

ITEM NUMBER: 5f

21/03107/FHA	Part single, part two storey rear extension, two storey side and front extension, raised ridge height to accommodate a loft conversion.	
Site Address:	28 Langley Hill Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9HE	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr & Mrs Kotecha	Mr Uskuri
Case Officer:	Heather Edey	
Parish/Ward:	Kings Langley Parish Council	Kings Langley
Referral to Committee:	Contrary view of Parish Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

1.1 That planning permission be GRANTED.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in principle, in accordance with Policies CS1 and CS4 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013). The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in design terms, noting that the works are not considered to detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene or surrounding area. Furthermore, it is not considered that the proposal would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties by being visually overbearing or resulting in a significant loss of light or privacy. Given that the proposal would not result in any changes to the existing site access or adjacent highway, it is not considered that the proposal would generate any highway or pedestrian safety concerns. Sufficient private amenity space and off-street parking provision would be provided for current and future occupiers of the site in line with the relevant policies. Given all of the above, the proposal complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021), Policies CS1, CS4, CS8, CS11, CS12 and CS29 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013), Saved Appendices 3, 5 and 7 of the Local Plan (2004) and the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site comprises a two storey detached dwellinghouse, situated off Langley Hill within a designated residential area in the Large Village of Kings Langley. The existing dwelling is externally finished in a mix of yellow facing brickwork, painted timber cladding and render, comprising a pitched roof, single storey front porch and attached single storey side garage.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the construction of a part single storey, part two storey rear extension, two storey side and front extension and to raise the ridge height of the existing dwelling to accommodate a loft conversion.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications (If Any):

4/1389/78 – Side Extension to Provide Garage, Car Port and Lobby
GRANTED - 17th November 1978

6. CONSTRAINTS

CIL Zone: CIL2

Former Land Use (Risk Zone):
Heathrow Safeguarding Zone: LHR Wind Turbine
Large Village: Kings Langley
Parish: Kings Langley CP
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Yellow (45.7m)
Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (King Langley)
Parking Standards: New Zone 3
EA Source Protection Zone: 3
EA Source Protection Zone: 2

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 (July 2021)
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
CS8 – Sustainable Transport
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction
Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004): Layout and Design of Residential Areas
Saved Appendix 7 of the Local Plan (2004): Small-Scale House Extensions

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (2020)
Planning Obligations (2011)
Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)
Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)
The Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020)

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 site is situated within a designated residential area in the Large Village of Kings Langley wherein Policies CS1 and CS4 are relevant. Policy CS1 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) guides new development to towns and large villages, encouraging the construction of new development and housing in these areas. Furthermore, Policy CS4 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) states appropriate residential development is encouraged in residential areas.

9.3 In light of the above policies, the proposed development is acceptable in principle.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.4 The NPPF (2021) states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development should be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Furthermore, Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 7 of the Local Plan (2004) seek to ensure that new development respects adjoining properties in terms of layout, scale, height, bulk and materials.

9.5 The application proposes the construction of a part single storey, part two storey rear extension and the construction of a two storey side and front extension.

9.6 Collectively, the proposed additions would significantly alter the visual appearance of the existing dwelling, increasing its visual bulk, mass and prominence within the streetscene. In particular, the proposed works would alter the property's front elevation, resulting in the creation of a new focal gable ended front projection and installation of new glazing.

9.7 Whilst properties sited on Langley Hill are typically large, two storey dwellinghouses positioned set back from the highway, these properties are mixed in terms of their design and character, noting that they vary significantly in terms of their architectural style, design, roof form and external material finishes. For example, whilst the existing dwelling comprises a simple pitched roof and modest single storey front projection, neighbouring property 26 Langley Hill comprises a focal first floor gable ended front protrusion, similar to that proposed under the current application.

9.8 Taking the above into account and noting the mixed character and design of properties along Langley Hill, it is not considered that the resultant dwelling would detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene, or that it would appear an overtly prominent addition to the streetscene.

9.9 The application also proposes the raising of the ridge height of the existing dwelling by approximately 0.9m to facilitate the conversion of the loft into habitable space.

9.10 The topography of the site sees ground levels rise steeply from east to west, with the existing dwelling sited on ground levels approximately 0.8m higher than neighbouring property 26 Langley Hill and approximately 0.8m lower than neighbouring property 30 Langley Hill.

