

ITEM NUMBER: 5g

19/02788/FUL	Demolition of detached garage and construction of two new semi-detached houses in the rear garden of Molly Ash	
Site Address:	8 Alexandra Road Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DS	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr Harman	
Case Officer:	Sally Robbins	
Parish/Ward:	Chipperfield Parish Council	Bovingdon/ Flaunden/ Chipperfield
Referral to Committee:	Ward Cllr call-in and contrary view of Parish Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the suggested conditions.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The proposed dwellings constitute limited infilling in a village, which meets one of the exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The dwellings are therefore acceptable in principle. The layout, design and scale of the proposed development will not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the adjacent Conservation Area, immediate street scene or residential amenity of surrounding properties. The proposed amenity space provision is compatible with the surrounding area and the scheme meets the parking requirements. The proposed development therefore complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies CS6, CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policies 58, 99, 100, 120 and Appendices 3 and 5 of the Local Plan (2004).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site comprises a roughly square shaped plot to the rear of Molly Ash and no. 8 Alexandra Road. Molly Ash has rear access from Croft Lane, leading to an area of hardstanding and a garage. No. 8 Alexandra Road comprises an existing wooden workshop, small shed together with hardstanding, which also has access from Croft Lane. The dwellings are separated by 1.8m high close-boarded fences, and there is mature hedging and other vegetation along the Croft Lane frontage. The remainder of the site is laid to lawn and other forms of vegetation.

3.2 The surrounding area comprises a variety of mainly terraced and semi-detached dwellings of varying styles and ages. The site lies close to the core of the village and backs onto the recently extended Chipperfield Conservation Area. The site is located in a Selected Small Village in the Green Belt.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the detached workshop to the rear of 8 Alexandra Road and the construction of a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications (If Any):

4/02492/18/FUL - Demolition of detached garage and construction of new detached dwelling in land fronting croft Lane.

WDN - 28th November 2018

4/00937/98/FHA - Single storey rear extension
GRA - 10th July 1998

Appeals (If Any):

6. CONSTRAINTS

Parking Accessibility Zone (DBLP): 4
Special Control for Advertisements: Advert Spec Contr
CIL Zone: CIL2
Former Land Use (Risk Zone): Infilled Pond, Alexandra Road, Chipperfield
Former Land Use (Risk Zone): Infilled Pond, Kings Lane, Chipperfield
Former Land Use (Risk Zone): Infilled Pond, Croft Lane, Chipperfield
Former Land Use (Risk Zone): Garage, Langley Road, Chipperfield
Green Belt: Policy: CS5
LHR Wind Turbine
Parish: Chipperfield CP
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)
Small Village: 3
EA Source Protection Zone: 3

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)
Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS6 - Selected Small Villages in the Green Belt
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (2002)

Planning Obligations (2011)
Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)
Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;
The quality of design and impact on visual amenity;
The impact on residential amenity; and
The impact on highway safety and car parking.

Principle of Development

9.2 The application site is located within the Green Belt wherein the provisions of section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) apply. Paragraph 145 states that Local Planning Authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. However, it goes on to list exceptions to inappropriate development, including limited infilling in villages.

9.3 The site lies within the heart of the designated 'Selected Small Village' of Chipperfield. Core Strategy Policy CS6 states that limited infilling with affordable housing for local people will be permitted, provided that the development: is sympathetic to its surroundings, including the adjoining countryside, in terms of local character, design, scale, landscaping and visual impact; and retains and protects features essential to the character and appearance of the village.

9.4 The proposal falls outside the normal infill approach under Policy CS6 which only allows infilling with affordable housing. However, the Council published an Affordable Housing Clarification Note (July 2016), which states that for infill sites in villages under Policy CS6, as all of these villages fall within the 'rural area' designated in the PPG, new dwellings will only need to be affordable where the scheme creates 6 or more units. As infilling is defined as schemes of 2 units or less, this means that the requirement for infill development to comprise affordable units set out in Policy CS6 longer applies.

9.5 The term 'limited' refers to development which does not create more than two extra dwellings and 'infilling' is a form of development whereby buildings, most frequently dwellings, are proposed or constructed within a gap along a clearly identifiable built-up frontage or within a group of buildings. The site comprises part of a gap within a clearly identifiable built up frontage along Croft Lane that would be capable of accommodating up to two dwellings comfortably and consistently with the existing grain of development.

9.6 Taking all of the above into account, it is considered that the proposal for a pair of semi-detached dwellings in this location is acceptable in principle. The main issues in this case relate to the impact of the development on the street scene and adjacent Conservation Area, the impact on residential amenity, parking, access and highway safety.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.7 The application site is situated adjacent to Chipperfield Conservation Area where development should conserve and enhance the established character or appearance of the area in accordance with Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013). Saved Policy 120 of the Local Plan (2004) specifies

that development proposals outside a Conservation Area that affect its character and setting will be considered likewise.

9.8 More generally, Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy, Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and paragraph 127 of the NPPF seek to ensure that new development integrates with the surrounding area in terms of layout, design, scale and materials.

9.9 The surrounding area is varied in terms of dwelling style and age, however the proposed dwellings would be seen in the context of the adjoining row of terraced cottages (Endlea, Arden and Heathfield Cottage), which are considered to contribute positively to the street scene and wider setting of the Conservation Area. These cottages comprise simple frontages with modest porches, finished in rough cast white painted render. The character of the street scene is enhanced by the boundary treatment to the front of these cottages, which comprises low walls finished in brick and flint. The proposed development would also be seen in the context of longer views towards the rear of properties in Alexandra Road and towards the junction with Langley Road, which sit within the Conservation Area.

