

**ITEM NUMBER: 5d**

<b>20/02378/FHA</b>	<b>Re-cladding of existing two storey ancillary garden building and new velux windows</b>	
<b>Site Address:</b>	<b>61 Longfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DF</b>	
<b>Applicant/Agent:</b>	<b>Mr P Mitchell</b>	<b>Mr Nicholas Rowe</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>James Gardner</b>	
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	<b>Tring Town Council</b>	<b>Tring West &amp; Rural</b>
<b>Referral to Committee:</b>	<b>Contrary views of Tring Town Council</b>	

**1. RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission be **GRANTED**.

**2. SUMMARY**

2.1 The application is located within a residential area and therefore the principle of development is acceptable.

2.1.1 In design terms it is considered that the cladding would improve the visual appearance of the building and, in so far as the outbuilding is visible from the street scene (which is limited), there would be a benefit.

2.1.2 Given the separation distance, it is not considered that there would be any harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings as a result of this application.

2.1.3 Hertfordshire Ecology do not believe that there is reasonable likelihood of bats being present within the building, and therefore have simply recommended that an informative be

**3. SITE DESCRIPTION**

3.1 The application site is located on the north-western side of Longfield Road, Tring, and relates to a 1.5 storey pre-existing outbuilding in the rear garden of no. 61.

**4. PROPOSAL**

4.1 Planning permission is sought to re-clad an existing two-storey ancillary garden building and the insertion of two Velux windows in the front roof slope.

**5. PLANNING HISTORY**

Planning Applications (If Any):

4/01814/18/FHA - Conversion of existing two storey workshop to a two storey annex  
*WDN - 25th October 2018*

4/00462/18/LDP - Loft conversion with front, rear and side velux windows and new windows to rear and side elevations  
*GRA - 27th April 2018*

4/02315/17/FUL - Replacement of two storey workshop with 2-bed dwelling  
*REF - 30th November 2017*

4/01576/17/FHA - Extension of existing bungalow to create a two-storey four-bed house

GRA - 3rd August 2017

Appeals (If Any):

4/02315/17/FUL - Development Appeal  
- 6th September 2018 (Dismissed)

## **6. CONSTRAINTS**

CIL Zone: CIL2  
Parish: Tring CP  
Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Tring)  
Residential Character Area: TCA2  
SPD Zone 3  
Town: Tring

## **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 Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)  
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

### Dacorum Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development  
CS1 - Distribution of Development  
CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages  
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design  
CS12 - Quality of Site Design  
CS26 – Green Infrastructure  
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

### Dacorum Local Plan

Appendix 3 – Layout and Design of Residential Areas

### 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:

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 a residential area wherein, in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Dacorum Core Strategy, the principle of appropriate residential development is acceptable subject to compliance with the relevant local and national planning policies.

## **Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity**

9.3 Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy state that, amongst other things, development should preserve attractive streetscapes, integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties in terms of materials.

9.3.1 The walls and roof of the outbuilding are currently clad corrugated metal sheeting. The purpose of this application is to replace the metal sheeting with materials of a more domestic appearance - i.e. black composite shiplap cladding, concrete roof tiles and uPVC windows.

9.3.2 The use of composite shiplap cladding is considered more suitable for an outbuilding than brick, which would give the impression of a residence. Indeed, the use of timber-style cladding would be congruent with sheds in the surrounding gardens.

9.3.3 It is considered that the proposed re-cladding would result in a visual improvement to the building and would not have a harmful impact on the street scene or character of the area.

## **Impact on Residential Amenity**

9.4 Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy states that development should, amongst other things, avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to surrounding properties.

## Loss of Privacy

9.4.1 Since the outbuilding is an ancillary building connected to the lawful residential use of the application site, consideration does not need to be given to any overlooking of no. 61 Longfield Road.

9.4.2 The floor of the upper floor is likely to be such that views of the surrounding gardens would be possible from the proposed Velux windows. However, these garden views would not be materially different to those available from the first floor windows of surrounding properties.