9.11 Given the nature of the topography of the site, and noting that the resultant dwelling would comprise a height set down from that of neighbouring property 30 Langley Hill and would remain approximately 15m set back from the highway, it is not considered that the raising of the ridge height of the existing dwelling would be harmful in this instance, or that the resultant dwelling would appear visually prominent following the construction of these works.

9.12 The existing dwelling is currently externally finished in a mix of yellow facing brickwork, pale grey render, pale green cladding boards, white uPVC windows/openings and grey roof tiles.

9.13 The current proposal seeks permission to alter these external finishes, with the resultant dwelling comprising an external render, timber cladding and slate stone finish, with dark grey aluminium windows, and a grey slate/concrete tile roof. Given that properties along Langley Hill are mixed in terms of their design and material finish, (i.e. comprising a mix of render and brickwork external walls and concrete roof tiles), the proposed material finishes are considered to be acceptable, harmonising with the mixed external finish of properties within the immediate area.

9.14 Given the above assessment, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in design terms and in terms of its impact on visual amenity, respecting adjoining properties and integrating with the character and appearance of the streetscene. As such, the proposal accords with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Appendix 7 of the Local Plan (2004) and the NPPF (2021).

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.15 The NPPF (2021) outlines the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers. Furthermore, Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seek to ensure that new development avoids visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to surrounding properties.

9.16 The application site shares side boundaries with neighbouring properties 26 and 30 Langley Hill and a rear/side boundary with neighbouring property 2 Archer Close.

Impact on 2 Archer Close

9.17 Given the scale and positioning of the proposed additions and the separation distances that would be retained between the proposed development and this neighbouring property, it is not considered that the proposal would have any adverse impacts on the residential amenity of this neighbouring property by being visually overbearing or resulting in a significant loss of light or privacy.

Impact on 26 and 30 Langley Hill

Visual Intrusion

9.18 The Parish Council have raised objection to the scheme on the grounds that the proposed extensions, (by reason of their size and bulk), would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring property 26 Langley Hill, appearing visually overbearing and resulting in a significant loss of light and privacy to this dwelling.

9.19 Given the difference in ground levels between the existing dwelling and 26 Langley Hill, (i.e. noting that 26 Langley Hill is sited on ground levels approximately 0.8m lower than the existing dwelling), and noting that the proposed front extensions would project beyond the front elevation of this neighbouring property, concerns were raised at pre-application stage that the resultant dwelling would appear visually overbearing to this neighbouring property.

9.20 In order to address these concerns, the original scheme has been amended, with the depth of the front extension being reduced and front elevation staggered, therein providing a visual break and reducing the visual bulk of this element of the proposal. In addition to this, it has been proposed that the front elevation of the resultant dwelling comprise a mixed material finish (i.e. mix of render, timber cladding and slate stone detailing). These amendments are considered sufficient to reduce

the visual bulk of the proposed front extensions, and ensure that this element of the proposal does not appear visually overbearing to this neighbouring property.

9.21 The proposed rear extension has also been sympathetically designed to ensure that it does not appear visually intrusive to neighbouring property 26 Langley Hill, noting that the proposed rear extension would be positioned set in at first floor level, therein projecting approximately 2.4m from the rear elevation of this dwelling. Taking this into account and noting that the rear element of the proposal would be partially screened from view by the existing boundary fencing and single storey side garage at no. 26, it is not considered that this element of the proposal would appear overly prominent or bulky when viewed by this neighbouring property.

9.22 Given the scale and bulk of neighbouring property 30 Langley Hill, the scale of the proposed additions and noting the difference in ground levels between the application site and this neighbouring property, (i.e. noting that the existing dwelling is sited on ground levels approximately 0.8m lower than this neighbouring property), it is not considered that the resultant dwelling would appear visually intrusive to this neighbouring property.

Privacy

9.23 One additional first floor window has been proposed to the side elevation of the dwelling, (i.e. serving a new ensuite bathroom), facing the flank elevation of 26 Langley Hill. Whilst the flank elevation of 26 Langley Hill comprises a single first floor window, this opening is positioned significantly set forward of the proposed new opening. As such, it is not considered that the proposed new window would facilitate any harmful overlooking of this neighbouring property.

