

ITEM NUMBER: 5d

20/01422/FHA	Construction of garden outbuilding.	
Site Address:	67 The Horseshoe Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8QS	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr M Welsh	Andrew Boothby
Case Officer:	Sally Robbins	
Parish/Ward:		Leverstock Green
Referral to Committee:	Called-in by Councillor Graham Sutton, Ward Councillor	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The proposed development through layout, design and scale will not adversely impact upon the use of the public footpath, visual amenity of the surrounding area or the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Policy 79 and Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS4, CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2019).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site is located on the southwest side of The Horseshoe in the Leverstock Green area of Hemel Hempstead. The site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling.

3.2 The site resides within Residential Character Area HCA27: Leverstock Green Central, an area of low density detached and semi-detached housing. The surrounding area is comprised of similarly sized and styled dwellings.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the construction of an outbuilding situated within the rear garden. The outbuilding would be used as a home gym. The application is part retrospective, the majority of the structure has been completed, however the building lacks a roof and has not been finished internally or externally.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications

19/02579/FHA - Retaining wall to rear of property
GRA - 24th February 2020

4/00547/13/FHA - Single storey front extension, two storey side extension, single storey rear extension with rooflights and chimney removal
GRA - 14th May 2013

Appeals

6. CONSTRAINTS

Parking Accessibility Zone (DBLP): 4
CIL Zone: CIL3

LHR Wind Turbine
Parish: Hemel Hempstead Non-Parish
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)
Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Hemel Hempstead)
Town: Hemel Hempstead

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
CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

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:

Principle of Development
Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity
Impact on Residential Amenity
Impact on Highway Safety and Parking
Other Material Planning Considerations

Principle of Development

9.2 The application site resides within a residential area of Hemel Hempstead, wherein the principle of appropriate residential development is acceptable, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013)

Policy CS4. There is no objection to the proposed use of the outbuilding as a home gym. The outbuilding would be incidental in scale and use to the main dwelling.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.3 Core Strategy Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 highlight the importance of high quality sustainable design in improving the character and quality of an area, seeking to ensure that developments are in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of scale, mass, height and appearance. This guidance is supported by Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan.

9.4 The development is not visible within the street scene, however a public footpath runs along the rear boundary of the site, therefore the outbuilding is visible from public vantage points.

9.5 As built, the retaining wall measures 0.8m high and the outbuilding measures 2.3m to the eaves and 3m to the ridge. This would result in a total maximum height of 3.8m when viewed from the public footpath.

9.6 The application as submitted included a fire escape door on the rear elevation, providing access to the public footpath. Concerns were raised regarding the fire escape door, in terms of whether it is necessary and whether it is safe. The finished building would have bi-fold doors and a separate access door on the front elevation, therefore it is unclear why a fire escape door would be required. Furthermore, the threshold of the fire escape door is situated 0.8m above external ground level, which is not considered to be safe. The fire escape has subsequently been removed from the proposed plans. It is noted that the opening for the fire escape door has already been built. Therefore, should planning permission be granted, the door would have to be blocked up in order to comply with the approved plans.

9.7 The proposed building would be finished in brown coloured composite cladding and a tiled roof. The originally submitted plans showed a white painted render finish, however concerns were raised regarding the visual impact of the building in relation to its surroundings when viewed from the public footpath. Other outbuildings situated adjacent to the footpath are finished in facing brickwork and in general the footpath is abutted by timber fence panels and hedges/vegetation. It was considered that white painted render would not be an appropriate finish for the surroundings. The plans were amended so that the breeze block retaining wall would be painted black and the external walls to the outbuilding finished in brown cladding. It is considered that the amended proposal will not have a significant detrimental visual impact on the surrounding area.

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.8 The proposed outbuilding would be situated up to the boundary with no. 65 and there would be a 0.5m gap from the common boundary with no. 69. The building would measure 2.3m to eaves and 3m to ridge height, comprising a gable-end roof when viewed from the adjoining properties.