9.10 The proposed semi-detached dwellings would be staggered to follow the curve of the road. The dwellings would comprise traditional gable-end roofs finished in slate to match the surrounding properties. They would be finished in rough cast render and would comprise small porches, to follow the traditional architectural detail and finish of the adjacent cottages. On the front elevation the proposed design includes some contemporary details, including the integrated car ports and glazed side panels to the front doors. The front boundary wall would be low level and finished in brick and flint to harmonise with the boundary treatment to the front of the adjacent cottages. The dwellings would comprise centrally located chimney stacks and the rear elevation would comprise two small hipped projections at first floor level.

9.11 The Council's Conservation & Design Officer has been consulted and recommended that the plans should be amended to remove the soldier courses above the windows and to centralise the chimney stacks. Both of these suggestions have been incorporated into the design. The Conservation & Design Officer commented on the uncharacteristic covered car port area with garage behind, however did not consider that this would have a detrimental impact upon the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.

9.12 It is considered that the layout, design and scale of the proposed dwellings will not have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In addition, the scheme will preserve the character of the adjacent Conservation Area. The proposal therefore complies with Saved Appendix 3 and Policy 120 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2019).

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.13 The NPPF (2019) outlines the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy, seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact upon the neighbouring properties and their amenity space.

9.14 With respect to Molly Ash and no. 8 Alexandra Road, as a result of the proposed development the back-to-back separation distance at first floor level would be 23m, which meets the minimum requirement set out in Saved Appendix 3. There would be six windows at first floor level facing towards the rear, four of which would serve bathrooms and would be obscure glazed.

9.15 There are no side facing windows proposed at first floor level. As such there are no concerns regarding loss of privacy or overlooking to the residential units situated either side of the application site, including The Hornets and Endlea on Croft Lane. In addition, the proposed windows on the rear

elevation would have a limited oblique view of surrounding gardens. This would be further mitigated by obscure glazing to the first floor windows on the rear elevation.

9.16 Other dwellings situated to the rear of the site, including 5 and 6 Alexandra Road, are positioned at an oblique angle and situated a sufficient distance away that it is not considered there would be any significant loss of privacy.

9.17 The front elevation of the proposed dwellings would be situated less than 23m from the front elevation of Rosetas and Wansfell on Croft Lane, however it would be commensurate with the front-to-front separation distance in the surrounding area.

9.18 In terms of amenity space for the proposed and existing dwellings, the minimum requirement set out in Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) is 11.5m. However, some flexibility can be applied provided that the gardens are of a width, shape and size that ensures the space is functional and compatible with the surrounding area.

9.19 The proposed garden depths for the two dwellings would be 9m and 10.2m. As a result of the sub-division of the plots Molly Ash would have a garden depth of 10m and no. 8 Alexandra Road would have a depth 6.2m. These garden depths are less than the requirement set out in Saved Appendix 3, however are similar to the adjoining properties on Alexandra Road (nos. 1 - 7).

9.20 Taking into account the layout of the surrounding area, it is considered that a reduced garden depth is acceptable in this instance. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed garden width, shape and size would result in a functional space that is compatible with the surrounding area.

9.21 The concerns of local residents have been taken into account with respect to the impact of the proposed development on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Whilst visible from surrounding units, it is not considered that the proposed development will have a significant impact upon light provision, privacy or overlooking. Nor will the development have a detrimental impact upon the living conditions of future occupiers. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of the NPPF (2019), Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.22 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF (2019) states that when setting local parking standards authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport; local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles. Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policies 57, 58 and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004) promote an assessment based upon maximum parking standards.

9.23 The maximum parking requirement for a three bedroom dwelling in this location, according to Saved Appendix 5, is 2.25 spaces. Therefore the total parking requirement for the development is 4.5 spaces. The development proposes 4 off-street parking spaces comprised within a covered car port and garage for each dwelling. It is considered that this level of provision meets the maximum requirement and is acceptable.

9.24 One parking space would be lost to the rear of 8 Alexandra Road as a result of the proposed development. One space would also be retained to the front of no. 8 and there are no parking restrictions evident on Alexandra Road. Parking for Molly Ash would be retained.

9.25 The Highway Authority has been consulted and raised no objection to the proposal, including the proposed vehicle crossover, subject to the relevant conditions and informative notes.

9.26 Taking all of the above into account, it is considered that the proposed development will not result in a detrimental impact on local parking provision, nor will it have a severe impact to the safety and operation of the adjacent highway. Thus, the proposal meets the requirements of Policy CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004).

Other Material Planning Considerations

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.27 Saved Policies 99 and 100 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seek to ensure that retained trees are protected during development and that new planting is a suitable replacement for any removed trees.

9.28 There are no Tree Preservation Orders of otherwise protected trees within the application site. Existing trees, hedges and shrubs within the rear gardens of Molly Ash and no. 8 Alexandra Road would be removed to facilitate the development. By way of mitigation, the proposed scheme has the potential to provide soft and hard landscaping on site, as well as appropriate screening. Should planning permission be granted a condition would be recommended requesting details of hard surfacing materials, proposed boundary treatment and screening and other soft landscaping details.

9.29 Subject to the above landscaping condition, the proposal is considered to accord with Saved Policies 99 and 100 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Waste Management

9.30 Saved Policy 129 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that developments have adequate storage for refuse and recycling. This information has not been provided, however it is considered that there is adequate space within the site to provide secure space to store wheelie bins. These details would be secured via the above mentioned landscaping condition, should planning permission be granted. It is considered that the development could be incorporated into the existing refuse and recycling service and therefore complies with Policy 129.

Contaminated Land

9.31 The site resides within an area of potentially contaminative former land uses. As such the Council's Contaminated Land Officer has recommended conditions in order to identify and, if necessary, mitigate any land contamination. Appropriately, worded conditions would be added to any planning permission.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.32 These points have been addressed above.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.33 Policy CS35 requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on the 1st July 2015. This application is CIL Liable.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 By virtue of their sympathetic layout, design and scale the proposed semi-detached dwellings will conserve the character of the adjacent Conservation Area. Additionally. The proposal will not

adversely impact upon the visual amenity of the immediate street scene or the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Policy 120 and Appendices 3 and 5 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS6, CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2019).