9.24 Two first floor windows have been proposed to the side elevation of the resultant dwelling, facing the flank elevation of neighbouring property 30 Langley Hill. Given that the flank elevation of 30 Langley Hill comprises a number of openings serving habitable rooms, concerns were raised at pre-application stage that the proposed development could be used to facilitate harmful overlooking of this neighbouring property.

9.25 In order to address these concerns, it is recommended that a condition be attached to the formal planning consent, ensuring that these openings are obscure glazed to a minimum of privacy level three and non-opening above 1.7m. This condition is considered to be necessary to safeguard the privacy of current and future occupiers of neighbouring property 30 Langley Hill, and noting that these openings would both serve bathrooms, it is considered that high standards of amenity would also be retained for current and future occupiers of the resultant dwelling.

Loss of Light

9.26 The proposed development has been designed to avoid obstructing sunlight/daylight to the existing windows/rooms of neighbouring properties 26 and 30 Langley Hill with the '45 degree test' being demonstrated on drawing 21015.00.201 Rev A, in line with the guidance set out under the Building Research Establishment's (BRE) - Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011). Given that the proposed development would clear 45 degree lines from the nearest habitable rooms of both neighbouring properties, it is not considered that the proposal would have a significantly detrimental impact on lighting levels of these existing dwellings.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.27 The NPPF (2021), Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policy 58 of the Local Plan (2004) all seek to ensure that new development provides safe and sufficient parking provision for current and future occupiers.

9.28 The proposed development would not involve any changes to the existing site access or adjacent highway, and as such, it is not considered that the proposal would generate any highway or pedestrian safety concerns.

9.29 The proposal would alter the property from a four to six bed dwelling, therein generating the requirement for additional off-street car parking provision to be provided.

9.30 The Council's car parking standards, (as set out in the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2020), state that the level of off-street car parking provision to be provided by dwellings comprising over four bedrooms in this area should be assessed on an individual case basis.

9.31 Whilst the proposal would result in the demolition of the existing attached garage, (and therefore associated loss of an off-street car parking space), the dwelling comprises a large area of hardstanding to the front, which could be used to facilitate off-street car parking for over four cars. Taking this into account, it is considered that the site accommodates sufficient off-street car parking provision for current and future occupiers of the site, and as such, no concerns are raised in this regard.

Other Material Planning Considerations

Amenity Space

9.31 Saved Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004) seeks to ensure that new development retains sufficient private amenity space for future occupiers, stating that private gardens should normally be positioned to the rear of the dwelling and have an average minimum depth of 11.5m.

9.32 Given that the existing dwelling would retain a garden measuring approximately 14.7m deep following the completion of the proposed works, it is considered that sufficient private amenity space would be retained for current and future occupiers of the site.

Contamination

9.33 The DBC Scientific Officer was consulted on the proposal and has raised no objection to the proposal on the grounds of land contamination.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.34 Two neighbours have raised objection to the proposal, raising the following concerns:

- The proposed development would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties by being visually intrusive and resulting in a significant loss of light and privacy.
- The proposed development would have an adverse impact on the Green Belt and Rural Area.
- The proposed development would amount to overdevelopment.

9.35 The first of the concerns raised above has considered and addressed during an earlier section of the report (see Impact on Residential Amenity section). Whilst concerns have been specifically raised in relation to the proposed rear dormer, it is not considered that this addition would facilitate any harmful overlooking of neighbouring properties, noting its scale and positioning, set in from flank walls. Furthermore, consideration is given to the fact that Government legislation allows householders to construct larger roof enlargements under permitted development rights, given that

the Applicant could utilise these rights to construct a full width rear dormer without requiring formal planning consent.

9.36 Given that the site does not fall within the designated Rural Area or Metropolitan Green Belt, the proposals failure to comply with local and national policy in this regard is not considered to reflect grounds for refusal of the scheme.

9.37 With regards to the final concern raised, it is noted that the scheme would significantly alter the visual appearance, bulk and prominence of the existing dwelling, given the cumulative scale of the proposed new additions. However, given that the site is of sufficient size/scale to provide the facilities required to enable the dwelling to function as a six bed dwelling, (i.e. noting that sufficient off-street car parking provision and amenity space would be retained for current and future occupiers of the site), and noting that the proposal is considered to be acceptable when considered against other material planning considerations, (i.e. in design/visual amenity terms and in terms of its impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties), it is not considered that the proposal would amount to overdevelopment of the site.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.38 Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy (2013) 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 1st July 2015. The application is not CIL liable.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 The application is recommended for approval.