9.9 There are no concerns regarding increased overlooking or loss of privacy. The outbuilding is single storey and any views will be restricted by the existing boundary fences on either side, measuring between 1.8-2m high.

9.10 Likewise, there are no concerns regarding the structure being visually overbearing. The outbuilding is located at the end of the garden and is unlikely to cause significant overshadowing. Furthermore, it should be noted that a 2.5m high flat roof outbuilding could be constructed up to the boundary under Permitted Development Rights.

9.11 Overall, whilst visible from surrounding units, the proposed outbuilding will not have a significant impact on the living conditions of surrounding residential units.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.12 There would be no detrimental impacts on the highway network. The Highway Authority has been consulted and raised no objection subject to the inclusion of informative notes, should planning permission be granted. There would be no increase in the number of bedrooms, and therefore no additional parking requirement, as a result of the proposed development.

Other Material Planning Considerations

Right of Way

9.13 The Council's Rights of Way Officer has been consulted and commented that the structure encroaches onto the public footpath by 20cm, however indicated that the Council would be unlikely to enforce on that.

9.14 The Rights of Way Officer did however raise concerns regarding the roof, guttering, downpipe and additional render/brickwork encroaching further onto the public footpath and the impact of water run-off onto the path. Also of concern was the access doorway onto the footpath.

9.15 The plans have been amended since the comments from the Rights of Way Officer were received. Specifically, there would be built-in gutters that would direct water run-off to a diagonal downpipe on the northwest flank of the building, leading to a rainwater harvester situated within the site to the front of the outbuilding. This would prevent water from spilling onto the public footpath as all water would be harvested within the site. Furthermore, the fire escape door has been omitted from the amended plans. It is considered that the amended plans have addressed some of the concerns raised by the Rights of Way Officer.

9.16 In terms of the installation of cladding to the external walls, it is considered that the additional few millimetres that this would add would not significantly affect the usage of the footpath by members of the public. In order to ensure that the cladding is an acceptable thickness, a condition would be imposed requiring details of cladding to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. On balance, it is considered that there would be visual benefits to the addition of cladding that would help the building to assimilate into its surroundings. The proposal therefore complies with Saved Policy 79 (Footpath Network) of the Local Plan (2004).

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.17 There are no Tree Preservation Orders or trees/vegetation of significance that have been/would be impacted upon as a result of the proposed outbuilding. Neighbours have indicated that there was previously a hedge forming the rear boundary, however its removal would not require consent.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.18 Concerns have been raised by neighbours regarding a variety of issues. These are listed and addressed below:

Overbearing impact

9.19 As discussed above, the outbuilding is visible from surrounding houses, gardens and from the public footpath. Once completed, the outbuilding would comprise a dual pitched roof that would increase its visibility. However, due to the siting of the outbuilding at the bottom of the garden, it is not considered that there would be significant overshadowing. The maximum height of the outbuilding when viewed from the adjoining properties would be 3m, which is 0.5m higher than what could be carried out under Permitted Development Rights.

Proximity to boundary (no space to add cladding)

9.20 In relation to no. 65, the submitted plans show that the outbuilding would abut the common boundary. The adjoining neighbour has provided photos showing that the outbuilding as constructed (i.e. the breezeblock structure, without external cladding) touches the boundary fence and is concerned that there would be no space to add cladding. The removal of the boundary fence would not require planning permission, however this should be agreed with the neighbour, for example via a Party Wall Agreement. Furthermore, as mentioned above, a condition would be imposed requiring further details of the proposed cladding.

Damage to boundary fence

9.21 The boundary fence between nos. 65 and 67 appears to be damaged as a result of the construction of the outbuilding. This is not a planning matter, and as above should be discussed / agreed directly between neighbours (for example via a Party Wall Agreement).

Drain pipe causing water to spill onto neighbour's property (no. 69)

9.22 The maintenance of the drainpipe would be the responsibility of the applicant. However, it is noted that there is a separation distance of 0.5m between the flank elevation of the outbuilding and the boundary with no. 69.