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the suggested conditions:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin 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. (a) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to the submission to, and agreement of the Local Planning Authority of a written preliminary environmental risk assessment (Phase I) report containing a Conceptual Site Model that indicates sources, pathways and receptors. It should identify the current and past land uses of this site (and adjacent sites) with view to determining the presence of contamination likely to be harmful to human health and the built and natural environment.

(b) If the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the report which discharges condition (a), above, indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination then no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:

- (i) A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;
- (ii) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.

(c) No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report; if required as a result of (b), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

(d) This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:

- (i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (c) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.
- (ii) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.

3. Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 2, encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority as soon as practically possible; a scheme to render this contamination harmless shall be submitted to and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority and subsequently fully

implemented prior to the occupation of this site. Works shall be temporarily suspended, unless otherwise agreed in writing during this process because the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.

Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.

4. No development shall commence until full details (in the form of scaled plans and/or written specifications) have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to illustrate the following:

- o Surface water drainage. Arrangement shall be made for surface water to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.

- o Proposed front boundary wall of a height of no greater than 0.6m to ensure that visibility levels for vehicles and pedestrians are maximised. This would need to be permanently maintained.

Reason: To ensure suitable, safe and satisfactory planning and development of the site in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

5. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted the vehicular accesses and associated highway works shall be provided and thereafter retained at the position shown on the approved plan drawing number 1105 02. Arrangement shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory access into the site and avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

6. No development (excluding demolition/ground works) shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the area in accordance with Policies CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

7. No construction of the superstructure shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:

- o all external hard surfaces within the site
- o other surfacing materials
- o means of enclosure (including heights of fences / walls etc.)
- o soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs
- o minor artefacts and structures (e.g. refuse or other storage units).

The planting must be carried out within one planting season of completing the development.

Any tree or shrub, which forms part of the approved landscaping scheme, which within a period of 5 years from planting fails to become established, becomes seriously damaged or diseased, dies or for any reason is removed shall be replaced in the next planting season by a tree or shrub of a similar species, size and maturity.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the development and its contribution to biodiversity and the local environment, as required by saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 (e) of the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2013).

8. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:

1105 01 A (PROPOSED PLANS AND ELEVATIONS)
1105 02 (PROPOSED SITE PLAN)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through early engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage and through the course of the application, which lead 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.
2. 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 1730hrs on Monday to Friday, 08:00 - 13:00 Saturday and no works are permitted at any time on Sundays or bank holidays.
3. 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 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.
4. 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.
5. The Environmental Health Team has a web-page that aims to provide advice to potential developers, which includes a copy of a Planning Advice Note on "Development on Potentially Contaminated Land and/or for a Sensitive Land Use" in use across Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire. This can be found on www.dacorum.gov.uk by searching for contaminated land.
6. Where works are required within the public highway to facilitate the new or amended vehicular access, the Highway Authority require the construction of such works to be undertaken to their satisfaction and specification, and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus

or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.) the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission, requirements and for the work to be carried out on the applicant's behalf. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/changes-to-your-road/dropped-kerbs/dropped-kerbs.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

7. 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-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.
8. 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 <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)	<p>Environmental Helath (Noise & Air Quality):</p> <p>No objection on noise or air quality grounds.</p> <p>I would advise on the standard information for construction noise / dust being applied to any permission (see below).</p> <p>Construction Hours of Working - (Plant & Machinery) Informative</p> <p>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 1730hrs on Monday to Friday, 08:00 - 13:00 Saturday and no works are permitted at any time on Sundays or bank holidays.</p> <p>Construction Dust Informative</p> <p>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 Practical Means (BPM) should be used at all</p>

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 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.

Further comments from Environmental Health (Contaminated Land):

Having reviewed the documentation submitted with the above planning application and having considered the information held by the Environmental Health Department I have the following advice and recommendations in relation to land contamination.

The application is for new dwellings on land that has been previously developed and which may have been associated with land uses or features with the potential to have resulted in ground contamination that could represent a risk to the proposed end use.

Therefore, it is recommended that the following condition is included on any permission that may be granted in order to ensure that the developer appropriately identifies and addresses any land contamination risks in implementing that permission.

Contaminated Land Conditions:

Condition 1:

(a) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to the submission to, and agreement of the Local Planning Authority of a written preliminary environmental risk assessment (Phase I) report containing a Conceptual Site Model that indicates sources, pathways and receptors. It should identify the current and past land uses of this site (and adjacent sites) with view to determining the presence of contamination likely to be harmful to human health and the built and natural environment.

(b) If the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the report which discharges condition (a), above, indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination then no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:

(i) A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;

(ii) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.

(c) No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report; if required as a result of (b), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

(d) This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:

(i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (c) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.

(ii) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.

Condition 2:

Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 1 encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority as soon as practically possible; a scheme to render this contamination harmless shall be submitted to and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority and subsequently fully implemented prior to the occupation of this site. Works shall be temporarily suspended, unless otherwise agreed in writing during this process because the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.

Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.

Informatives:

The above conditions are considered to be in line with paragraphs 170 (e) & (f) and 178 and 179 of the NPPF 2019.

The Environmental Health Team has a web-page that aims to provide advice to potential developers, which includes a copy of a Planning Advice Note on "Development on Potentially Contaminated Land and/or for a Sensitive Land Use" in use across Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire.

