

ITEM NUMBER: 5e

21/03742/FHA	Single storey rear and side extension and loft conversion	
Site Address:	17 Vicarage Lane, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire, WD4 9HS	
Applicant/Agent:	MR ANDY SMITH	Mr Frank Amankwah
Case Officer:	Tristan Goldsmid	
Parish/Ward:	Kings Langley Parish Council	Kings Langley
Referral to Committee:	Contrary views of parish Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The proposed development is located within the large village of King Langley, whereby in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy, development is acceptable if it meets local and national policies.

2.2 The overall size, scale and design of the extension and loft conversion is acceptable, and given that the proposal would be shielded from view, it would not result in any harm to the character or appearance of the street scene. Both the proposed loft conversion and rear extensions are not considered to have any significant adverse impacts on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties by being visually overbearing or resulting in a loss of light or privacy.

2.3 Furthermore, it is not considered that the scheme would have an adverse impact on the road network or create the significant parking stress

2.4 Given all of the above, the proposal complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies CS1, CS4, CS11, CS12, CS27, CS29 and CS32 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policies 57-58 and Saved Appendices 3, 5 and 7 of the Local Plan (2004), the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020) and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site is comprised of a two-storey, mid-terrace dwelling, situated on the northern side of Vicarage Lane, a residential lane located within the large village of Kings Langley. The dwelling sits amongst a terraced row of 6 properties.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 The application is seeking householder planning permission for a single storey rear and side extension, as well as a loft conversion.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

None

6. CONSTRAINTS

CIL Zone: CIL2
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 (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
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (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)

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 in a residential area, in the large village of Kings Langley, wherein Policies CS1 and CS4 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) are relevant. Policy CS1 guides new development to towns and large villages, encouraging new development within these areas. Furthermore, Policy CS4 encourages a mix of uses in town and local centres, encouraging residential uses.

9.3 Taking the above policies into account, the proposal for a single storey rear and side extension, with loft conversion is acceptable in principle.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.4 Policy CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy 2013 states development should respect the typical density intended in an area, preserve attractive streetscapes and respect adjoining properties in terms of scale, layout and materials.

9.5 Both the rear extension and loft conversion would not be visible from public vantage points along Vicarage Lane.

9.6 The proposal would use materials to match the existing property.

9.7 17 Vicarage Lane is part of terrace of 6 dwellings which feature outriggers to the rear. Further along Vicarage Lane there are examples of dormer loft conversions as well as single storey rear extensions, however there are currently no examples of mansard loft conversions on the terrace that No. 17 Vicarage Lane is situated within.

9.8 Given that there are currently no similar loft extensions amongst the adjacent properties, the proposed mansard loft conversion with two rear facing windows would appear at odds with the appearance of the area. However, given that the mansard style loft conversion would be situated to the rear and would not be visible from public vantage points it is not likely to cause any significant harm to the character of the row of terraced dwellings or the character of the wider street scene. It is acknowledged that the mansard style loft extension proposed would increase the bulk of the roof space, however it is important to note that the dwelling would be entitled to convert the loft to add 40 cubic metres of roof space under Class B of their Permitted Development rights and the design of this could be identical to that currently proposed (ie it could feature a mansard roof). The mass, bulk and overall design of the proposed dormer could be undertaken without the need for Planning Permission and this is a material consideration. It is concluded that a dormer of this size and design would not warrant a refusal.

9.9 The rear and side extension proposed would replace the existing single storey rear extension and would extend at the side to the boundary shared with no.19 and would not extend further outwards. The extension would also introduce rooflights and side windows positioned along the boundary shared with no. 19. Whilst this modern design will differ from the traditional architecture visible among adjacent dwellings, given the shielding from view, the proposed rear extension is not considered to cause any significant harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or area.

9.10 Taking all of the above into account, it is considered that the layout, architectural style and built form of the proposed development would not result in a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore complies with Saved Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2006-2031) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021).

Impact on Residential Amenity

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

9.12 Given the proximity of 17 Vicarage Lane to neighbouring dwellings, the proposed development would be visible from the adjoining neighbours at no. 15 and no. 19 and the dormer from beyond them.

9.13 Objections have been raised relating to loss of privacy due to the loft conversion. The loft conversion would create two large rear facing windows. Occupiers of these windows would have views to the rear gardens of no. 15, no. 13, and no. 19 causing some loss of privacy. However this loss of privacy is considered to be minor given that the view to the rear of no. 15 and no. 13 would be obscured by the roof of the existing outrigger. Furthermore, the existing first floor rear windows of the terrace of properties already mutually overlook each other, and therefore the rear gardens of these dwellings are not considered to suffer from any significant increase of loss of privacy. In addition, as set out a dormer could be constructed with similar sized windows without the need for planning permission, and these windows would permit identical views of surrounding properties and would be outside the control of the LPA.