Inaccuracy of plans

9.23 The plans have been amended to show the accurate measurements.

Height of structure including raised base result in overlooking / loss of privacy

9.24 The structure as built is single storey and has not been built on a raised platform. This is also shown on the proposed section. As discussed above, it is not considered that there would be any significant overlooking or loss of privacy.

Potential noise nuisance

9.25 Any noise nuisance should be reported to the Council's Environmental Health Department.

Conditions

9.26 As the development has already commenced, there is no requirement for a time limit condition.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.27 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 not CIL Liable as it results in less than 100 square metres of additional floor space.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 To conclude, the proposed development has been assessed in terms of its impact on the adjoining public footpath, visual impact and impact on living conditions of surrounding units. The proposed outbuilding through layout, design and scale will not adversely impact upon the use of the public footpath, visual amenity of the surrounding area or the residential amenity of neighbouring

occupants. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Policy 79 and Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS4, CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2019).

11. RECOMMENDATION

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

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

1. **Within 3 months of the date of this permission, details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the outbuilding hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details to include:**

- Roof tiles
- External cladding specification (including thickness)

Development shall be carried out and retained in accordance with the approved details. The external cladding shall be completed prior to the first use of the outbuilding hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, to safeguard the visual character of the area and to protect the amenity of the adjacent public footpath, in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policy 79 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004).

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

HRS/02 (Site Location Plan) dated May 2020
HRS/04 (Proposed Block Plan) dated September 2020
HRS/01 (Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations) dated September 2020

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 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.
2. The Public Right of Way should remain unobstructed by vehicles, machinery, materials, tools and any other aspects of the construction during works. The safety of the public using the route and any other routes to be used by construction traffic should be a paramount concern during works, safe passage past the site should be maintained at all times. The condition of the route should not deteriorate as a result of these works. Any adverse effects to the surface from traffic, machinery or materials (especially overspills of cement & concrete) should be

made good by the applicant to the satisfaction of this Authority. All materials should be removed at the end of the construction and not left on the Highway or Highway verges.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Rights Of Way (DBC)	<p>This site abuts Hemel Hempstead public footpath 117.</p> <p>The boundary between 67 The Horseshoe and land set aside as public highway (footpath 117) was identifiable by the original boundary bank which was, prior to the installation of the retaining wall (1902579/FHA), intact. If it 'collapsed' it was due to the installation of the retaining wall, installed in order to provide solid foundations for a security fence (which had previously been erected on the public footpath).</p> <p>I met the occupier of 67 The Horseshoe on 11/7/19 to give guidance on the width of the public path (2.8m NW boundary, 2.6m SE boundary) in preparation for the reinstatement of the security fence so that they would be no arguments about further encroachment onto the public footpath. If those widths are encroached upon then the construction of the dwelling obstructs the public footpath. At present I haven't had a chance to visit the site but will do in the near future. As soon as I have been on site I'll let you know.</p> <p>Even if the development is exactly on the boundary it will give a sense of enclosure to the footpath. The citing of previous examples are not on the main footpath but a spur (public footpath 69) linking the route to The Horseshoe (marked red on attached plan).</p> <p>The roof gable and guttering will 'encroach' on the public footpath with the down pipe looking to go into a drain that would need to be installed in the surface of the public footpath. Apart from being unacceptable there is the strong possibility that excess water will cause problems on the path, either because of adverse weather and/or maintenance issues.</p> <p>Further comments:</p> <p>1) The wall leaves 2.6m for the path at each end. That's 20cm over what we agreed but we're not likely to enforce on that unless a member of the public issues us with a notice to do so.</p> <p>2) However, the roof, guttering and downpipes will further erode the width of the path, as will any rendering/brick work added to the concrete blocks.</p> <p>3) The potential for water run-off to affect the path remains a major</p>