	<p>This can be found on www.dacorum.gov.uk by searching for contaminated land.</p> <p>Please let me know if you would like to discuss this advice.</p>
Local Parish	<p>CPC: OBJECTION for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inadequate parking in 2 x proposed dwellings ' in a car dependent village 3 spaces are necessary for 3 bed dwellings. Furthermore, tandem parking is discouraged because it tends to lead to on-street parking of 1 vehicle. 2. Inadequate parking of retained dwellings ' No 8 Alexandra Road reduces from 2 spaces to 1; not acceptable. Molly Ash retains 2 spaces but also tandem which tends to lead to on-street parking. 3. On street parking within Croft Lane is reduced by the increased meterage dropped kerb. 4. Building line facing Croft Lane should be curved to match the curvature of the lane. 5. Overdevelopment of the site ' adjoining terrace of cottages are 2 bedrooms.
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	<p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No development shall commence until full details (in the form of scaled plans and/or written specifications) have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to illustrate the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Surface water drainage. Arrangement shall be made for surface water to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway. o Proposed front boundary hedge of a height of no greater than 0.6m to ensure that visibility levels for vehicles and pedestrians are maximised. This would need to be permanently maintained. Reason: To ensure suitable, safe and satisfactory planning and development of the site in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018). 2. Access / Highway Works Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted the vehicular accesses and associated highway works shall be provided and thereafter retained at the position shown on the approved plan drawing number 1105 02. Arrangement shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway. Reason: To ensure satisfactory access into the site and avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway in

accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

HIGHWAY INFORMATIVES: Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) recommends inclusion of the following highway informative / advisory note (AN) to ensure that any works within the public highway are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980:

AN) Construction standards for new/amended vehicle access: Where works are required within the public highway to facilitate the new or amended vehicular access, the Highway Authority require the construction of such works to be undertaken to their satisfaction and specification, and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.) the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission, requirements and for the work to be carried out on the applicant's behalf. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/changes-to-your-road/dropped-kerbs/dropped-kerbs.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

AN) 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-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

AN) 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 <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

COMMENTS / ANALYSIS: The application comprises of the demolition of an existing detached garage and construction of two semi-detached dwellings at land to the rear of Molly Ash and 8 Alexander Road, Chipperfield - the new dwellings would be accessed from Croft Lane. Croft Lane is designated as an unclassified local access road, subject

to a speed limit of 30mph and is highway maintainable at public expense. Alexander Road is designated as highway but not maintainable at public expense.

ACCESS: There are two existing vehicle crossovers (VXO) from Croft Lane providing access to the rear of 8 Alexander Road and Molly Ash. One of these VXOs is to be utilised to provide access to a driveway for one of the proposed dwellings whilst the other VXO is to remain as a vehicular access for Molly Ash. In addition, there will be one new VXO providing access to a driveway/garage for the second proposed dwelling, which would require the extension of the existing dropped kerb for Molly Ash. The arrangements are shown on submitted plan no. 1105 02 and considered to be acceptable by HCC as Highway Authority.

The applicant would need to enter into an agreement with HCC as Highway Authority in relation to the works required to create the extended VXO and any other associated highway works.

The proposed front boundary planting would need to be of a height of no greater than 0.6m to ensure that vehicular and pedestrian visibility is maximised, particularly due the bend in the road to the north of the access.

PARKING & MANOEVRABILITY: The general layout and provision of parking (with two parking spaces per each of the new dwellings) is considered to be acceptable by HCC as Highway Authority. Although the proposals will lead to a loss of parking for 8 Alexander Road, any effects from this would not be significant enough to recommend refusal from a highways perspective. Dacorum Borough Council as parking authority would ultimately need to be satisfied with the overall level of parking.

REFUSE / WASTE COLLECTION: No specific details have been provided as part of the application. Provision would need to be made for an on-site bin-refuse store within 30m of the dwelling and within 25m of the kerbside/bin collection point.

EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS: The proposal is within the recommended emergency vehicle access of 45 metres from the highway to all parts of the buildings. This adheres to guidelines as recommended in MfS, Roads in Hertfordshire; A Design Guide and Building Regulations 2010: Fire Safety Approved Document B Vol 1 - Dwellinghouses.

CONCLUSION: The applicant will need to enter into a vehicle crossover agreement with HCC as Highway Authority to cover the works required to widen the existing VXO. The proposal would not have an unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highway. HCC therefore has no objections on highway grounds to the application, subject to the inclusion of the above planning conditions and informatives.

<p>Conservation & Design (DBC)</p>	<p>The application site is to the rear of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash but fronts on to Croft Lane. Molly Ash and 8 Alexandra Rd (along with the rest of Alexandra Road) was included in the extended Chipperfield Conservation Area boundary following the production of the 2011 Chipperfield Conservation Area appraisal; but the boundary does not incorporate the full plot. The site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and the impact upon the setting of the Chipperfield CA will therefore need to be considered. The rear part of the plot currently contains a garage / sheds / garden etc. Adjacent to the plot is a short terrace of 3 rendered properties (19th or early 20th century, extended) which front on to Croft Lane.</p> <p>In principle, an appropriately designed and detailed semi-detached pair of properties would be acceptable upon this plot and will preserve the street scene.</p> <p>The proposed 2 storey dwellings are proposed to be of roughcast render finish (to match the adjacent properties) which is acceptable - however I would suggest the render covers the window heads rather than leave the brick soldier courses exposed which would look rather awkward in my view (and being fully roughcast rendered would reflect the design of the adjacent terrace). The introduction of chimney stacks is welcomed but stacks, which are central to each roof, may look better in this case. The use of slate for the roofs is acceptable.</p> <p>The one element of the scheme that is visually rather uncharacteristic is the proposed covered area with garage behind for each dwelling (to provide the necessary parking) but this will not have a detrimental impact upon the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.</p> <p>The low flint / brick front / side boundary wall is acceptable in principle.</p> <p>Recommend the plans are amended as outlined above (render over the window heads and central chimney stacks).</p> <p>If approved a condition requiring details of external construction materials is recommended.</p>
--	---

