width to facilitate the omission of the crowned central section would be welcomed, however this section is only 2.7m in depth so would not appear unduly dominant and sufficient space is retained around the building to avoid a cramped appearance. This element would not be visible from public vantage points and as such it is concluded that a refusal on this element alone could not be sustained. The single storey rear extension whilst projecting for a further 3m would not dominate the building or plot. A generous rear garden area way in excess of the 11.5m policy requirement would remain. It is also important to note that whilst a prior approval application would be required a single storey rear extension up to 8m in depth may be permissible under Class A of the Town and Country Planning (general Permitted development) Order and this is a material consideration. Both adjoining properties already feature 3m deep full width single storey rear additions. Appropriate wall to window ratios are achieved. The proposed building materials would match those of the existing and the windows design and proportions are generally consistent.

9.4 For the reasons outlined above the proposal would achieve a comfortable degree of compatibility with the existing property to comply with Policy CS12.

#### Impact on Street Scene

9.5 The site is situated within HCA 8:Counters End which is broadly characterised as ' a spacious, high quality and largely informally laid out area of planned detached housing featuring large areas of amenity land, open plan front gardens and mature landscaping dating mainly from the late 1960s/early 1970s'. The development principles for the area are as follows;

##### Housing

Design: Scope for variety, innovation and modernity in design.

Height: new buildings should not normally exceed two storeys.

Size: medium to large dwellings are encouraged.

Layout: informal layouts are acceptable, although dwellings should follow a defined building line. Spacing should be provided in the medium range (2m to 5m).

9.6 The proposed extensions (as amended) are considered to be acceptable from a design aspect and would successfully integrate with the street scene. The proposal introduces significant extensions to the property but the area is characterised by medium and large dwellings (which are encouraged) such that the resulting building would not appear at odds or unduly dominant in its setting. The rear extension is large, but would not be visible from public vantage points and as such would not harm the

character or appearance of the street scene. A prominent front gable is being introduced, however its minimal projection at 2.3m beyond the main front wall (1.3m beyond the existing garage), and its proximity to other existing examples in the street scene means it will harmonise well. The remainder of the street scene is varied and the original building line is no longer overly evident. As such the proposals would not appear as dominant or incongruous features in the street scene. Moreover, the architectural quality of the dwellings is not such that it should be preserved without alteration, innovation and variety is encouraged in the area. The build line is no longer clearly defined with many properties extending forward of the original main front walls. The proposals do therefore follow the general build line.

9.7 The property one away to the west; No. 30 features a 3.6m deep, 6m wide, two storey gabled front/side extension which would project further into the street than the extension currently proposed. In addition both No.s 18 and 20 to the east exhibit similar two storey gabled front/side extensions which again exceed the depth of that currently proposed. Given their position at the bend in the road both No.s 18 and 20 occupy a far more prominent position than the application site and both extensions were considered acceptable and granted planning permission. Albeit smaller in width and of differing design there are also other examples of first floor extensions in the immediate vicinity. Both No.s 24 and 22 immediately to the right feature first floor front/side gabled extensions set forward of their original build line. Given the existing larger, more prominent examples in the immediate street scene the proposals would successfully integrate to comply with Policy CS12.

9.8 Turning to the proximity of the extension to No. 30, the proposal has been amended during the course of the application and has now been set 0.5m from the common boundary. Whilst it would be preferable for the separation distance to be increased, given the existing street pattern it is considered that a refusal could not be sustained. There is no uniformity in the general spacing of the properties and many have been extended right up to the common boundary such that there is very little space in between some properties. The 0.5m set in proposed would ensure the development does not appear cramped and together with the gabled design would ensure no terracing effect with No. 30. The spacing with No. 24 does not alter as a result of the proposal.

9.9 Despite its forward projection and proximity to the boundary, given the numerous existing examples in the immediate street scene, the two storey front/side extension proposed is not considered dominant or intrusive but would successfully integrate into the area. The rear extension would not be visible so would have a negligible impact on the area.

#### Impact on Residential Amenities of Surrounding Properties.

9.10 The application site has three directly adjoining properties, including the dwellings either side at No's 24 and 26 Ashtree way and one dwellings to the rear at No's 121 Green End Road.

9.11 The proposed extensions would be located 46m from No. 121 Green End Road beyond their own rear garden and that of the application property. At this distance it is not considered there would be any concerns with respect to visual intrusion or loss of light. Despite being 2.7m closer to the properties of Green End Lane the proposed first floor windows would not significantly increase overlooking levels when compared to

existing levels.