	<p>concern. It is not acceptable to have the roof, guttering and downpipe carrying water onto the path.</p> <p>4) There appears to be a doorway in the wall to allow for access onto the footpath. In order to use this door steps would be required. These cannot be built on the footpath. There would be no legal permission and they would be deemed an unauthorised obstruction. However, it may be that the steps are to be built within the proposed building.</p>
<p>Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)</p>	<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.</p> <p>Highway Informatives</p> <p>AN 1) The Public Right of Way should remain unobstructed by vehicles, machinery, materials, tools and any other aspects of the construction during works. The safety of the public using the route and any other routes to be used by construction traffic should be a paramount concern during works, safe passage past the site should be maintained at all times. The condition of the route should not deteriorate as a result of these works. Any adverse effects to the surface from traffic, machinery or materials (especially overspills of cement & concrete) should be made good by the applicant to the satisfaction of this Authority. All materials should be removed at the end of the construction and not left on the Highway or Highway verges.</p> <p>If the above conditions cannot reasonably be achieved then a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order would be required to close the affected route and divert users for any periods necessary to allow works to proceed. A fee would be payable to Hertfordshire County Council for such an order. Further information on the rights of way network is available via the website. Please contact Rights of Way, Hertfordshire County Council on 0300 123 4047 for further information in relation to the works that are required along the route including any permissions that may be needed to carry out the works.</p> <p>https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/recycling-waste-and-environment/countryside-access/rightsof-way/rights-of-way.aspx</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>The proposal is for the construction of a garden outbuilding with access onto rights of way land behind at 67 The Horseshoe, Hemel Hempstead. The Horseshoe is a 30 mph unclassified local access road and is maintained at public expense.</p>

	<p>HCC would comment that the garden outbuilding in the rear garden would have no impact on the highway and as such HCC Highways is not concerned with the building of this structure.</p> <p>HCC would comment, that the rear access from the garden outbuilding is not onto highway land and can only be accessed by foot and therefore would not impact the highway network.</p> <p>However, it is rights of way land and as such, care should be taken to ensure this land is not infringed, therefore, the highway informative above should be closely read and understood.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>HCC as Highway Authority considers that the proposal would not have a severe impact on the safety and operation of the surrounding highway network. Therefore, HCC has no objections on highway grounds to the application.</p>
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.</p> <p>Highway Informative</p> <p>HCC as Highway Authority recommends inclusion of the following Advisory Note (AN) / highway informative to ensure that any works within the highway are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980:</p> <p>AN) The Public Right of Way should remain unobstructed by vehicles, machinery, materials, tools and any other aspects of the construction during works. The safety of the public using the route and any other routes to be used by construction traffic should be a paramount concern during works, safe passage past the site should be maintained at all times. The condition of the route should not deteriorate as a result of these works. Any adverse effects to the surface from traffic, machinery or materials (especially overflows of cement & concrete) should be made good by the applicant to the satisfaction of this Authority. All materials should be removed at the end of the construction and not left on the Highway or Highway verges.</p> <p>If the above conditions cannot reasonably be achieved then a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order would be required to close the affected route and divert users for any periods necessary to allow works to proceed. A fee would be payable to Hertfordshire County Council for such an order. Further information on the rights of way network is available via the website. Please contact Rights of Way, Hertfordshire County Council on 0300 123 4047 for further information in relation to</p>