10.2 The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in principle, in accordance with Policies CS1 and CS4 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013). The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in design terms, noting that the works are not considered to detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene or surrounding area. Furthermore, it is not considered that the proposal would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties by being visually overbearing or resulting in a significant loss of light or privacy. Given that the proposal would not result in any changes to the existing site access or adjacent highway, it is not considered that the proposal would generate any highway or pedestrian safety concerns. Sufficient private amenity space and off-street parking provision would be provided for current and future occupiers of the site in line with the relevant policies. Given all of the above, the proposal complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Policies CS1, CS4, CS8, CS11, CS12 and CS29 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013), Saved Appendices 3, 5 and 7 of the Local Plan (2004) and the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020).

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following 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 constructed in accordance with the materials specified on the application form and 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).

3. **The windows at first floor level in the west elevation of the extension hereby permitted shall be non-opening and permanently fitted with obscured glass to a minimum of privacy level three unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenities of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings in accordance with Policy CS12 (c) of the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 130 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

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

**21015.00.100 Rev D
21015.00.101 Rev B
21015.00.001 Rev A
21015.00.201 Rev A
21015.00.102 Rev A
Design and Access Statement**

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

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Parish/Town Council	The Council objected to this application as it felt that because of the bulk and size of the proposal it would be overbearing on the neighbouring property (No. 26), with a loss of privacy and light.
Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)	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.

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
11	2	0	2	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
26 Langley Hill Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9HE	<p>Response to Planning Application 21/03107/FHA Summary & Conclusions</p> <p>I have focused my response on the most relevant 'material planning considerations' and have referenced relevant Dacorum Planning Policies ignored by the applicant.</p> <p>To ensure a comprehensive response, I have addressed sections of the application, demonstrating the deep flaws.</p> <p>The conclusion of the application (see p9 of this document) is that it should be approved. I believe I have demonstrated comprehensively that it should be rejected.</p> <p>Material Planning Considerations</p> <p>Loss of Light or Overshadowing</p> <p>Due to a single-storey extension we will not lose light to adjacent downstairs windows under the terms of the 45 degree rule. However, the increase in height of the proposed new roof, extending at that increased height by over 7m, will overshadow our property, especially as it is positioned 'down hill' and to the East of no 28.</p> <p>In Section 6 the applicant lists recent planning applications which they deem as relevant. I found this list to be misleading, ignoring recent extensions on Langley Hill that provide a significant body of evidence that this proposed scheme is inappropriate when compared to others recently implemented. Other approved extensions have avoided Overshadowing and been sympathetic to the surrounding properties.</p> <p>Overlooking/Loss of Privacy</p> <p>At present the property at no28 can barely be seen from our property and vica-versa. Should the scheme be built, this will change completely. In particular, the large rear dormer window proposed which will stand an additional 2.5m above first floor windows, will have full view across our patio and garden. This represents a significant impact to our privacy.</p> <p>In my response to Section 6, I address the differences between this application and the schemes the applicant references, demonstrating how this planning application has a significant impacts he others do not. I also list other recent extensions, omitted from this application, that demonstrate how others in Langley Hill have significantly altered their homes while avoiding the problems created by this scheme.</p> <p>I also commented on the response by the planner to the pre-application. The issues as regards overlooking should have been addressed then. This needs to be put right in this part of the application process.</p>

In my comments on Section 8, (page 5 of this document), I demonstrate how the application of published Council policies 22, 37 and 111 highlight the numerous issues with the application. These policies, need to be set alongside this application.

Visual Intrusion

Any scheme that includes a full height and full coverage 3rd story is likely to fall foul of Visual Intrusion in a way that other local approved schemes do not. Extending a house by raising the height by nearly 1m and implementing a full height dormer, resulting in the increased height extending for over 7m, will inevitably cause visual intrusion. This surely in the reason why no other approved scheme on Langley Hill has implemented such a proposal. (see my comments on P4 of this document)

Design and Access Statement

I have made the following comments responding to the relevant paragraphs to provide the detailed evidence to support my conclusions above.