9.12 Turning to the properties either side, given their size and position the extensions would be visible from, would alter light levels to habitable windows and cause slight overshadowing of adjoining properties. However not to such a degree as to appear intrusive or harm residential amenity. The scheme has been amended since original submission and an acceptable amount of light and aspect would now be maintained to both adjacent properties. The Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines "Site Layout and Planning for daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice" provides guidance on avoiding unacceptable impacts. A useful guideline for measuring the impact of new developments is the 45 degree rule of thumb whereby an extension must clear a 45 degree line (plan and elevation) taken from the centre point of adjacent habitable windows. The proposed two storey front and rear extensions do not project for an unacceptable distance to the front or rear of adjacent properties, are set away from the common boundaries, albeit only marginally to the west, and as such they now clear a 45 degree angle from all nearest adjacent front and rear first floor habitable rooms. The following windows have been fully considered and assessed and there is no harm identified; to the rear No. 28 has three rear facing window in close proximity to the common boundary with No. 26, the ground floor serving a kitchen which is set 3m beyond the current rear elevation of the application property and the first and second storey ones, both serving bedrooms. The kitchen is also served by secondary windows/doors. To the front there are two windows to consider, the first floor serving a bedroom and the ground floor an office / study. Looking at No. 24 it features ground floor sliding doors which are set approximately 3m behind No. 26 and the first floor is a bedroom window. To the front the extension are set some distance from the common boundary such that no assessment has been undertaken. The two storey elements of the proposal would not result in a significant loss of light to adjacent properties or appear unduly oppressive to the detriment of residential amenity. Given the orientation of the properties the extensions proposed would overshadow the adjacent immediate gardens in the early morning (No. 30) and late evening (No.24) but for the majority of the day the impact would be comparable to the existing circumstances. All the properties in this section of the road are served by generous rear gardens which rise to the north, as such other areas of the gardens would continue to provide an acceptable level of amenity to occupiers.

9.13 At ground floor level it is proposed to extend for 6m beyond the existing rear wall. However given both adjoining properties have been extended themselves by approx 3m, the ground floor projection would actually be only 3m beyond the adjacent properties. At 3m in depth the single storey rear extension would not have a significant adverse impact in terms of light, or visual intrusion. Moreover the resulting impact to No. 24 and 30 would be similar to that of the existing extensions on the rear facing windows of the current application property, which are not significantly harmful to residential amenity. In addition to the rear extension No. 24 has erected a tiled pitched roof garden pavilion structure further to the rear which projects for a similar depth to the current proposals. This would further reduce the impact of the proposals on their rear facing habitable rooms as their own structure would be far more visible and restrictive to light levels than the proposals. It is important to note that under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order for a detached dwelling such as this the construction of a 4m deep rear extension similar to that proposed does not require formal planning permission. This suggests that the impact of such an extension is deemed acceptable and does not result in material harm to adjacent properties. The current proposal extends only 3m further to the rear.

9.14 The proposals would not result in a loss of privacy or increase overlooking levels. The rear facing windows would permit similar views over adjoining properties to the existing rear facing windows and it is not proposed to introduce any windows to the side flank elevations.

9.15 the proposals do not result in material harm to the residential amenities of adjacent and surrounding properties to comply with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013.

#### Impact on Highway Safety

9.16 The proposals do not alter the sites existing access arrangements and as such there would be no harm to the safety or operation of the highway. The resulting building would have five bedrooms which would require a maximum of three on site parking spaces under saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan. Whilst it is proposed to extend to the front, at ground floor level the projection is only 1.3m further than the existing garage and as such the remaining frontage would be of sufficient depth and area to accommodate three parking spaces to the required minimum dimensions (2.4m x 4.8m). It is important to note that provided it is porous, the amount of hard surface to the front of the dwelling could be increased without the need for planning permission and most of the properties to this section of Ashtree way have constructed larger driveways to the front. An indicative plan demonstrating the space available to the front and possible future parking arrangements has been submitted but these do not form part of the proposal. In addition to the generous frontage the plans illustrate a garage is to be retained, although given the limited width it is unlikely this would be used for parking. Given that three spaces can clearly be provided it therefore follows that the parking arrangements are sufficient and would not result in displacement parking onto the local highway network.