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
10	23	0	22	1

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
<p>Zellstones Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DU</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development</p> <p>I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets.</p> <p>The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.</p> <p>The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.</p> <p>The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Overshadowing</p> <p>The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.</p> <p>Overlooking</p> <p>The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.</p> <p>Lack of benefit to the Community</p> <p>This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,</p> <p>The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.</p> <p>We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further t houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of</p> <p>The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.</p>

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integralgarage. The othertwo do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infilla clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by sitingthem end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space forthe existing house at No:8 so the toial number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for

No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street

	<p>spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park. There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.</p> <p>Trees and Hedges On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No". I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.</p> <p>Drains and sewage Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Traffic Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction. I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Melrose Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DU</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes. The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets. The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.</p>

The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.

The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.

Overshadowing

The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.

Overlooking

The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.

Lack of benefit to the Community

This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.

We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further 4 houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integralgarage. The othertwo do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2 The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infill a clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4 I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2 In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by siting them end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space for the existing house at No:8 so the total number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for

No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.

There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.

Trees and Hedges

On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".

I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.

Drains and sewage

Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from

Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.

Traffic

	<p>Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.</p> <p>I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Heathfield Cottage Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DU</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development</p> <p>I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets.</p> <p>The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.</p> <p>The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.</p> <p>The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Overshadowing</p> <p>The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.</p> <p>Overlooking</p> <p>The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.</p> <p>Lack of benefit to the Community</p> <p>This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,</p>

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar. We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further 10 houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integral garage. The other two do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2 The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infill a clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4 I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2 In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by siting them end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through

	<p>the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.</p> <p>Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space for the existing house at No:8 so the total number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.</p> <p>There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.</p> <p>Trees and Hedges</p> <p>On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".</p> <p>I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.</p> <p>Drains and sewage</p> <p>Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.</p> <p>I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Timbertop Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DU</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development</p> <p>I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the</p>

proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.

The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets.

The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.

The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.

The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.

Overshadowing

The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.

Overlooking

The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.

Lack of benefit to the Community

This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.

We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further 4 houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integral garage. The other two do

not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2 The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infill a clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4 I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2 In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by siting them end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space for the existing house at No:8 so the total number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for

No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.

There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.

Trees and Hedges

On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".

I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.

Drains and sewage

Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from

	<p>Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Traffic Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction. I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Milford Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DU</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes. The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets. The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border. The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage. The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Overshadowing The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.</p> <p>Overlooking The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun</p>

(which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.

Lack of benefit to the Community

This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.

We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further 11 houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integral garage. The other two do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2 The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infill a clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4 I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2 In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by siting them end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-

	<p>detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".</p> <p>The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.</p> <p>Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space for the existing house at No:8 so the total number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.</p> <p>There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.</p> <p>Trees and Hedges</p> <p>On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".</p> <p>I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.</p> <p>Drains and sewage</p> <p>Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.</p> <p>I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Oakland Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow</p>

Hertfordshire
WD4 9DX

hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.

Over development

I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.

The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets.

The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.

The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.

The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.

Overshadowing

The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.

Overlooking

The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.

Lack of benefit to the Community

This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.

We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further t houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integral garage. The other two do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2 The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infill a clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4 I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2 In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by siting them end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space for the existing house at No:8 so the total number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for

No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.

There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.

Trees and Hedges

On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".

I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are

	<p>no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.</p> <p>Drains and sewage Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Traffic Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.</p> <p>I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>The Orchard Alexandra Road Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DS</p>	<p>I would like to support this development as village needs more houses.</p>
<p>Mayleaves Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DX</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets.</p> <p>The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.</p> <p>The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.</p> <p>The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.</p>

Overshadowing

The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.

Overlooking

The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.

Lack of benefit to the Community

This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.

We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further t houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integralgarage. The othertwo do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infilla clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.41disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by siting them end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space for the existing house at No:8 so the total number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for

No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.

There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.

Trees and Hedges

On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".

I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.

Drains and sewage

Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer.

Existing sewage drains from

Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.

Traffic

Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden

Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed

	<p>development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.</p> <p>I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>The Briars Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DX</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development</p> <p>I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets.</p> <p>The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.</p> <p>The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.</p> <p>The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Overshadowing</p> <p>The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.</p> <p>Overlooking</p> <p>The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.</p> <p>Lack of benefit to the Community</p> <p>This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,</p> <p>The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.</p> <p>We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further t houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of</p>

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integralgarage. The othertwo do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infilla clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by sitingthem end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space forthe existing house at No:8 so the toial number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for

	<p>No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.</p> <p>There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.</p> <p>Trees and Hedges</p> <p>On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".</p> <p>I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.</p> <p>Drains and sewage</p> <p>Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.</p> <p>I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Endlea Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DU</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development</p> <p>I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets.</p>

The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.

The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.

The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.

Overshadowing

The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.

Overlooking

The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.

Lack of benefit to the Community

This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.

We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further t houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integralgarage. The othertwo do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infilla clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by sitingthem end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space forthe existing house at No:8 so the toial number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for

No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced fron'l 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.

There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.

Trees and Hedges

On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".

I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.

Drains and sewage

Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer.