9.4.3 What is of greater relevance is the distance from the outbuilding to rear elevations of the nearest dwellings. Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan provides the following guidance:

*“...minimum distances of 23 m between the main rear wall of a dwelling and the main wall (front or rear) of another should be met to ensure privacy. This distance may be increased depending on character, level and other factors.”*

9.4.4 The standard within Appendix 3 provides no guidance in terms of what the minimum separation distance between an outbuilding and a dwelling should be. In general, outbuildings will be used less intensely than dwellings. It follows, therefore, that there may be scope to accept separation distances of less than 23 metres. However, this case is unusual in that the outbuilding is essentially of 1.5 storey construction, with windows proposed at roof level. Furthermore, the floorplans indicate that the room within the roof will be used as an office. Given the recent proclivity for home working, it is therefore not unreasonable to assume that the room may be used intensively. On this basis, it is submitted that a minimum separation distance of 23 metres would strike the appropriate balance.

9.4.5 The site and location plans submitted in support of this application - see drawing no. PL/001 (Rev. B) – show the outbuilding approximately 23 metres away from the outrigger of no. 63 Longfield Road. As a result, it is not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking. Should Members be of a differing opinion, it is suggested that a condition requiring the windows to be permanently fitted with obscure glass and non-opening may offer an acceptable solution.

#### Visual Intrusion

9.4.6 The dimensions of the outbuilding will remain unchanged. The proposal is simply to re-clad the building in order to provide a more appropriate visual appearance. It is not considered that a change in materials would be sufficient to result in visual intrusion.

#### Noise Pollution

9.4.7 The separation distance from the neighbouring properties is likely to limit any noise transmission which may occur within the outbuilding. This notwithstanding, the use would continue to be domestic in nature and therefore it is unlikely that the renovation of the building and its subsequent use as an office would give rise to any issues in terms of noise and disturbance. In the unlikely event that this occurs, then there would be a means of redress through Environmental Health legislation.

#### Light Pollution

9.4.8 It should be noted that the application site is located within a town and thus is not an intrinsically dark area such as the open countryside or an isolated hamlet. Furthermore, the roof lights proposed are of modest scale and unlikely to result in significant levels of light being directed toward the windows of nearby dwellings. Indeed, the nature of domestic lighting is such that, with the exception of security lighting, it has a more diffuse quality. The outbuilding is proposed to be used as an office so it is unlikely that it will be internally illuminated throughout the night. Should issues subsequently be raised with regard to light pollution, this is a matter which could be dealt with through Environmental Health legislation.

#### Loss of Sunlight / Daylight

9.4.9 The outbuilding already exists and the proposal does not include increasing its dimensions. Consequently, there would be no loss of daylight / sunlight to surrounding gardens and dwellings.

#### **Other Material Planning Considerations**

##### *Impact on Trees and Landscaping*

9.5 Although there are a number of trees in relatively close proximity to the outbuilding, no below-ground development is proposed and therefore no damage to root protection areas would arise.

9.5.1 It is conceivable that works to the roof may necessitate cutting back overhanging branches; however, these trees are not subject to TPOs and can be cut back under common law without the requirement to seek permission from their owner.

### Ecological Impacts

9.6 Policy CS26 of the Dacorum Core Strategy states that the Green Infrastructure Network will be protected, extended and enhanced, while Policy CS29 states that impacts on biodiversity should be minimised and positive measures to support wildlife incorporated.

9.6.1 Hertfordshire Ecology were consulted and have confirmed that they are not aware of any existing habitat or species data for this site. They are also of the view that, given the nature of the site and the scale of development proposed, there is insufficient sufficient likelihood of bats being present and affected for the local planning authority to require a formal survey prior to determination. Instead, the following informative is recommended for inclusion with any grant of planning permission:

*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.*

9.6.2 Concerns have been raised from local residents that the proposed development could result in damage to a wildlife corridor. However, no further information in terms of the species affected, or how the proposed development would cause harm, has been provided.

9.6.3 The proposal is simply to replace existing metal sheeting with a composite shiplap cladding, with no excavation being required.

### Response to Neighbour Comments

9.7 Concerns have been raised by local residents in connection with the following:

1. Applicant may seek to convert the outbuilding to an independent residential dwelling.
2. Structural integrity of the building may not be sufficient to support the additional weight of the tiled roof.

