

ITEM NUMBER: 5f

19/02521/FHA	Single storey front extension, two storey side and rear extension	
Site Address:	15 New Road Wilstone Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4NZ	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr Trotter	
Case Officer:	Jane Miller	
Parish/Ward:	Tring Rural Parish Council	Tring West & Rural
Referral to Committee:	Contrary to the views of Tring Rural Parish Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The application seeks permission for a householder extension to a dwelling within the Rural Area. The site is located within the Wilstone Conservation Area. The principle of extensions in this location is acceptable subject to being in accordance with Policy CS7. The extensions are considered to be acceptable and would not have a significant impact upon the Rural Area, Conservation Area, character and appearance of the surrounding area or residential amenity of surrounding properties. The proposed development therefore complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies CS7, CS27, CS11, CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site is located on the north east side of New Road within the Wilstone Conservation Area and designated Rural Area. The site comprises a Rothschild style two storey semi-detached dwelling with off-street parking to the front. The dwelling is set back from the front boundary by approximately 17m.

3.2 The immediate character on the north east side of that part of New Road comprises similarly designed semi-detached dwelling houses, many of which have been extended, some rather dominant in their design and scale. The overall character of the area is evident.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 This application seeks permission for a single storey front extension, two storey side and rear extension.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 None

6. CONSTRAINTS

Parking Accessibility Zone (DBLP): 4
 Special Control for Advertisements: Advert Spec Control
 Area of Archaeological Significance: 13
 CIL Zone: CIL2

Conservation Area: WILSTONE
Former Land Use (Risk Zone): Former Animal Feed Mill, Tring Road, Wilstone
Former Land Use (Risk Zone): Infilled Pit, Tring Road, Wilstone
Former Land Use (Risk Zone): Former Smithy, Tring Road, Wilstone, Tring
Parish: Tring Rural CP
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Yellow (45.7m)
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: RAF HALTON: DOTTED BLACK ZONE
Rural Area: Policy: CS7
Small Village: Wilstone

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
CS7 – Rural Area
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS27 – Quality of the Historic Environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Saved Policy 22 of the Local Plan
Saved Appendix 5 – Parking Provision

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;
Impact on the Rural Area
Impact on the Conservation Area;
The quality of design and impact on visual amenity; and
The impact on residential amenity;

Principle of Development

- 9.2 The application site is located within the rural area wherein policy CS7 of the adopted Core Strategy allows for small scale development including limited extensions to existing buildings provided that it has no significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside.
- 9.3 Saved Policy 22 of the Local Plan is also relevant, which states that extensions to dwellings in the rural area will not be permitted unless they are limited in size. Policy 22 goes on to say that extensions should be less than 150% of the floor area of the original dwelling.
- 9.4 Whilst the proposal may result in a floor area over 150% of the original dwelling, the key consideration is whether or not the proposal would have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS7.
- 9.5 The main issues of consideration relate to the impact of the proposal's character and appearance upon the rural area, conservation area, the existing dwelling house, immediate street scene and residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

Impact on the Rural Area

- 9.6 In design terms the extension relates to the existing dwelling and surrounding rural area in terms of materials, scale and form. It is considered that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the countryside and is in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS7.

Impact on the Character of the Conservation Area

- 9.7 The Conservation and Design Officer's comments are set out below.
- 9.8 The Conversation Officer had various concerns in respect of the initial submission, including that it would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Further comments included that any side extension should be set down from the ridge, and back from the front elevation and the importance of retaining a gap between the dwellings. She also commented that the existing gable over the front door, whilst a later addition, should be retained, as many of the dwellings in that location had previously added similar gables and that they had in themselves become a feature of this row of Rothschild style dwelling houses.
- 9.9 After much discussion between the agent, planning officer and the conservation officer, revised plans were received for discussion which retained the front gable, set down the side extension from the ridge, removed the two storey front gable thereby balancing up the pair of semi-detached dwellings (Nos. 13 and 15) as requested.
- 9.10 The revised plans introduced a single storey front extension, with a depth of approx. 2.2m, under a dual pitch roof. Overall this sits only slightly forward of the existing front elevation to the dining room (by approx. 0.8m). Further, in order to achieve the space required internally, the two storey side extension was extended out to the rear.