#### Other Material Planning Considerations

9.17 No trees or significant landscape features would be affected by the proposals.

#### Response to Neighbour comments

9.18 Concern has been raised by local residents in relation to the building line, parking, visual intrusion, loss of light, design out of keeping and dominant in street scene. These issues and concerns have been considered in the above sections but in addition to these concern is expressed in relation to over-development, covenants, raising the roof, and the total floor area increase.

9.19 Overdevelopment - the proposal does not amount to an over-development. The plot is large and whilst the resulting building would span almost the entire width, the site coverage with buildings is minimal. A generous front and rear garden and adequate and functional space for servicing the enlarged dwelling (parking, bins etc) is retained.

9.20 Covenants - the existence of covenants would not be a matter for consideration by the Local Planning Authority, these are legal restrictions placed upon the land.

9.21 Raising the roof - the proposal does not involve the raising of the roof. The side

and rear extension extend at the same height as the existing property and the two storey front extension is set marginally down from the existing ridgeline.

9.22 Floor Area increase - given the site is located within the town of Hemel Hempstead, whilst Policy CS12 requires development to respect the mass, bulk, height etc of the existing and surrounding properties there is no restriction on the size increase or the necessity for the extension to be proportionate to the original building like would apply to development proposed in the Green Belt (CS5).

CIL

9.19The development would not be CIL liable.

**10. 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>The materials 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.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Stratgey 2013.</p>
3	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:</p> <p>06/19/26A WWHH-201 REV A            06/19/26A WWHH-202 REV A            06/19/26A WWHH-203 REV A            06/19/26A WWHH-204 REV A            06/19/26A WWHH-205</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p> <p>Article 35;</p> <p>Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.</p>

## **Appendix 1**

### **Consultation responses**

No responses received.

## **Appendix 2**

### **Neighbour notification/site notice responses**

8 Representations have been received all objecting to the proposals. The MP has made written representation supporting the objectors concerns.

### **Objections**

## **(Objects)**

### **Comment submitted date: Wed 31 Jul 2019**

I fully support the objections raised by Mr Caterer and his concerns regarding the potential impact on neighbours either side and the street in general.

of particular concern is the plan to build beyond the 'building line' and its subsequent reduction in off road parking which will add to existing parking problems.

the proposal is too close to the neighbouring property and it cannot be right that the proposed gap will not allow room for any maintenance work.

the proposed building will impact on privacy and reduce sunlight to the adjacent property.

whilst the proposal does not directly affect me, i am concerned that planning permission that is sought, without due consideration of neighbours and the local environment, should be sympathetically considered, and in this case rejected.

## **(Objects)**

### **Comment submitted date: Wed 31 Jul 2019**

We live directly opposite No. 26.

We do not object to sympathetic planning but we do object to the current proposals particularly in relation to the front build line and also because the proposals would mean that the gap between the properties is not 2m and this will make the properties look semi-detached when we are all currently detached.

It would appear that DBC policy is being flaunted by these proposals by not adhering to the 2m gapping and the build line that has been in place for years.

We also object in to the front in terms of privacy, parking and that the whole proposals are not in keeping with the neighbouring properties or indeed those opposite.



the properties opposite all comply with the build line and we object to the way this will affect Ashtree Way and its visual appearance.

Looking at the proposals for the rear, whilst this does not materially affect us it is obvious that the large two storey rear projection will take privacy away from our neighbours and to their gardens as the sun moves around the building.

We understand the ward councillor has called in the application and we trust this has happened.

## **(Objects)**

**Comment submitted date: Tue 30 Jul 2019**

We are in support of an extension that is in line with the front line neighbouring buildings.

We have reservations about the extent of the expansion towards the road which will break the view line of/with the neighbouring buildings.

Such an expansion may reduce parking opportunities which are becoming increasingly difficult in this road.

## **(Objects)**

**Comment submitted date: Fri 05 Jul 2019**

original plans ;

Concerns Received - too large, impact on light to habitable rooms, breach of front build line.

Revised plans;

Following the submission of the revised plans, we have tried to log into the website to respond in the time suggested, but two attempts have failed, so we are emailing you and will drop in the original, so that they can be added by you.