	<p>the works that are required along the route including any permissions that may be needed to carry out the works. https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/recycling-waste-and-environment/countryside-access/rightsof-way/rights-of-way.aspx</p> <p>Comments</p> <p>HCC Highways previously commented on the prior iteration of this application in June 2020. The new amended application has removed the access onto the rights of way route from the rear of the outbuilding. The removal of the access does not change our wish to not restrict a grant of permission for the site.</p> <p>Therefore, HCC Highways would like to reiterate our prior response:</p> <p>The proposal is for the construction of a garden outbuilding with access onto rights of way land behind at 67 The Horseshoe, Hemel Hempstead. The Horseshoe is a 30 mph unclassified local access road and is maintained at public expense.</p> <p>HCC would comment that the garden outbuilding in the rear garden would have no impact on the highway and as such HCC Highways is not concerned with the building of this structure.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>HCC as Highway Authority considers that the proposal would not have a severe impact on the safety and operation of the surrounding highway network. Therefore, HCC has no objections on highway grounds to the application.</p>
Crime Prevention Design Advisor	<p>Thank you for sight of planning application 20/01422/FHA, Construction of garden outbuilding, 67 The Horseshoe Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8QS .</p> <p>I would ask that the outbuilding is secure , if the client would like any crime prevention advice please contact this office.</p>
Crime Prevention Design Advisor	<p>In relation to crime prevention I have no objection to this application, if the applicant would like any crime prevention or security advice , please contact me.</p>

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
5	6	1	5	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
<p>69 The Horseshoe Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8QS</p>	<p>I object to the above planning application as detailed below:</p> <p>Visual impact / privacy</p> <p>Imposing bulk / size</p> <p>Concerned over potential change of use from gym</p> <p>One the OS survey map submitted it show 65/67/69 rear boundary in a fairly straight line, if the building is already on the rear boundary level how can it be possible to possible to put in 3/4 steps from the proposed fire door leading onto the public footpath leading to Autumn Glades? This is a route used by many elderly residents as well as parents with buggies.</p> <p>The current construction is concrete blocks and even if rendered I don't believe it will be in keeping with other local properties.</p> <p>Current height (without the roof) is 2.6metres - the plan shows an overall height of 3metres. Not sure how a pitched tile roof can be added with the remaining 400mm.</p> <p>I'm concerned where the rainwater from the guttering would be dispersed to- either the pathway into Autumn Glades or into our banking behind our rear fence. Mr Welsh stated that his bank was unstable so he removed it - would excess water running into our bank make that unstable?</p> <p>In response to the points in the application justification I would respond as follows.</p> <p>3.1 of application- I don't consider this a minor construction</p> <p>3.3 States the block work will be rendered- not sure how this can happen as there is less than 160mm between the construction and our boundary.</p> <p>4.1 this states application ref 19/02579/FHA regarding the retaining wall was granted in February 2020, in fact my understanding was it was October 2019, that's when it was built. This is not objection just observation of incorrect information.</p> <p>6.2 I don't believe the scale and visual impact of the construction is similar to others in the vicinity.</p> <p>6.7 it states height to eaves is 3m - as stated previously it currently stands at 2.6m without the roof.</p> <p>6,8 adjacent gardens are on the same level, however there is 0.8m of bank removed from the footpath. It also states here that the proposed</p>

eaves height is a modest 2.15m. Is this correct?

6.12 I disagree that the building is consistent in character and appearance

6.13 Whilst the building does not impact on our light it would have an overbearing impact on our garden

6.14 Again, the statement refers to the building being a 'modest' 2.15mtr in height to the eaves I disagree with this statement as previously stated the building currently stands at 2.6m without the roof!

6.17 I don't understand how a fire door is required under H&S?

7.1 again, I don't agree with this statement that the building is a modest addition in keeping with existing developments

7.2 whilst the building may not be visible from the road/front of The Horseshoe, it is clearly visible from rear bedrooms and gardens, as well as Autumn Glades.

7.3 comments as 7.1

These are our objections on this proposed building

Having reviewed the revised plans most of our original objections submitted on 30th June, 2020 still apply. The only amendments we can see are the filling in of the fire door opening onto the footpath leading to Autumn Glades and redirecting the drain pipe into a water harvester tank in the rear garden. We do have a concern about this as the plan shows it very close to our boundary fence - we don't know much about them but worry if there is a possibility of it overflowing into our garden.

Section AA

The revised plans show the build to have cladding. With the rear side of the building already on the legal boundary of the footpath (plus 20mm over in one section) with batons, cladding and guttering this is only going to further encroach onto the footpath by approximately 120mm in our estimation).