4.0 | Amount

'This application seeks permission for the addition of a two storey side and front extension, part single part two storey rear extensions, raised ridge height to accommodate a loft conversion with rear dormer and internal alterations'

My objection to this is that it seriously understates the extent of the changes to accommodate the 'loft conversion', which is of significant size and entirely dependent upon the extensions applied to the 1st floor to enable it to be built. It is effectively a new 2nd floor, increasing the height and scale of the property.

6.0 | Site & Local Planning History

6.1 '..... The most recent and relevant applications are set out below.'

6.2: '...66 Langley Hill Ref: 4/02253/13/FHA' This is a far more sympathetic scheme and includes preferable aspects compared to the application:

- The hill has a far reduced gradient at this point in the road
- Scheme created a dwelling in keeping with those around it, with a comparable roof height
- The dormer windows are small in the centre of the plot, thereby avoiding Overlooking/loss of privacy.
- Where the loft extends to the East - i.e. is higher than the house next door, velux windows have been employed and the roof height lowered to avoid overlooking
- Thus the scheme is wholly sympathetic to the impacts to neighbours and is in keeping with the size and rooflines of adjacent homes - unlike this application

6.3 1 'Langley Hill Close Ref: 20/03430/FHA'

This is not comparable

- This scheme does not involve a roof extension or movement of building line towards the road
- The two storey extension is down the hill and behind the nearest impacted house, which is no 5 Langley Hill
- The scheme is far smaller than what is being proposed at no 28

6.4 '20 Langley Hill Ref: 20/01372/FHA'

This is not comparable at all as

- The scheme does not involve a roof extension
- Aside from the porch, does not move the building line closer to the

road

- The rear two storey extension is on the West side of the plot only, thereby minimising any loss of light, overshadowing, overlooking or loss of privacy to the swelling down the hill

- It is therefore far more sympathetic to and in keeping with surrounding homes

6.5 '4 Langley Hill Close Ref: 4/02908/17/FHA'

This is not comparable at all as

- It is a much smaller scheme

- The scheme does not involve a roof extension

- The two storey rear extension only covers part of the rear

6.5 '59 Langley Hill Ref: 4/02649/16/FHA'

This is not comparable at all as

- The scheme does not involve a roof extension

- The two storey rear extension only covers part of the rear

This list of recent applications provided in the application provide little relevance to this application, and conspicuously ignores recent extensions elsewhere on or close to Langley Hill which have included extensions into the roof including Langley Hill nos 7, 9, 19, 21 and 15 Archer Close. The latter is in clear view from Langley Hill. Here is a description of each of these schemes:

- No 7 was a complete rebuild, and is on a much larger plot than 28, so is not wholly comparable. But in some ways, maybe that is the point here. It is on a much larger plot than no 28! The scheme includes rooms in the loft, but the roof remains in keeping with neighbouring properties and the dormer window is positioned far away from either boundary so removes any risk of overlooking

- No 9 was an extension to an already large house on a substantial plot. The scheme included a loft extension with a Crown Roof but crucially did not alter the roof height. It did include a dormer window to the rear but positioned a long way from the boundary with neighbouring properties. Therefore, the scheme had negligible impact

- No 19 and 21 are both comparable as are modestly sized houses on smaller plots and have implemented extensions which include rooms in the loft. Neither have altered the roofline, using velux windows as the main source of light. No 19 also appears to have a small centrally positioned rear facing dormer. This ensures that the loft extensions are inconspicuous to the adjacent houses, cause little overlooking etc and are sensitive to the impact of the slope of the hill

The above examples demonstrate the extent to which homeowners can achieve their goals of larger houses while minimising the impact of loft extensions. They have all avoided adding a new floor to an existing house with the attendant impacts that brings. If these principles were applied to no 28 the application would be rejected as it falls outside the approved standards of extension on Langley Hill.

7.0 | Pre-Application Advice

It was a cause of some concern to read that the plans for this scheme were discussed with Heather Edey before being discussed with neighbours.

The planning application claims, under paragraph 7.4, that 'The volume of glazing to the front elevation was discussed but was noted as a key feature of the design. The larger areas of glazing are located to area which will not have a negative impact on overlooking but greatly enhances the design.'

I am extremely disappointed that this assertion was not investigated by

the planning officer as it is a misleading statement. 'the larger areas of glazing' will absolutely have a negative impact on overlooking. There is no need at all to position such a large dormer window where it maximises overlooking. As identified above, no other loft extension on Langley Hill has provided such intrusive Overlooking.