Existing sewage drains from

Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely

	<p>on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Traffic Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.</p> <p>I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Bay Cottage 7 Alexandra Road Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DS</p>	<p>19/02788/FUL Demolition of detached garage and construction of two new semi-detached houses in the rear garden of Molly Ash 8 Alexandra Road Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DS</p> <p>Whilst we are happy that the plans now incorporate the minimum distance of 23m between the main rear walls of the proposed houses and those on Alexandra Road (including ours), as required by the local plan, we still feel there are significant shortcomings with the proposed design, particularly with respect to parking and sewage.</p> <p>Most of these shortcomings stem from the fact that the proposed site, is an over development - 2 bedroom houses would be more suitable than the proposed 3 bedroom houses. I feel that in an attempt to shoe horn in 3 bedroom houses the design has been poorly conceived.</p> <p>Finally, it is pertinent to make reference to the proposed development on the Orchard (Planning application /03231/18/FUL) which was rejected earlier this year for some of the reasons I describe below.</p> <p>1) Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal provides 2 parking spaces per property, but these are provided end-on-end, one of which is inside a garage. This is totally impractical as only one car, at any one time, can access the street. - This will almost certainly mean future inhabitants will end up with at least one car parked on the road. - As Chipperfield is zone 4, in terms of accessibility, the local plan (pg. 434 on the link below) states that 2.25 car spaces should be provided for new 3 bedroom houses. This should mean the new houses need to provide 5 spaces between them. The proposed does not achieve this and actually removes one on-street parking space through the addition of a new dropped curb.

<http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/dacorum-borough-local-plan-adopted-2004---post-adoption-of-core-strategy-and-site-allocations-dpds.pdf?sfvrsn=2>

- The proposal is misleading and further flawed by the fact it only provides a net increase of 3 car parking spaces across the 4 houses (8 Alexandra Road, Molly Ash and the 2 proposed) as one space from the existing houses is cannibalised - the number of parking spaces currently available to #8 and Molly Ash would drop from 3 to 2.

- I don't know how many bedrooms Molly Ash and #8 have, but I must assume they have at least 3 each and whilst 1 parking space per home may be sufficient for the current owners I don't think anyone can be satisfied this will be sufficient for future owners and families, especially in a world where increasing numbers of families have at least 2 cars.

- All in all the proposed scheme will add further pressure to the parking on both Alexandra Road (which has very limited parking as it is), Croft Lane and the roads surrounding it. Alexandra Road has no capacity for more cars and Croft Lane is not much better. To illustrate this, we have a rear parking space at the end of our garden that fronts onto Croft Lane and this has frequently been blocked by Croft Lane residents whom had nowhere else to park. Thus I cannot see how the proposed development will do anything more than exacerbate this problem.

2) Boundary, Design, Overshadowing

- The proposal is to build right up to our boundary with virtually no space in-between.

- This is obtrusive, over bearing and will no doubt reduce the light into our garden.

- Is there a minimum required set back from the boundary? If so, then this would fail the test by any measure.

- The design statement says the new houses will be inkeeping with the existing houses; I am not sure how the developer concluded this - there are no other houses with a "car port" in the vicinity. The proposed houses will be out of character and damage the residential amenity of neighbors - the only reason the "car ports" are included in the design is to squeeze a 3rd bedroom in, which is another example of how this is an over development.

3) Public Sewer

- A public sewer, from Alexandra Road, runs partially through the garden of 7 Alexandra Road, before running through number 8.

- No reference to this is made in the plans, and unless clarified, I can only assume the plan is to build over the public sewer - in which case has permission been sought and obtained from the sewage undertaker?

4) Garden Depth

- It is difficult to tell from the plans whether the depth of the gardens meet the minimum requirement of 11.5m.

- This should be clarified.

	<p>I hope that you agree with the issues I have raised above, particularly the parking provisions which verge on absurd. Therefore unless the applicant can provide suitable parking, which adheres to the local plan's requirements, then I urge you to reject the proposal. I would also encourage you to insist that the applicant clarifies the sewer point.</p>
<p>The Hornets Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DU</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development</p> <p>I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets.</p> <p>The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.</p> <p>The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.</p> <p>The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Overshadowing</p> <p>The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.</p> <p>Overlooking</p> <p>The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.</p> <p>Lack of benefit to the Community</p> <p>This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,</p> <p>The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.</p> <p>We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further t houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of</p>

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integralgarage. The othertwo do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infilla clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by sitingthem end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space forthe existing house at No:8 so the toial number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for

	<p>No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.</p> <p>There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.</p> <p>Trees and Hedges</p> <p>On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".</p> <p>I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.</p> <p>Drains and sewage</p> <p>Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.</p> <p>I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Beechcroft Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DX</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development</p> <p>I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets.</p>

The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.

The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.

The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.

Overshadowing

The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.

Overlooking

The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.

Lack of benefit to the Community

This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.

We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further t houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integralgarage. The othertwo do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infilla clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by sitingthem end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space forthe existing house at No:8 so the toial number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for

No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced fron'l 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.

There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.

Trees and Hedges

On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".

I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.

Drains and sewage

Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer.

Existing sewage drains from

Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely

	<p>on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Traffic Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.</p> <p>I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Rosetas Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DX</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets.</p> <p>The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.</p> <p>The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.</p> <p>The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Overshadowing The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.</p> <p>Overlooking The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.</p> <p>Lack of benefit to the Community</p>

This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.

We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further 10 houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integralgarage. The othertwo do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infilla clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by sitingthem end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently

	<p>parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.</p> <p>Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space for the existing house at No:8 so the total number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.</p> <p>There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.</p> <p>Trees and Hedges</p> <p>On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".</p> <p>I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.</p> <p>Drains and sewage</p> <p>Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.</p> <p>I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Wansfell Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DX</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development</p>

I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.

The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets.

The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.

The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.

The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.

Overshadowing

The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.

Overlooking

The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.

Lack of benefit to the Community

This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.

We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further t houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring

terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integral garage. The other two do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2 The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infill a clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4 I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2 In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by siting them end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space for the existing house at No:8 so the total number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for

No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.

There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.

Trees and Hedges

On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".