1. This proposal represents significant over development of the site, the bulk and mass of the proposed extension would result in an overbearing and ugly house with a discordant and over dominant front gable.
2. The convoluted and discordant roof form is indicative that the floor plans are too large, also proven by the need for a crown roof. If the roof spans were reasonable the resulting pitched roof forms would sit well in the street scene without the need for fake ridges generated by a crown roof. Daylight to some rooms of the proposal will be significantly compromised and we note the 'snug' doesn't even have any natural daylight so is not technically a habitable room.
3. The proposal comes significantly forward of the building line which is quite a strong feature of the 3 houses in a row, nos 24 ?28. Other extensions on Ashtree Way which have eroded the building line are on a bend in the road and so the impact is much less.
4. The extension would fill in the gap between Nos 26 and 28, which is directly south of the rear terrace / amenity space of no 28 therefore creating significant shading and loss of light to that rear terrace / amenity space of no 28. This is exacerbated by the large front extension with a dominant gable element.

5. The existing extensions to Nos 24 and 28 respect and preserve the bulk and mass of the original house form, and the original roof form is easily legible. The proposal for no 26 extends much further back at both ground and first floor levels than its neighbours and is excessively deep and inappropriate.

6. The large bulk and mass of the proposal results in big blank side elevations which although partly obscured by the adjacent houses will nonetheless detract from the street scene.

7. Whilst we acknowledge there is now a 500mm gap between the proposed extension and the boundary, this should be increased to at least 1m to avoid a terracing effect of the properties. In addition, 500mm is not sufficient space for a scaffold to carry out the building works or to carry out any ongoing maintenance / decoration in subsequent years, again at least 1m is required. This is supported by the fact that the current gap between no. 28 and 30 is 2.2meters and the current gap between no. 26 and 24 is 2.7m. See the planning policy 'development within the plot'

8. The planning office will obviously and most definitely protect and defend any attempt to break the layout planning policy for Counters End and Boxmoor. The points laid out in our objection make this obvious.

Summary of Dacorum Planning Policy, HCA8 Counters End

Layout

Dwellings generally front the road in an informal layout although there is a distinct pattern to the development which produces curved building lines. This gives visual interest to the area but also contributes strongly to a feeling of spaciousness. Spacing generally within the medium range 2m to 5m between dwellings.

Traffic : Off-street parking

Dwellings have generally good on-site provision.

No.26 Ashtree Way, has a large grass frontage and existing drive which, if copied from the existing drive on the neighbouring property no. 28 could facilitate five cars off road. Recent parking policy has increased on-road parking in Ashtree Way significantly and surely highways could not support an erosion of the possibility to remove some of this unwanted on road vehicle use.

Development of the Plot

Extensions should normally be subordinate in terms of scale and height to the parent building.

9. Whilst we strongly object to the current plans that have been submitted we are not adverse to the property having a sympathetic extension which incorporates both planning policy and a neighbouring right to correct spacing and to enjoy the natural light between dwellings. It seems to us and it is our opinion the planning application is being judged on purely as permitted development. We understand that permitted development only covers the ground floor extension to the rear. Permitted development does not cover the huge second floor proposal or the closeness of the new development to No. 28.

It would be far more in keeping to the street scene to adopt the build line that both 24 and 28 Ashtree way have adhered to of which a covenant is in place to protect this boundary. New plans should be submitted which would incorporate a staggering effect, grading the rear extension to the original exterior wall and having the largest second floor extension area central to the new plans. This seems an obvious way forward to reduce mass and least affect both parent properties.

10. Any previous applications that have been passed in Ashtree Way should not be used a a

precedent for future planning mistakes to further erode the correct scene.

### **Comment submitted date: Tue 30 Jul 2019**

1. This proposal represents significant over development of the site, the bulk and mass of the proposed extension would result in an overbearing and ugly house with a discordant and over dominant front gable.
2. The convoluted and discordant roof form is indicative that the floor plans are too large, also proven by the need for a crown roof. If the roof spans were reasonable the resulting pitched roof forms would sit well in the street scene without the need for fake ridges generated by a crown roof. Daylight to some rooms of the proposal will be significantly compromised and we note the 'snug' doesn't even have any natural daylight so is not technically a habitable room.
3. The proposal comes significantly forward of the building line which is quite a strong feature of the 3 houses in a row, nos 24 -28. Other extensions on Ashtree Way which have eroded the building line are on a bend in the road and so the impact is much less.
4. The extension would fill in the gap between Nos 26 and 28, which is directly south of the rear terrace / amenity space of no 28 therefore creating significant shading and loss of light to that rear terrace / amenity space of no 28. This is exacerbated by the large front extension with a dominant gable element.
5. The existing extensions to Nos 24 and 28 respect and preserve the bulk and mass of the original house form, and the original roof form is easily legible. The proposal for no 26 extends much further back at both ground and first floor levels than its neighbours and is excessively deep and inappropriate.
6. The large bulk and mass of the proposal results in big blank side elevations which although partly obscured by the adjacent houses will nonetheless detract from the street scene.
7. Whilst we acknowledge there is now a 500mm gap between the proposed extension and the boundary, this should be increased to at least 1m to avoid a terracing effect of the properties. In addition, 500mm is not sufficient space for a scaffold to carry out the building works or to carry out any ongoing maintenance / decoration in subsequent years, again at least 1m is required. This is supported by the fact that the current gap between no. 28 and 30 is 2.2meters and the current gap between no. 26 and 24 is 2.7m. See the planning policy "development within the