Following further discussion with the agent, a revised plan with the depth of the rear element reduced to approx. 1.8m was received and re-consultations took place.

- 9.11 In respect of the inclusion of a single storey front extension, whilst it is acknowledged that this is not ideal in this setting, it is important to note the adjoining neighbour, at No. 13, has previously been granted and built a very similar front extension (under planning reference 4/01063/97). Further, the revised plans have balanced the two adjoining neighbours, which formed part of the conservation officer's initial concerns. See details of other nearby extensions in section below.
- 9.12 A further consultation response from the Conservation Officer was received on the 2nd April 2019 (see below) which notes that if the application is approved, a condition requiring all external construction materials to match existing (and samples/details to be submitted) is recommended. Bricks should match in terms of colour, finish, brick bond and mortar colour / finish). Hung tiles to side elevation to be re-used or matched on a like-for-like basis.
- 9.13 Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to concerns in terms of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area subject to conditions. The proposed materials to the extensions at the rear of the dwelling would be acceptable. The proposal therefore accords with Policies CS27 of the Core Strategy.

Effect on appearance of building and street scene

- 9.14 Dacorum's Core Strategy Policies CS11 (Quality of Neighbourhood Design) and CS12 (Quality of Site Design) state that development within settlements and neighbourhoods should preserve attractive streetscapes; integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties in terms of scale, height, bulk and materials.
- 9.15 Chapter 12 of the Framework emphasises the importance of good design in context and, in particular, paragraph 130 states permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to improve the character and quality of an area.
- 9.16 Whilst the initial proposal was not acceptable (see Conservation section above), it is considered that the revised proposal, which would result in a single storey front extension, two storey side and rear extension, has been designed to balance with the adjoining neighbour at No. 13, and echo the main features of the Rothschild design. With red brick; under a clay tile roof with low eaves; the re-hanging of tiles to the new side elevation, and an appearance considered to be subservient to the existing dwelling in the streetscene.
- 9.17 The existing single storey side extension/storage (to be demolished) is built up to the boundary with No.17 and whilst the perceived gap between No.15 and No.17 may appear reduced from the two storey side extension, the width of the proposal is less than the existing, and there will now be room for a side pedestrian access to be created at No.15. The width of the access is approx. 1m near the front elevation and approx. 1.3m at the rear. It should be noted that the neighbours at No.17 have

previously constructed a two storey side extension under reference 4/02090/14/FHA, thereby previously reducing the gap. Whilst the two together are not ideal, a gap of approximately 2.4m will be retained thereby avoiding a terracing effect.

- 9.18 The existing conservatory and side extension to be demolished has a combined footprint of approx. 35 sq m and the proposed footprint would be approx. 38.6 sq m.
- 9.19 Further many of the properties along that side of New Road have previously been altered, including some relatively dominant in their design and scale. Examples of development include No.23 (4/01453/99), No.9 (4/01090/91), and Nos. 13 and 17 (adjacent to No.15).
- 9.20 Overall, it is considered that the proposal does not appear unduly dominant in terms of bulk, scale and height to the parent building and streetscene and it will use sympathetic materials to match existing.
- 9.21 Therefore it is considered that the proposal would be generally sympathetic and in keeping with the surrounding area, respect adjoining properties and would therefore result in no significant adverse effects on the character and appearance of the streetscene in terms of visual and residential amenity. This accords with local and national policies mentioned above.