9.7.1 Each shall be responded to in turn.

- ❑ Planning permission is not being sought to convert the outbuilding to an independent residential dwelling. An application to extend and convert the outbuilding to an independent residential dwelling has previously been refused and dismissed on appeal. The current application differs in a number of ways.
  - A new residential dwelling is not being sought.
  - A two-storey front gable is not proposed.
  - There would be no subdivision of the rear garden.
  - There would be no intensification of use (since it would be ancillary to the main dwelling).
- ❑ If external alterations would be required in order to strengthen the structural integrity of the building, this is likely to require planning permission. This has not been sought as part of this

application so it is assumed that the necessary surveys have been carried out and that this is not necessary.

#### Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.8 This application is not CIL liable.

### **10. CONCLUSION**

10.1 The principle of altering an existing outbuilding is acceptable in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

In visual terms the proposal would result in an improvement as compared with the outbuilding's current ramshackle and dilapidated appearance. The use of shiplap cladding would respect the outbuildings in adjoining gardens.

There would be no significant adverse impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.

### **11. RECOMMENDATION**

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

#### **Condition(s) and Reason(s):**

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

**PL/001 Rev B**  
**PL/003 Rev C**

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

3. **Notwithstanding Section 5 (Materials) of the planning application form, the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be fully in accordance with those specified on the approved plans.**

Reason: To make sure that the appearance of the building is suitable and that it contributes to the character of the area in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

## Informatives:

1. If bats, or evidence for them, are discovered during the course of roof 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.

## APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Hertfordshire Ecology	<p>Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Ecology on the above. I apologise for the delay with this reply.</p> <p>I am not aware of any existing habitat or species data for this site; however, there are records of roosting bats in the area.</p> <p>Given the nature and scale of the site, 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 prior to determination. However, I advise a precautionary approach to the works is taken, as bats are known to be in the area, and recommend the following Informative is added to any permission granted:</p> <p>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 trust these comments are of assistance.</p>

## APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

### Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
7	9	0	9	0

### Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
58 Longfield Road Tring Hertfordshire	This is a renewed attempt to convert a shed into a dwelling, in a different guise, but the aim is the same. The previous application 4/02315/17/FUL was rejected by Tring, Dacorum and by the Secretary

HP23 4DF	<p>of State on appeal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approval of this tandem planning consent will set a precedent for similar applications within Longfield Road and surrounding roads by introducing a building line at the rear of properties and create opportunities for the re-development of larger properties building between Longfield Road and Beaconsfield Road in an uncontrolled way. This will destroy the character of these roads, increase pressure on parking, increase noise issues and reduce quality of living for current residents.</li> <li>2. This application does not respect the pattern and character of the surrounding area, and the local plan states that dwellings should normally front the highway.</li> <li>3. The development of the workshop into a 2 storey house will have a significant visual impact to neighboring properties, reducing privacy and increasing noise &amp; light pollution</li> <li>4. The application should take into consideration that an application to replace a 2 bedroom bungalow on the same site with a 4 bedroom storey house was approved, and then an application was made for a 2 bed 2 storey house. These two applications should have been considered together, rather than using a fragmented approach, If two properties on this site was the desired outcome then planning should have been sought to build 2 semi-detached houses on the plot of the existing bungalow. This would be far less damaging to the current planning rules instead of the underhand approach here.</li> <li>5. Parking in front of the proposed converted building at the rear of the plot would be via a narrow access between the existing bungalow and neighboring property. This will increase noise and pollution next to the neighboring properties amenity space. It is likely that difficulty in access to the rear of the property will also lead to cars being parked in the road as has been demonstrated in Longfield Road with other re-developed sites increasing the pressure on parking.</li> <li>6. The workshop, originally built as stabling has only been used for storage for many years.</li> <li>7. Such a tandem development could set an unwelcome precedent, in effect creating another road between people's gardens.</li> <li>8. This redevelopment would have an enormous impact on surrounding properties, reducing their value, taking away privacy, and increasing noise and pollution, especially with cars driving and turning inches from their back gardens.</li> <li>9. It would also increase traffic and parking pressure in Longfield Road, where these are already a problem.</li> <li>10. This redevelopment would destroy a valuable wildlife corridor, which was pointed out by Tring Town Council with respect to the previous application.</li> <li>11. If allowed, this redevelopment would set a dangerous precedent, and the consequences for Tring would be disastrous. Tring would change for ever, and many residents would probably move away, depriving Tring of valued members of its community.</li> </ol> <p>In summary, this application should be rejected outright on grounds of overdevelopment.</p>
65 Longfield Road Tring	Having observed numerous attempts by this applicant to misrepresent the status of this building as anything other than a shed, I am firmly