Side section (abutting onto our property):

There is no existing space to fit cladding/drain pipe as Mr Welsh's fence encroaches onto our property by 130mm. When this fence was erected we were away and arrived home to find it erected, attached to our utility wall. The distance on this section with the fence as it stands is 150mm, bearing in mind 130mm of that space we believe to be on our property.

We also do not believe the proposed block plan shows an accurate distance between boundary fences.

As stated above all our previous objections regarding size / bulk / height still remain. The height from ground level to the top of the steel lintel already in place (without food plate yet fitted) is 2.6m. This leaves 400mm to fit a pitched roof?

<p>65 The Horseshoe Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8QS</p>	<p>I do not object per se to a modest garden building that is in keeping with surrounding structures being erected in our neighbouring garden, however, I would like to raise three primary concerns. Namely; the height of the structure, invasion of privacy and proximity to our perimeter fence.</p> <p>The structure is built upon a concrete platform. Contrary to the planning application we believe this elevates the floor of the building above the neighbouring ground level. When standing on this concrete platform construction workers were visible from the chest up when viewed from the neighbouring garden. As a result, I believe the existing boundary fence is not sufficiently high enough to prevent a direct line of sight into our garden and property.</p> <p>My second concern is that the dimensions of the pitched roof are understated in the planning application and cannot be constructed to the stated height, under the stated conditions. The application states the eave height will be 2.15m at a pitch of 15 degrees. If the total height of the structure is 3m and the roof is constructed at the stated 15 degrees we estimate the eaves will reach 2.4m, resulting in the structure standing 0.25m higher than stated.</p> <p>Finally, the structure has been built within a matter of millimetres to our existing boundary fence. The proposed plans state that the structure is to be rendered. As a result of this close proximity I do not believe that this is possible without the removal of our existing fence and shed. Furthermore, ongoing maintenance of the fence will be impossible. My reasons for objection remain the same as the objections I made on June 30th. The alterations to the plans have not addressed any of my concerns. The building is to be clad but how is the wall on our side of the building going to be clad when it is already touching our fence? (we have pictures of this but there is no facility on this site to submit them) Whilst mentioning our fence, the cement used when constructing the building has fallen down beside it & bowed it at the bottom on at least 2 panels. In regard to the garages shown in the pictures submitted by Mr Welsh they are slightly higher at the moment but if you look at where the walls stop & gables start, once the proposed pitched roof is added it will be much higher, also they have no windows which means they are not overlooking anyone's property and are not being used by the householders for any purpose other than storage. The height of this building and the raised base mean it remains intrusive to the privacy of our garden & bedrooms.</p>
<p>48 Autumn Glades Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8UB</p>	<p>I object to this project in its current application form. The building is too high and ugly, and the finished appearance is not or will not be in keeping with the character of the surrounding garages as alleged in points 6.8, 6.12 and 7.1 of the application. I understand this structure will also have a pitched roof and therefore make it even higher.</p> <p>The previous ugly fence that was constructed to the rear of this property was 8ft 6" high, and had to be taken down as it breached planning regulations. This construction is already almost 10ft in height without the addition of the pitched roof.</p> <p>Point 6.7 - The fire door to the rear of the construction is 0.8m from the</p>

ground, and this begs the question is a step to be added, which will protrude into the alleyway and a health and safety issue? I am curious as Mr Welsh told his neighbour that the rear door would be for him to store his bicycles, as there is no access to the front of the property.

The photographs that have been included in the application are not showing the adjacent alleyway from Autumn Glades to The Horseshoe, but the alleyway from Autumn Glades to Colonsay. The building will be visible from Autumn Glades. The photographs supposing to show similar buildings in the near area are nowhere near this property.

Finally, Mr Welsh removed the trees from the alleyway (which I understand was against regulations on his deeds). Perhaps he should be requested to reinstate new trees.