8.0 | Planning Policy Considerations

This section specifically references, in paragraph 8.2, the St Albans Planning Policy, and in particular compliance with POLICY 72.

I am uncertain as to why St.Albans policies are important. However, I reviewed the policies online and found these statements included under no 72:

(i) Scale and character - the extension shall relate to the domestic scale, character and appearance of the street;

(ii) Compatibility with original building - the architectural style, roof form, windows, detailing and materials shall normally be appropriate to the original building, particularly in conservation areas;

On the basis that the applicant believes these policies to be relevant to the application, both provisions are compromised by this application:

(i) Scale and Character: The houses on this part of Langley Hill are standard 2-storey design utilising normal pitched roofs. None have increased the height of the roof or implemented a crown design to include a large 2nd storey covering the footprint of the extended house. Thus this scheme conspicuously fails to meet this policy which it is asking to be judged against.

(ii) Compatibility with original: it should be noted that this policy explicitly references 'roof form' and 'windows'. The change from a pitched gable-end roof to a much larger crown roof design fails the first part of the policy, while the inclusion of an intrusive overlooking dormer fails the second.

On conducting a search of the Dacorum council website, policies absolutely of relevance to this application, though not referenced in it, include:

Policy 22 - Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt and the Rural Area

This policy states that a maximum 150% increase in floor area 'can be used as general guidance when determining planning applications (source: [policy-advice-note.pdf](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/policy-advice-note.pdf?sfvrsn=81473c9e_8) p26, https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/policy-advice-note.pdf?sfvrsn=81473c9e_8).'

As Kings Langley sits within green belt and the rural area, the policy is relevant. In this application, each floor is increased as follows:

- Ground - current is roughly 86sqm, new is roughly 210
- First - Current is roughly 86sqm, new is roughly 195
- Second - current is 0sqm as there is no used floor space, new is roughly 90.

So the current floor area is approx. 172 sqm. New floor area is approx. 495 sqm. Thus the proposal results in an increase in floor space of over 180%. This is outside the guidance and demonstrates why the scheme creates major issues of overlooking, visual intrusion etc.

37 - Environmental Improvements

The policy states that 'support is given to general environmental improvements'. Having reviewed the plans and supporting documentation there does not appear to be any environmental improvements referenced or included in the scheme.

However, as identified in my Summary on P1, the increase in roof height will reduce the efficiency of the PV scheme on the roof of no.26 as it will increase the hours of shadow on the panels. Thus this scheme will have a negative environmental impact, leading to an increase in CO2 emissions.

111 - Height of Buildings

I was unable to find this specific policy on the Dacorum web site. However, where referenced in other documents it was summarised thus: 'Policy 111 of the Local Plan makes it clear that buildings of 3 storeys will be permitted provided that they harmonise within the character of the surrounding area.' ('civiczonebriefsection3.pdf', <http://web.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/planning-development/civiczonebriefsection3.pdf?Status=Master&sfvrsn=0>).

The proposed planning application stands alone on Langley Hill as one which seeks to increase the height of the roof by a significant amount (circa 1m), and by making that roof flat (so-called 'crown design') where it was pitched. These changes dramatically increase visual intrusion. While the 2nd floor dormer, also results in a significant impact on overlooking and loss of privacy.

Thus this scheme significantly compromises this policy 111.

9.0 | Layout

The paragraphs that drive material external impacts are as follows:

9.5 'The raised ridge in the loft allows for two bedrooms with ensembles as well as ample storage space.'

The use of language in this paragraph deliberately obscures the reality that there is not just an increase in ridge height, but removal of the ridge design to a Crown design along with the inclusion of a brand new dormer window. None of these changes are mentioned, but they have a material impact on Visual Intrusion and Overlooking.

The proposed roof design will sit roughly 1m higher than the current top of the ridge, extend at that increased height parallel to the boundary of no26, for approximately 7.4m. This will obviously significantly increase the Visual Intrusion and Overlooking introduced by the proposed scheme.

9.6 'These improvements to the existing dwelling will greatly improve the applicants' enjoyment of their home, whilst bringing the house up to a modern standard of living. The layout is one that takes advantage of the large front driveway whilst also being considerate to the neighbouring properties.'

I have no doubt that the scheme will provide advantages to the applicants. But at what long term cost to the applicants' neighbours? At no point was the scheme discussed with neighbours, so I am not certain how the applicants can be sure they have been 'considerate'.