<p>Hertfordshire HP23 4DF</p>	<p>convinced that this application is simply a furtive step towards achieving a residential property at the end of the garden. Such a proposal has already been rejected as inappropriate, and this application should be seen for what it is and rejected accordingly.</p> <p>The Location and site plan is inaccurate in showing a patio where there is a gravelled turning head. (If this is meant to be a proposal, I would welcome it as it would reduce vehicle movements.) A rear fence is shown where there is an adjoining building in the rear neighbour's garden. It is stated in the application that there are no trees within falling distance, whereas in fact there is a large sycamore immediately adjacent and a cupressus in the garden behind. The building has for some time now been used for the storage of goods in connection with a florist's business. Our enjoyment of our garden is reduced by the comings and goings of vehicles along the gravelled drive, some in connection with this unauthorised use. It is not stated whether the intended office and workshop use would be for the benefit of 61 Longfield Road or for a third party. If the latter, it would be likely still further to increase the number of vehicle movements, which would adversely affect our amenity.</p>
<p>53 Longfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DF</p>	<p>There was an application previously for this building to be converted into a residential dwelling, which was rejected. Have a concern that this new application is one step towards gaining residential permission in the future. Would not object to a single storey development.</p>
<p>Office The Market House 61 High Street Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4AB</p>	<p>The Town Council supported Dacorum Borough Council's decision with regard to the prior application 4/02315/17/FUL for a similar development of this site on the basis that the proposal would result in a cramped form of tandem residential development that would not reflect the context and local distinctiveness of the surrounding area or the density, pattern and grain of surrounding built form.</p> <p>As such, it would have resulted in significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to policies CS11 and CS12 of the adopted Core Strategy September 2013 the defined Development Principles of TCA2 in the Area Based Policies SPD, and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.</p> <p>Whilst this application is for a workshop, the proposed design would, similarly, be out-of-keeping with the surroundings.</p> <p>The Town Council would also seek, should permission be granted, conditions that would prohibit any proposals for a future change to residential use.</p> <p>The Town Council was also opposed to the application because of the damage it would do to an established wildlife corridor.</p>
<p>45 Beaconsfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DW</p>	<p>This application follows on from previously refused applications to convert this outbuilding to a residential property. Our concerns remain that the applicant will seek to convert to residential use despite previous refusals.</p> <p>The current proposal includes the addition of new velux windows which, whilst they do not directly affect ourselves, would result in a</p>

	<p>significant loss of privacy to homeowners at 59 &amp; 63 Longfield Road as they look directly at first floor level into their rear gardens.</p> <p>This application follows on from previously refused applications to convert this outbuilding to a residential property. Our concerns remain that the applicant will seek to convert to residential use despite previous refusals.</p> <p>The current proposal includes the addition of new velux windows which, whilst they do not directly affect ourselves, would result in a significant loss of privacy to homeowners at 59 &amp; 63 Longfield Road as they look directly at first floor level into their rear gardens.</p> <p>The application also states that it has no impact on trees where anybody who has visited the site would realise that there are a number of trees that would be adversely affected by this proposal.</p> <p>We would fully expect this application to be refused.</p>
<p>64 Longfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DF</p>	<p>I am confused by the letter sent by Dacorum Council which states that the proposal is for re-cladding and installation of velux windows. On closer inspection of the plans which bear a remarkable similarity to a previous failed planning application it becomes obvious that there is a lot more going on, there is the installation of a new floor and a staircase, this is not mentioned in the letter. Whilst not qualified to comment on the structural strength of the existing roof and wood in the building if there are plans to tile it surely the weight of slates or tiles is considerably more than corrugated steel there at the moment so significant building work would have to be done, this then makes me suspicious that the plans are in fact a return of the previous failed application to turn a large shed into a separate house which could be sold on to a new party. The plans are also inaccurate in stating that there are no trees adjacent to any building when it is obvious to anyone visiting the property there are several. This work would have significant impact on the neighbouring properties as the Velux windows would overlook several houses even if they are frosted as they could be opened. I find it strange that the proposer of this application is prepared to spend large amounts of money on developing what is in essence a shed when a new single storey home office can be purchased for less money and would not require planning permission which again raises suspicion that there are ulterior motives in this development.</p>
<p>63 Longfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DF</p>	<p>This is a shame.</p> <p>The building has the potential to be a lovely shed and should be used and restored as such.</p> <p>However, while a workshop may need the roof weather proofed, it does not need to be extended in height and or fitted with new Velux windows, as they are specifically used in residential applications.</p> <p>This is the issue. This is not an application to restore a shed.</p> <p>This is an application to start creating a residential house in the back</p>