plot"

8. The planning office will obviously and most definitely protect and defend any attempt to break the layout planning policy for Counters End and Boxmoor. The points laid out in our objection make this obvious.

Summary of Dacorum Planning Policy, HCA8 Counters End

Layout

Dwellings generally front the road in an informal layout although there is a distinct pattern to the development which produces curved building lines. This gives visual interest to the area but also contributes strongly to a feeling of spaciousness. Spacing generally within the medium range 2m to 5m between dwellings.

Traffic : Off-street parking

Dwellings have generally good on-site provision.

No.26 Ashtree Way, has a large grass frontage and existing drive which, if copied from the existing drive on the neighbouring property no. 28 could facilitate five cars off road. Recent parking policy has increased on-road parking in Ashtree Way significantly and surely highways could not support an erosion of the possibility to remove some of this unwanted on road vehicle use.

Development of the Plot

Extensions should normally be subordinate in terms of scale and height to the parent building.

9. Whilst we strongly object to the current plans that have been submitted we are not adverse to the property having a sympathetic extension which incorporates both planning policy and a neighbouring right to correct spacing and to enjoy the natural light between dwellings. It seems to us and it is our opinion the planning application is being judged on purely as permitted development. We understand that permitted development only covers the ground floor extension to the rear. Permitted development does not cover the huge second floor proposal or the closeness of the new development to No. 28.

It would be far more in keeping to the street scene to adopt the build line that both 24 and 28 Ashtree way have adhered to of which a covenant is in place to protect this boundary.

New plans should be submitted which would incorporate a staggering effect, grading the rear extension to the original exterior wall and having the largest second floor extension area central to the new plans. This seems an obvious way forward to reduce mass and least affect both parent properties.

10. Any previous applications that have been passed in Ashtree Way should not be used as a precedent for future planning mistakes to further erode the correct scene.

We reserve the right to make further comments.

We await to hear from you urgently.

## **(Objects)**

**Comment submitted date: Tue 30 Jul 2019**

With reference to the proposed development of 26 Ashtree Way, I would wish to provide my response as a resident in Ashtree Way which is very close to this property.

Whilst I acknowledge that the property in question has scope for extending as it is similar in size and shape to our original house prior to us extending, the sheer scale of what is proposed appears to exceed what would fit in with the neighbouring houses in Ashtree Way as well as those along the whole road.

Whilst the plans uploaded do not provide a visual context with the neighbouring properties, from the measurements provided; the raising of the roof line and the requirement to include a Crown roof, these lead to the conclusion that this proposal is very substantial and out of keeping with other properties.

For example:

1) The front edge of the property would exceed the natural building line of this and adjoining properties. With this being two storeys high with a gable end to the roof, this would be a significant structure out of keeping with neighbouring properties. Similar developments along Ashtree Way, albeit not quite to the same scale, are on properties which have a larger frontage, thereby giving a less obtrusive image. Furthermore, when we extended our property, we were refused a request to build beyond the building line so I question what has changed?.

2) The front extension would see a reduction in their off-street parking provision which for a house being increased from 4 to 5 beds comes across as a negative move. Again, we were required to increase our off-street parking when we added 1 bedroom.

3) The ridge height has been raised for no other reason other than to enable the extensive extensions to be built (as opposed to utilising the roof space for additional bedrooms). This suggests the overall external dimensions of the property are too great.