I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.

Drains and sewage

	<p>Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Traffic Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction. I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Stoneycroft Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DX</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes. The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets. The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border. The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage. The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Overshadowing The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.</p> <p>Overlooking The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom</p>

and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.

Lack of benefit to the Community

This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.

We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further 11 houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integral garage. The other two do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2 The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infill a clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4 I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2 In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by siting them end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-

	<p>detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".</p> <p>The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.</p> <p>Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space for the existing house at No:8 so the total number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.</p> <p>There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.</p> <p>Trees and Hedges</p> <p>On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".</p> <p>I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.</p> <p>Drains and sewage</p> <p>Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.</p> <p>I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Green Orchard Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road.</p>

Hertfordshire
WD4 9DU

Over development

I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.

The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terraced houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of the terraced houses and that of The Hornets.

The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.

The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.

The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.

Lack of benefit to the Community

This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer.

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.

We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 4 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5

on the Spice Village site. A further 3 houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by siting them end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings....., are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking

problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No: 8 site this removes a space for the existing house at No:8 so the total number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for No:8 is reduced to 1.

In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.

There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.

Trees and Hedges

On the planning application question I-0 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".

I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate.

Drains and sewage

Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.

Traffic

Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden

Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.

I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.

<p>Reddings Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DU</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terraced houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of the terraced houses and that of The Hornets.</p> <p>The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.</p> <p>The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.</p> <p>The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents. Lack of benefit to the Community This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer.</p> <p>The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar. We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of L4 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further 4 houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.</p> <p>Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.</p> <p>Lack of adequate parking The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4. These are only made possible by siting them end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The</p>
---	---

semi-detached dwellings.....,are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No: 8 site this removes a space for the existing house at No:8 so the total number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for No:8 is reduced to 1.

In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.

There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.

Trees and Hedges

On the planning application question I-0 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".

I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate.

Drains and sewage

Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from

Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others)flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.

Traffic

Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden

Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to

	<p>see whether a car is coming from the other direction. I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Shalom Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DX</p>	<p>Please count this email as two further objections to the above proposed building application.</p> <p>We object to the application for the following reasons-</p> <p>Over development</p> <p>(i) The proposed 2x 3 bed semi detached houses would just be crammed into a small site at the end of two gardens. This would result in 4 homes being crammed into a small site</p> <p>(ii) The immediate village area is becoming over developed already with the planning permission granted to the Garden Centre at the back of Croft Lane Plus applications in for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o the Land Rover Garage o the site opposite the Kia garage <p>Inadequate parking allocation</p> <p>(iii) Firstly this is a village location with poor existing bus links. Consequently it can be expected that occupants of a 3 bed home will have at least 2 cars.</p> <p>It is unacceptable to make an application where 2 spaces involve cars being parked one behind the other together with the other semi-detached using a garage as one of the two parking spaces. One of your colleagues has already stated that parking spaces cannot include cars being parked one in front of each other for an application to extend their property in Croft Lane</p> <p>At recent planning committee meetings I have attended, Councillors have highlighted the need to acknowledge different parking requirements for rural areas compared to town centres.</p> <p>Common sense says this proposal will result in an additional two cars having to use the road. Plus any visitors parking using the road. Plus any commercial vehicle the owners may have using the road. This will increase the existing parking problems in Croft Lane.</p> <p>(iv) This application is not in keeping with local planning directions of 2.25 for a 3 bed house.</p> <p>Building lines</p>

	<p>(v) The proposals would not meet the existing building lines either side of the proposed development</p> <p>Chipperfield Design Statement</p> <p>(vi) The property design is not in keeping with the Chipperfield Design Statement. It is acknowledged by Dacorum Planning department this document should be taken into account with applications</p> <p>Removal of trees</p> <p>(vii) The application would result in existing trees being removed from the site. There would be no scope for replacing these with the properties being crammed into such a small site. The planting of trees is obviously a hot topic currently</p> <p>Sewers</p> <p>(viii) There is currently a major issue with the drains servicing Croft Lane. One family has the issue of their garden being flooded with human waste periodically to date. Building further properties will add to this problem.</p> <p>Would you be kind enough to acknowledge receipt of our email please as it appears you have problems with your systems at the moment.</p>
<p>Arden Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DU</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development</p> <p>I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets.</p> <p>The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.</p> <p>The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.</p> <p>The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Overshadowing</p> <p>The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room</p>

and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.

Overlooking

The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.

Lack of benefit to the Community

This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.

We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further 4 houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integralgarage. The othertwo do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infilla clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by siting them end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space for the existing house at No:8 so the total number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for

No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.

There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.

Trees and Hedges

On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".

I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.

Drains and sewage

Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from

Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.

Traffic

Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden

Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.

I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY

	<p>proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>2 Didsbury Cottages Chapel Croft Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DP</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development</p> <p>I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets.</p> <p>The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border.</p> <p>The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns, avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.</p> <p>The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Overshadowing</p> <p>The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.</p> <p>Overlooking</p> <p>The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.</p> <p>Lack of benefit to the Community</p> <p>This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,</p> <p>The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.</p> <p>We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further t houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of</p> <p>The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.</p> <p>Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.</p>

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integralgarage. The othertwo do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infilla clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.4I disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by sitingthem end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space forthe existing house at No:8 so the toial number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for

No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced fron'l 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.