I am unable to provide photographs on here of the view from Autumn Glades to the proposed construction, of the relative height of this building to others around it, deliberately omitted from the application. Perhaps a site visit should be undertaken to assess the situation or I can supply photographs if required.

If the construction had been of brick in keeping with every other building in the vicinity, had been 8ft high before roof added, it would be more in keeping with local garages.

I am not an unreasonable person, but am not happy with the height and appearance of this structure as proposed.

I see that Mr Welsh has amended his plans to remove the proposed fire exit from the rear of the build and has added a water harvester. He had builders in digging out earth from his garden for two days and adding large stones indicating the installation of a soak away.

I am sending, under separate cover, photographs to show how close the build is to neighbouring properties, which begs the question as to how he intends to clad the sides of the structure as there isn't the space to do so. The photographs also show how high the build currently stands in proportion to the neighbouring garages before the addition of a pitched roof. One photograph shows that the build protrudes at almost a metre into the alleyway, and beyond neighbouring properties, into the space where the trees used to be, (which Mr Welsh removed). Surely, this shouldn't be allowed? If approved, surely this would set a precedent for other properties to do likewise?

Another photograph shows, in my opinion, that the build is still too high, standing approx 3800 the alley side before any addition of a pitched roof. The height measurement taken from the alleyway is different from the height measurement taken from the garden as the height of the ground in both areas is different. So from the garden side the build is 3000.

The 800 "retaining wall" actually forms part of the rear wall of the build and is shown as "foundations" on the plans, which may be the case in the garden side of the build, but certainly not the alley side. I have always believed foundations are under the ground.

I have also ticked "noise nuisance" as this building is very close to my garden which at best is 10metres, (unlike Mr Welsh whose garden is approximately 30metres) and as Mr Welsh isn't a person who has due

	<p>consideration for his neighbours, playing loud music from the rear or his property on warm evenings with his bi-fold doors open, which I can hear over the sound of my TV (bearing in mind I am in a different street from his property!) If he decides to play loud music from this structure it will be even closer to my property!</p> <p>Having said this, if the build was to be moved back correctly into his garden, made smaller so it could be clad properly and was built lower on the alley side, then I wouldn't have an objection to it (as long as he doesn't play loud music in it!)</p> <p>I believe Mr Welsh should also be asked to replant trees or shrubs in the alleyway, which should never have been removed in the first place.</p>
<p>Ward Councillor</p>	<p>If you are minded to approve the above application then I request the right to call it in.</p> <p>I am concerned with the height and bulk of this and I also have grave concerns with applicants intended use, many are just too big to be classified as a "Garden Room" or "Garden Office".</p>
<p>71 The Horseshoe Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8QS</p>	<p>Part way through construction this development already appears excessively high and imposing. I am concerned that when the development is completed it will be far too high and will dominate the local residential setting. I can already see this from my kitchen window.</p> <p>The development also significantly steps out from the fence boundary of properties 71 and 69. From the location plan it is indicated that the boundaries of number 71,69,67 are all in a straight line? Does the development therefore encroach the boundary?</p> <p>There is also a door opening with its threshold 800mm above the public footpath which is of concern. If the development is on the boundary, how will this door be safely accessed? I presume this will require at least 4 steps down which will therefore need to extend beyond the development onto the public footpath. This will surely be a trip/health and safety hazard?</p>
<p>29 Autumn Glades Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8UB</p>	<p>The initial build was an unsightly large corrugated fence which has since been removed. However both the previous build and new build both seem to encroach onto what appears to public land.</p> <p>The current build is not in line with the adjacent neighbours boundary fence line.</p> <p>The construction size is much larger than any surrounding buildings and with what looks like an exterior door entrance at the rear if steps were to be installed these would be directly place in the current right of way public path.</p> <p>The whole alleyway has a small verge that contains natural bushes and trees. The new build has completely destroyed this and now looks unsightly in relation to the rest of the properties along the alleyway.</p>

	I am not against a more natural building being erected however the size and placement of the current build is not in character with the surrounding properties.
--	---