4) The reduction in the space between this property and its direct neighbours at 24 and 28 leads to the impression that the houses will be terraced. Again, this was raised when we extended our house and required us to provide an alternative so as to break up the ridge line. The properties at 22 / 24 Ashtree Way and 25 / 27 Ashtree Way were given by us as examples of such permission to which the Planning Officer replied saying they didn't like the image these created.

5) From a rough calculation, the existing house (excluding garage) is approximately 115m<sup>2</sup> (both floors) whereas the proposed extensions would result in approximately 250m<sup>2</sup> (excluding garage) which appears an excessive increase.

In summary I consider the proposal to be out of keeping with other properties in the road being too obtrusive with substantial front and side extensions (I cannot really comment about the rear) and raised roof line with reduction in off-street parking.

I am also concerned that if this proposal was granted, this would provide a precedent for other properties in the road.

Overall, I do believe this proposed development is of a size and appearance which is out of keeping with the area and whilst I would not have any objection to a more appropriate proposal, this one as it stands is excessive.

## **(Objects)**

**Comment submitted date: Mon 29 Jul 2019**

Blocking light, spoiling the line of houses and encroaching on the drive way making the houses look like semis and devaluing at the same time

Reducing parking in general

## **(Objects)**

**Comment submitted date: Mon 29 Jul 2019**

I have seen the application to extend this house and think that the extension is overdone. The proposal is far too big and out of line with other residences on the same road. I park my car in the road and there is often not enough parking spaces. If the proposed extension does go ahead, there will be less parking spaces on Ashtree way as the occupants will have to park their cars on the road, reducing the available spaces for non-residents. Why does the council continue to allow people to build these hideous monstrosities, no doubt just to make as much money as they can and then sell up and leave again.

## **(Objects)**

**Comment submitted date: Sun 28 Jul 2019**

With regards the planning application 4/01558/19/FHA, 26 Ashtree Way, Hemel Hempstead.

My wife and I, and other local residents are deeply concerned by the revised plans and wish to lodge our objection to the proposed plans. We are in no way against an extension of a reasonable size at the property, one that has a similar profile to the houses either side of number 26, one that has less of an impact to the look and feel of the street itself and does not impinge on the quality of life of the neighbours. The changes in the revised plans, compared to the initial proposal, are so slight they are all but inconsequential. The fact the revised plans seem set to be approved, with very little change, strongly indicates that the only consideration given was in relation to the 45 degree right to light. However, the plans have a much greater, more significant, impact on the locality and the neighbours.

The current plans are grossly oversized and are absolutely not in keeping with the surrounding houses. The size and style of the proposed first floor extension, with the crown roof, will cause issues for us at number 24, greatly impacting residential amenities due to the sheer bulk and size of the proposed plans. This will result in us losing direct sunlight much earlier in the evening. As the sun goes down it will now be blocked by the new rear extension, putting our patio and garden pavilion in the shade. This is, by far the area of the garden we use most. As both myself and my wife work full time we are only able to use the garden and patio in the early evenings which is exactly when the oversized first floor rear extension will block out the sunlight, putting us in shade. Were the first floor rear extension to be limited in size to that of numbers 28, 24 or even 22 (as these houses are all in a straight line) we feel it would be unreasonable of us to object, however, the current plans are for the first floor extension to come out further than any of the existing rear extensions. I also believe the fact a crown roof is required indicates the proposals are oversized for the plot and the current streetscape.

In addition to the first floor rear extension, the size of proposed side extension is currently, in our opinion, too close to number 28. This will not only impact the residents at 28, due to loss of direct sunlight but also will give the street the feel of terraced housing, which is not a look that sits well with us.

With regards the front extension, we were flabbergasted that this is potentially going to be permitted. A covenant in the deeds clearly states that residents may not even install a small boundary such as a fence or bush, so for an extension coming out over 2 metres from the front of the current property to be permitted is somewhat of a shock. The property line must be taken from the houses that are directly parallel. We fail to see how any other houses that are around bends of the road can be used as a benchmark for how far any extension can protrude from the front. In addition to the visual intrusion and the fact that it will look grossly out of character the front extension will clearly impact the available parking on the road. This has already been severely impacted by the recent introduction of residents permits on Green End Road, which has forced commuter traffic from the train station onto Ashtree Way and the loss of off-road parking at number 26 will further exacerbate this issue. The new family at no 26 are potentially a 5 car family, so to build out over what is currently ample off-road parking is an act of extreme folly.

As stated above, we are in no way against expansion, but we do object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed plans due to the size of the first floor, front, side and rear extensions.