Effect on Residential Amenity

- 9.22 The NPPF 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 (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact upon neighbouring properties and their amenity space. Thus, the proposed should be designed to reduce any impact on neighbouring properties by way of visual intrusion, loss of light and privacy.
- 9.23 Objections have been received from both adjoining neighbours at No.13 and No.17, and No.10. The assessment for CS7 has been dealt with above, and bats under ‘other considerations’ below.
- 9.24 It is noted that the rear gardens of Nos.13, 15 and 17 face north-east compromising the amount of direct sunlight received. The front of the properties therefore receiving most sunlight throughout the year.
- 9.25 In respect of No.17 (non adjoining neighbour), the proposal would result in a gap of approximately 2.4m between the dwellings closest side elevations, and approximately 5.14m between the proposed rear elevation and the side elevation of the single storey rear projection at No.17. It is understood that the nearest windows/doors at the rear ground floor level service a store and utility area and that the single storey rear projection contains a multi aspect kitchen/diner with numerous rooflights, windows and doors.

- 9.26 Further, the proposed two storey rear element has a relatively shallow depth of 1.8m and there is no breach of the 45 degree angle from the corner of the proposed rear extension to the middle of the nearest habitable windows at No.17 as shown on Drawing 19/0088/02 Rev E. The new side windows in the flank elevation servicing the first floor and stairwell would be conditioned to remain obscured glazed and non-opening below 1.7m from ground level to avoid any potential overlooking issues.
- 9.27 In respect of the objection from No. 13 New Road (adjoining semi), the proposed rear projection is set well away from the boundary with No.13 by approx. 6.17m, and from the plans it is understood that there is approx. 9.76m to the rear projection at No.13. The 45 degree line will not be breached from the corner of the proposed two storey rear extension to the middle of the nearest habitable windows at No. 13 as shown on drawing 19/0088/02 Rev E.
- 9.28 Overall, it is considered that the proposal would result in no significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties when considering a loss of daylight, sunlight or privacy. It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with Policy CS12.

Other considerations

- 9.30 PARKING : The proposed front extension will reduce the length of the driveway, however according to the site plan and Design and Access Statement adequate off-street parking for three vehicles will remain on the current driveway. The officer has taken measurements. Overall it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
- 9.31 A neighbour's objection has mentioned that they feel the existing entrance would need to be widened including for construction vehicles. The officer has passed this on to the Agent, however please note that any such alteration does not form part of this current application. Any future proposals to widen the entrance / increase the width of the cross over may require planning permission.
- 9.32 BATS - It is noted that neighbour objections included concern in respect of the possible presence of Bats. Hertfordshire Ecology have been consulted on this application and their consultation response recommended an informative be added to the decision notice in respect of Bats.

Community Infrastructure Level (CIL)

Not liable (below 100 sqm)

10. CONCLUSION

- 10.1 Based on the above assessment the proposal is considered acceptable.

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be granted subject to the following 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. **The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development, including brick bond, hereby permitted shall match the existing building in terms of size, colour and texture. No development (excluding demolition/ground investigations) shall take place until details of the materials and brick bond to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Please do not send materials to the Council offices. Materials should be kept on site and arrangements made with the Planning Officer for inspection.**

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

Reason: To preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the designated heritage asset in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Policy CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

3. **No construction of the superstructure shall take place until details of how the existing hung tiles are to be re-used and/or matched on a like for like basis in the new side elevation hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

These details shall include:

- **A plan showing how the re-used tiles will be placed on the approved side elevation and how they relate to any new tiles; and**
- **Details and photos of the matching tiles.**

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan and details.

Reason: To preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the designated heritage asset in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Policy CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

4. **Notwithstanding the details shown on Drawing 19/0088/02 Rev E proposed plans and elevations, the new first floor side window within the gable end side elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be permanently fitted with obscure-glazing and non-opening below a height of 1.7m from finished floor level.**

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding residential amenity in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013.

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

19/0088/01 existing floor plans and elevations

19/0088/02 Rev E proposed floor plans, elevations, and site plans

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

Informatives:

1. Ecology Informative

If bats, or evidence for them, are discovered during the course of works, work must stop immediately and advice sought on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England to avoid an offence being committed.

2. 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.

In accordance with the Council's adopted criteria, all noisy works associated with site demolition, site preparation and construction works shall be limited to the following hours: Monday - Friday 07:30am to 17.30pm, Saturdays 08.00am - 13:00pm, Sundays and Bank Holidays - no noisy works allowed.