10.0 | Scale

There are a number of paragraphs in this section presenting the advantages and improvements of the new scheme. Two stand out as requiring comment:

10.2 'The extension to the rear..... than the new additions.'

It is true that the existing building is probably smaller in mass than other adjacent properties, which is why it has always been ripe for extension. However, this proposal will create a dramatically oversized house to replace it, that will dominate adjacent properties. This scheme will result in a house that extends as far on three floors where other

properties primarily extend on the ground floor only. Hence the obvious over-development of this application.

10.5 'Overall, the scale compliment the existing dwelling and the surrounding context'

One only has to glance at the drawings included alongside this text to see that the new dwelling represents a very significant increase in scale when viewed from the front or rear elevations. I note that there is no comparison provided as regards side elevations. If these had also be included the statements would be even more obviously misleading.

This scheme does not complement the 'surrounding context'. If built, it would be significantly detrimental to the surroundings. I make this statement while supporting the principle that no 28 is ready for an extension to 'complement the existing dwelling'. But it would be easy to achieve this with far less impact than the proposed scheme - albeit one that whilst providing the significant increase in downstairs living, may not stretch to 5 large double and 1 large single bedrooms.

Such a large house simply does not belong on this relatively modest plot; such houses do exist on Langley Hill but on very much larger plots. The scheme as proposed would lead to significant over-development.

12.0 | Appearance

The relevant paragraph is:

12.3 'The proposed ... hill. The new openings are to create a modern family home with views over the garden without creating overlooking issues.'

It is the second sentence which is contentious. The new openings are at such a great height above ground level that you will be able to easily see into neighbouring gardens, which is why this scheme creates significant Overlooking issues across all adjacent properties.

15.0 | Conclusions

There are 7 paragraphs included in this section, which I will address in turn:

15.1 I have argued throughout this response that the proposed design is wholly unacceptable principally in terms of scale and massing, creating significant and obvious problems for neighbouring properties due to Overshadowing, Overlooking/loss of privacy, and Visual Intrusion.

15.2 I have demonstrated in my response that the planning history section is at best misleading and at worst disingenuous, seeking to provide the impression that this scheme is perfectly normal and common on Langley Hill. In fact, such a scheme has never been approved for a property of a similar nature to no 28, for good reason, due to the negative impact it creates.

15.3 This again is a misleading assertion; as this document details, there are many good reasons for this scheme to be rejected, not least due to overlooking and size.

15.4 'The rear extension, if only consisting of two storeys - ground & first floor - would probably fit the description of not being 'overly dominant'. However, when the 2nd floor extension is factored in, alongside the dominant position no28 already holds due to being higher up the hill, this scheme would see no 26 in particular being dwarfed by a new and hugely over-dominant structure above it.

15.5 A scheme cannot be described as 'well balanced' if it introduces numerous and significant impacts to neighbouring properties. The

	<p>'clever design' has been used to create an over-dominant building on a street where all houses, although different, exist in harmony with one another. None have such an obvious and overbearing 2nd floor.</p> <p>15.6 It has already been stated by the applicant in para 9.6 that the objective of the scheme is to bring 'improvements to the existing dwelling [which] will greatly improve the applicants' enjoyment of their home....'. If adjacent properties were to be transformed from a 4 bed, 1 bathroom house to a 6 bed, 6 bathroom house, then obviously the owners of such a property would enjoy it. A mere 'facelift' of the front elevation could have a positive impact to the area, such as provided by the extension to no20. The scheme at that house has not created a behemoth. This proposal for no28 will not have a positive impact on the immediate area as it is dramatically over-sized compared to all other extensions undertaken on Langley Hill.</p> <p>15.7 I would argue that my response demonstrates beyond doubt that Dacorum Planning Authority should reject this application, deeming the proposal wholly unacceptable in terms of policy, never mind its negative impact to the overall environment of Langley Hill.</p>
<p>Flat 2 Newlands 32 Langley Hill Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9HE</p>	<p>I have not been able to do as much research as my neighbour at 26 Langley Hill but, comments regarding the size of this new plan and the impact on the general area, I totally agree with these observations.</p> <p>I absolutely have no problem with anyone making improvements to their home but please consider the impact on your neighbours and the area. Perhaps modifying those plans with this in mind.</p>