	<p>There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.</p> <p>Trees and Hedges On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No". I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.</p> <p>Drains and sewage Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Traffic Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction. I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.</p>
<p>Belmont Croft Lane Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9DU</p>	<p>I am writing to express my extreme opposition to the plan to place dwellings on the Croft Lane end of the garden of 8 Alexandra Road and Molly Ash, Alexandra Road. My wife and I live at Endlea, Croft Lane and our property is separated from the garden of number 8 by a narrow hard standing, small garden shed and narrow garden of the property at 7 Alexandra Road.</p> <p>Over development I strongly believe that the proposal is not consistent with the building to garden ratio which applies generally in Chipperfield. In addition the proposal will increase the density of buildings beyond reasonable levels and will be totally out of place with nearby homes. The proposed dwelling does not sit "on the existing building line between the terrace houses and the 1970 houses" as the developer has stated being situated a good way in front of our house and that of The Hornets. The development sits adjacent to the conservation area and I hope it would not be the Council's wish to have this dense development on such a border. The proposal fails to meet several criteria of the Chipperfield Design Statement being: respect for established informal building patterns,</p>

avoiding formal "estate style" layout, allowing for car access and parking away from the frontage.

The development is unsympathetic to neighbouring residents.

Overshadowing

The new house at no 8 will severely restrict the amount of light to our home, particularly into our dining room/kitchen. It will also prevent the sun reaching our back garden and patio area, both in the winter and afternoons and evenings in the summer, The view from our dining room and main bedroom onto gardens and mature silver birch trees will be ruined.

Overlooking

The windows at the back of the proposed houses will look directly into our garden, particularly onto our patio which is situated at its bottom and was built there deliberately to catch the afternoon and evening sun (which will be blocked by the proposed buildings). This is an invasion of our privacy.

Lack of benefit to the Community

This development brings nothing good to the village. In fact it takes away a "green" area consisting of trees, shrubs and flowers. We need more of these areas, not fewer,

The only people who will benefit are the owners and the developer who will be better off financially but leave a legacy of bricks and mortar.

We don't need any more houses in the village. A number have been on the market all summer and remain unsold. Plans have been approved for a total of 14 houses on the Garden Centre site and 5 on the Spice Village site. A further t houses are proposed for the Land Rover site and the owner of

The Orchard in Alexandra Road is persistent in his hope for approval of his plans for, currently, 3 houses there.

Were this proposal to be granted I believe it would set a precedent for the village.

Inaccuracies and questionable statements in the design and access statement

The developer's design and access statement makes a number of incorrect statements and assumptions.

1.5 I strongly refute the assumption that the scheme "carefully and sensitively.....fits the street scene and compliments the nearby conservation area"

1.5 The proposed dwelling does not follow the building line in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right as the developer has stated being situated in front of our house and well ahead of that of The Hornets. The new buildings will not be "in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right". None of these have a carport, described as a covered driveway. One has an integralgarage. The othertwo do not. None of the homes in the vicinity look anything like the houses proposed.

1.7 The street scene cannot be enhanced by replacing gardens with two houses.

2.0.2 The houses are not set on a building line to match the neighbouring terrace houses as mentioned above. Best use of the site would be to leave it as it is.

2.2.2The developers seem to think it is a good idea to "infilla clearly identifiable gap in the built up frontage of Croft Lane". I strongly disagree. The gap gives us green space.

2.2.41 disagree that it makes more effective use of the site. Removal of green space is not to be desired.

2.3.2 In what way does the building make better use of the site? By replacing a pleasant garden with a pile of bricks?

2.5.4 The garden areas created are certainly not in keeping with those neighbouring the site. They and what is left of the existing gardens will be much smaller than their neighbours.

Lack of adequate parking

The parking requirement for a new three bedroom house is for 2.25 (ie 3) parking spaces on a property. This means that the two houses proposed should have 5 spaces and they only offer 4.

These are only made possible by siting them end-on-end with one in a garage. None of the houses in the vicinity have this arrangement so I again question the developer's statement in 1.6 that "The semi-detached dwellings.....are in keeping with the neighbouring terraced houses to the right".

The inconvenience of having to move one car in order to get another car out of the garage will mean that one of them will be permanently parked in Croft Lane thus adding to the existing parking problem. This will be increased by the removal of one on street parking place through the addition of a new dropped kerb for the house on the rear garden of Molly Ash.

Since one parking space at the foot of the garden of No: 8 will become one of the spaces for the proposed house on the No:8 site this removes a space for the existing house at No:8 so the total number of new spaces provided for the two houses is actually only 3 and the number of spaces for

No:8 is reduced to 1. In practice, therefore, if we assume one car from each house will be parked in Croft Lane and the number of on street spaces is reduced from 3 to 2, there will not be any spaces in front of the new houses for anyone else to park.

There are no planned visitor parking spaces so they will end up parking somewhere in Croft Lane, thus adding to an existing problem.

Trees and Hedges

On the planning application question 10 asks "Are there any trees or hedges which.....might be important as part of the local landscape character?" to which the developer has answered "No".

I strongly refute this answer. There are substantial mature trees on the site which are important to the residents of Croft Lane since there are no other trees in the immediate vicinity. Trees are important in so many ways as we now all appreciate. Three hedges which currently add to the greenness of the area will be grubbed up.

Drains and sewage

Mention is made that foul sewage will be dealt with by Mains sewer. Existing sewage drains from

Nos: 7 and 8 Alexandra Road (and maybe others) flow under their gardens and, therefore, under the new building(s) and into the main drain in Croft Lane. This is already inadequate and backs up severely on occasions. More such from the new buildings will only exacerbate the situation.

Traffic

Existing heavy traffic which will be increased by owners of the new houses to be built on the Garden

Centre site, their families and visitors will be further amplified by the cars of the new owners of the proposed development, their family and

visitors. Croft Lane already suffers from traffic problems, being a narrow road with a dogleg just by the site of the proposed development. It is not helped by on street parking in the road in front of the proposed development in that this makes it difficult to see whether a car is coming from the other direction.

I hope that you can see that there are a number of reasons for this proposal to be refused. Many of these stated above will apply to ANY proposal to build on the sites and to which I would object expressing similar views.