3. Construction Dust Informative

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

5. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Tring Rural Parish Council	TRPC OBJECTION Proposed extension at the front protrudes beyond existing wall Should be kept back to line with existing frontage
Local Parish	Confirmation received by email from Tring Rural Parish Council on 23.03.2020 that there was no objection to the original scheme (originally consulted 22.10.2019).
Tring Rural Parish Council	No comment
Conservation & Design (DBC)	<p>15 New Road is a semi-detached dwelling, dating to the early 20th century and of a typical 'Rothschild' estate cottage design. It forms a wider group with other, similarly designed, semi-detached pairs of properties all set back from New Road (nos. 9 - 27). The properties are of red brick construction with areas of hung tile, traditionally pitched clay tile roofs, projecting gables with deep eaves and white casement windows. Both nos. 13 and 15 (the pair) have an additional (later) projecting gable to the front, there are several examples of this type of gable - seemingly added to create first floor bathrooms. A number of these properties have been altered / extended but generally the pairs of cottages make a strong positive contribution towards the character and appearance of the Wilstone Conservation Area. The established pattern of development and the gaps / space between the pairs of properties is also of importance.</p> <p>The proposed two storey side extension is considered overly dominant and to detract from the existing symmetry of the semi-detached pair. The existing gabled bathroom projection should be retained. A two storey side extension may be feasible but it should be set down from the ridge line, set back from the front elevation and be of reduced width. Any side extension should not feature a front gable or dormer (the proposed projecting gable is wider than those existing on nos. 13 and 15 so is in no way subordinate).</p> <p>A street scene view, showing the extension to no. 15 in relation with no. 17 and the boundary between the properties would be helpful. Ensuring a sufficient gap is retained to the side, to respect the separation that exists between the pairs of properties is important.</p> <p>Recommend the application is amended, or refused. The current proposals detract from the design and appearance of 13 and 15 New Road and will therefore fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Wilstone Conservation Area.</p> <p>21.11.2019</p>

	<p>Yes, I have visited the site (viewed from New Road, I did not go on to the property) and the site / street is also visible on 'google street view' although this is not up to date and does not show the extension to no. 17.</p> <p>13 New Road has been extended to the side (approved in 1997) with a two-storey side extension which is set down slightly at ridge level and includes a forward extension at ground floor so yes, this has slightly disrupted the symmetry of the pair and this was not acknowledged in my initial comments. However the early 20th century properties themselves have a front gable each with a later front gable adjacent added to provide a first floor bathroom to each and these paired gables are now a feature of the semi-detached nos. 13 and 15 and do give them a level of symmetry.</p> <p>Introducing an extension of the design proposed to no. 15 will be visually more intrusive as a larger / wider front gable will be introduced to the side extension which also continues the existing ridge height, in my view the proposal lacks a desirable level of subservience. The existing later gable to the bathroom would be removed which, in my view, would disrupt the current design of the semi-detached pair. Whilst the details proposed are sympathetic (matching materials / window design / barge boards etc) the design / scale of the proposed extension is considered to harm the character and appearance of the property / pair of properties and therefore fail to preserve the character / appearance of the Wilstone CA.</p> <p>It is not the case that the property cannot be extended to the side but some alteration to the design and reducing the bulk / size of any side extension as suggested in my previous email would, in my view, provide a more sympathetic / proportionate addition to the pair of properties, and it is suggested this is given further consideration.</p> <p>Could I also request that a street scene view is provided, showing the proposed extension in relation to no. 13 and no. 17. It is important the extensions to no. 15 are considered in relation to the adjoining / adjacent properties and that there is sufficient gap retained between 15 and 17.</p>
<p>Conservation & Design (DBC)</p>	<p>I still have concerns regarding the proposed substantial side extension to 15 New Road but welcome the omission of the two-storey front extension. I would like to see the single storey front projection omitted - I consider it to detract from the character / appearance of no. 13 but will look more closely at the planning history for no. 13 (if there is any relating to this). However before commenting further I would really like</p>

the applicants to provide a proposed street scene view showing 15 New Road in relation to nos. 13 and 17 - I think this is really important to have in this case.