	<p>garden of 61 Longfield road.</p> <p>The owners have made this proposal before and it was rightfully rejected. (61a Longfield Road proposal 4/01576/17/FHA I think)</p> <p>This proposal looks basically the same as the 61a Longfield Road proposal (ie a house) rather than a really nice workshop and garage for car storage.</p> <p>If it was a genuine proposal for workshop garage, it would have a large garage door, instead of a domestic style entrance, roof lights not Velux window and no patio area. (Since when does a shed have its own patio!?)</p> <p>So, in my view, this is a proposal to start building a house at the end of a garden, as such it will eliminate any privacy in the adjacent 6 private back gardens, as they will all be overlooked.</p> <p>The eco corridor that runs behind the garden boundary will also be significantly disrupted by any building works.</p> <p>Also, the proposal shows no trees when there are trees on the site.</p> <p>Vehicle movements are already prohibitive and disruptive, (the current owner/developer has four cars (one on the road the other three, plus florist work vans coming and going at all times in the back garden, so I am naturally nervous about any subsequent development undertaken.</p> <p>This is all very disappointing and I would ask that this proposal is rejected.</p>
<p>59 Longfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DF</p>	<p>The application to re-clad the existing barn, add a slate roof, double glazed windows and doors is simply the first stage in an underhand attempt to turn an old garden metal shed into a house. The plans don't even attempt to hide this with the addition of a second floor with stairs and roof windows. The finished result would essentially be a tandem house within the garden, which, with some additional stealth planning applications could be converted into a full working house.</p> <p>Approval of this application will undermine the original planning decision to refuse planning for a very similar design and size of house on the footprint of the original metal shed, reference 4/02315/17/FUL. This was rejected at the Dacorum planning stage and also rejected on appeal by the secretary of state.</p> <p>The design proposal leaves no doubt that the intention isn't just to turn the structure into an outside office or gym but into a building that can be lived in as a house, the plans clearly show this. There are various garden buildings in Longfield road used for offices or gyms, but all are single storey unlike the 2-storey proposal. These single storey constructions pose little or no effect on neighbours' privacy.</p> <p>The structure of the barn is fairly simple consisting mainly of metal corrugated sheets over a timber frame. Re cladding and roofing would require additional support to withstand the additional loading. No</p>

	<p>additional support walls or internal supports are mentioned on the application.</p> <p>In summary, this application should be rejected on the grounds that this is an underhand attempt to construct a tandem house where previous planning applications have been rejected outright by Dacorum council and by appeal.</p>
<p>53 Beaconsfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DW</p>	<p>as i live at 53 beaconsfield road, the proposed property is directly at the end of my garden ( the building is actually attached to our out buildings). i live in a one storey bungalow as i am a wheelchair user with ptsd so privacy is really important and so to approve this planning which will inevitable lead to a private separate dwelling on the site in the not too distant future would mean that i would have a 2 storey house at the bottom of my garden which would mean a total intrusion into our property. many of us have outhouses at the bottom of our gardens in beaconsfield road and longfield road so i'm sure this will lead to over development on both these roads.</p> <p>im not too sure why the applicant has said no to oversized trees in their property or adjoining properties. there are several huge trees a leylandii tree, a yew tree, a laurel tree and a hazel tree to name a few, all having lots of wildlife that live in them. i completely understand that the area we live in has and will be developed more but this application would cause noise pollution, privacy issues, strain on parking and would set the precedent for all of us applying to convert buildings at the bottom of out garden</p>