02.04.2020 - amended plans

19/02521/FHA

15 New Road, Wilstone

2-storey side, 2-storey rear and single storey front extension

15 New Road is a semi-detached dwelling, dating to the early 20th century and of a typical 'Rothschild' estate cottage design. It forms a wider group with other, similarly designed, semi-detached pairs of properties all set back from New Road (nos. 9 - 27). The properties are of red brick construction with areas of hung tile, steeply pitched clay tile roofs with low deep eaves, projecting gables and white casement windows - the shared central stack is a focal point within the roof. Both nos. 13 and 15 (the pair) have an additional (later) projecting first floor gable to the front, there are several examples of this type of gable - seemingly added to create first floor bathrooms to these estate cottages. A number of these 'Rothschild' cottages properties have been altered / extended to the side, some with 2 storey and some with single storey extensions, but generally the pairs of cottages make a strong positive contribution towards the character and appearance of the Wilstone Conservation Area. The established pattern of development and the wide gaps / space between the pairs of properties is also of significance. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out a general duty in relation to conservation areas and states that 'special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.'

Previous proposals for a full height 2-storey side extension with 2 storey front gable were considered overly dominant in design / visual terms and to detract from the existing symmetry of the semi-detached pair. The proposals have undergone a number of amendments since the original submission and the 2-storey projecting front gable to the side extension omitted and the two-storey side extension set down giving it a small amount of subservience. The proposal now reflects the design of the extension to no. 13 New Road (the other property in this semi-detached pair) and includes a single storey gabled front projection.

Whilst there are concerns relating to the overall scale of the 2-storey side extension with single storey front projection and gabled rear extension it is noted that a number of properties in this group have been extended in a similar way and with extensions of a similar scale.

	<p>Concerns also remain relating to the resulting narrower gap which will remain between no. 15 and 17 (resulting in an unfortunate terracing effect between these distinct pairs). As previously advised the scheme would benefit from the omission of the single storey front extension in particular.</p> <p>The NPPF (para. 193) states that 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.' The proposed extensions to 15 New Road, despite the improvements to the scheme, are considered to result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the property and the street scene / wider Conservation Area. In accordance with NPPF para. 196 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'</p> <p>If the application is approved, a condition requiring all external construction materials to match existing (and samples / details to be submitted) is recommended. Bricks should match in terms of colour, finish, brick bond and mortar colour / finish). Hung tile to side elevation to be re-used or matched on a like-for-like basis.</p>
Contaminated Land (DBC)	<p>With reference to the above planning application, please be advised Environmental Health have no objections or concerns. However I would recommend the application is subject to construction working hours with Best Practical Means for dust.</p> <p>See Noise on Construction/Demolition Sites Informative / Construction Dust Informative / Noise on Construction / Demolition Sites Informative - on decision</p> <p>11.03.2020</p> <p>Having reviewed the application submission and the ECP Team records I am able to confirm that there is no objection on the grounds of land contamination. Also, there is no requirement for further contaminated land information to be provided, or for contaminated land planning conditions to be recommended in relation to this application.</p>
Archaeology Unit (HCC)	<p>In this instance I consider that the development is unlikely to have a significant impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest, and I have no comment to make upon the proposal.</p> <p>25.03.2020</p>

	<p>Thank you for re-consulting us on the amendments to the above application. Our apologies for the delay in responding.</p> <p>We have no additional comments to make; our advice remains unchanged from that sent on 12/11/19.</p>
Archaeology Unit (HCC)	<p>Thank you for re-consulting us on the amendments to the above application. Our apologies for the delay in responding.</p> <p>We have no additional comments to make; our advice remains unchanged from that sent on 12/11/19.</p>
Hertfordshire Ecology	<p>The proposed works will require the removal of the tile hung extension and bargeboards as well as the loss of the existing side gable end. There are known bat roosts within a 100m of the dwelling. However, the proportion of the existing roof that is being removed and replaced, the existing side extension, is a dormer so without an unutilised attic space. In addition the hung tiles as shown in photos in the DAS appear to be relatively new and tightly sealed.</p> <p>Given apparent characteristics of the building and limited impact on the roof of the proposed works, on this occasion I do not consider there is sufficient likelihood of bats being present and affected for the LPA to require a formal survey. However, in the unlikely event that bats are found, given the proposal will involve removal of the hung tiles and modification of the existing roof. I advise a precautionary approach to the works is taken and recommend the following informative is added to any permission granted.</p> <p>informative if bats, or evidence for them, are discovered during the course of works, work must stop immediately and advice sought on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England to avoid an offence being committed.</p> <p>I do not consider there to be any other ecological issues with this proposal.</p>
Hertfordshire Ecology	as previous

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
5	3	0	3	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
17 New Road Wilstone Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4NZ	<p>The owners have not lived in the property for over 15 years.</p> <p>We are concerned about the application and in particular the dominant impact of the proposed extension.</p> <p>The proposal will increase the width of the front elevation by more than 60% and bring an over powering two storey structure to less than one metre from our mutual boundary.</p> <p>We note that the owners of the adjoining property No. 13 have carried out a much more sympathetic extension, without the use of the high gable in this application.</p> <p>No 15 is in a relatively wide plot and we think that a redesigned extension could be accommodated that did not extend so close to the boundary and which had a more sympathetic roof line.</p> <p>Bats are present in the current eaves of the property and would be significantly impacted on by the proposed works. The proposed extension would remove most natural light from my garden. When we applied for planning permission 5 years we were told an extension to the front of the property had to remain within the current boundaries. I am unaware of any changes to planning laws which results in this application being viewed any differently</p>
Huckvale 13 New Road Wilstone Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4NZ	<p>The proposed development does not comply with the Dacorum core planning policy CS7 that allows 'limited extensions to existing buildings'. The proposed extension is a huge two storey to the front, side and rear of the property and cannot be described as 'limited' in any sense.</p> <p>There are bats visible every evening in the gardens of numbers 13 and 15 and I believe they are resident in the eaves of outbuildings of both properties as well as the existing side extension to number 15.</p> <p>The proposed rear two storey extension would lead to a significant loss of light to our north east facing kitchen, utility room and living room and would affect our right to light.</p>

	<p>Similarly, there would be considerable overshadowing especially in the winter months, together with loss of sunlight. This would affect residential amenity to a seating area outside the kitchen. There would be comparable loss of light etc to number 19 New Road, given its proximity</p> <p>The style (2 storey) of the development would also detract from the appearance of pairs of Rothschild cottages at 13 and 15 new road and the conservational area of wilstone.</p> <p>We therefore object to the application.</p> <p>13 New Road</p> <p>i would like to reiterate my previous comments. In particular the extension to the side front and rear is not 'limited' as permitted under the dacorum core strategy for rural areas-policy CS7.</p> <p>In addition, I reiterate the comments made by 10 tring road in relation to parking. Current parking in number 15 is a narrow driveway with limited access. Since the proposed development will have 4 bedrooms there will likely be 2 or 3 cars that will need to park behind each other; this is unlikely to be practicable and there is no scope or room for more parking on new road. We have enlarged our driveway as a necessity and believe it will be essential for number 15 to do the same whatever development is permitted.</p>
<p>10 Tring Road Wilstone Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4PB</p>	<p>We have received the invitation to comment. The existing extension to the original Rothschild cottage appears to be listing and may be structurally unsound. So it is likely that modification will be required. We are too far away to be directly affected by the proposed extension to the house itself so this comment should not be interpreted as a comment on the extension to the house itself.</p> <p>New Road has a parking problem which has recently been exacerbated by Dacorum's decision to permit the construction of the house to the rear of 12 Tring Road (plot B 12 Tring Road). Number 15 Tring Road suffers from restricted access and New Road narrows at this point. Whatever happens to the house as a consequence of this or subsequent applications the dropped kerb and gate should be increased in width both to allow access for construction of traffic during the build (as the owners of number 13 New Road have done), to facilitate access for the residents, and to minimise the likelihood of damage to neighbouring properties.</p>