9.14 Objections have been raised regarding loss of light, privacy and visual intrusion caused by the proposed rear and side extension. As the extension would extend to the boundary shared with no. 19, no. 19 is likely to experience some harm to residential amenity. The ground floor side and rear windows of no.19 and will experience some loss of light and visual intrusion due to the proposed height of 2.6m of the proposed extension, which would move 1.23m closer to the boundary than the current rear extension and would have a height 0.8m taller than the existing boundary fence.

9.15 The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed extension would not breach 25 degree lines, when drawn on elevation plans from the centre of the side facing rear window of no.19. The proposed extension would breach the 45 degree guidance when 45 degree lines are drawn from the rear facing window on the floor plans. However the proposed total height of the side/rear extension is 2.6m high. Member's attention is drawn to the fact that a 2m high fence/wall could be erected along the entire common boundary without the need for Planning Permission. The additional 0.6m height currently proposed, especially given its glazed design to the upper section, would not result in any significant harm over and above the 2m fence/wall. The upper glazed section would allow light to continue to reach no.19, and would be less intrusive than a brick structure such that it would not appear unduly intrusive or result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure. Given its siting on the common boundary it is considered necessary and reasonable that a condition be included requiring this glazed section to be obscured, to safeguard residential amenity.

9.16 With regards to light it is important to note that the current two storey outrigger, breaches the 45 degree and 25 degree lines in floor plan and elevation form, and as such would already have a significant impact. The impact of the extension currently proposed when compared to the existing outrigger is concluded to be minimal and would not warrant a refusal.

9.17 Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposed development will not detrimentally impact the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, or future occupiers, thus is considered acceptable in terms of the NPPF (2021), Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2006-2031).

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.18 The Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2020 states all parking demand for residential development should be accommodated on site. The proposed development would not change the number of bedrooms within the dwelling as 2 bedrooms would be retained. Thus, the proposal meets the requirements of Appendix A of the Parking Standards SPD (2020).

Other Material Planning Considerations

9.19 No other considerations.

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.7 No issues.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.8 Neighbour objections have been received expressing concerns in relation to;

- The design being out of character of the surrounding area are Victorian terrace
- Visual harm caused to surrounding area
- Unacceptable relationship with neighbouring dwellings
- Unacceptable scale of the design
- Overbearing form of development
- Loss of light to No. 19, No. 17 and No. 13
- Loss of privacy to No. 19, No. 17 and No. 13
- Undue sense of enclosure
- Noise impacts from loft extension

The majority of these concerns have been addressed above. With regard to noise impacts there is no evidence to suggest the conversion of the loft will result in any significant noise or disturbance issues and would be governed by building regulations (noise insulation etc). Moreover the loft could be converted without the need for permission as previously set out. A refusal on these grounds could not therefore be sustained.

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission consent 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 carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:**

192_PP-001-3_P1 Site Location Plan
192_PP-002-3_P1 Proposed Block Plan

192_PP-110-3_P1 Proposed Floor Plans
 192_PP-111-3_P2 Proposed Floor Plans
 192_PP-211-3_P1 Proposed North and South Elevation
 192_PP-210-3_P1 Proposed Rear Elevation received 17/11/21

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

3. **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).

4. **The high level window at ground floor level in the southern elevation of the rear extension hereby permitted shall be non-opening and permanently fitted with obscured glass.**

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).

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Kings Langley Parish Council	The Council OBJECTS to this application because of its size and design is not in-keeping with the other properties in the terrace and the balcony would have a serious impact upon the privacy of neighbouring properties.

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
5	3	0	3	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
13 Vicarage Lane Kings Langley WD4 9HS	The proposed application, the loft conversion specifically, will have an adverse affect on our privacy in our garden. Being a row of terraced cottages, the gardens are not large, especially width wise and this proposal will undoubtedly impinge on our privacy as it will overlook us. The gardens on this terrace are all north / south facing and there will undoubtedly be some loss of light, specifically in the evenings as the

	property sits to the West of us.
<p>15 Vicarage Lane Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9HS</p>	<p>I write in response to your letter of 14 October 2021. Please be aware that on the ariel plan submitted, Number 15 is shown as Number 13. This is incorrect and should read that our property, Number 15 is adjoining Number 17. The balcony proposal, with glass balustrades will be encroaching on our privacy by overlooking our garden, thus creating a visual intrusion. These gardens are only approximately 12 feet in width, and we have spent many years, working hard, erecting fences of the allowed height and planting small trees and shrubs to make our garden as private and relaxing as possible and to realise and achieve our retirement plans.</p> <p>The overall plan is totally out of character for a mid-terrace Victorian cottage and not in context with the other 4 cottages in the row. A modern structure such as this will look totally incongruous. Furthermore, I am concerned that the loft conversion hub will further diminish the light in our garden. Already we have lost 2 to 3 hours of light on our patio when a previous owner extended a kitchen and added a downstairs cloakroom. I understand that you cannot consider the impact of the proposed work on our lives, but I would like to make it clear that, given the nature of the work, we could, potentially, anticipate some damage to our property. Fairly obviously, this gives us huge grounds for concern.</p> <p>Re my comments on the 25 th November , these reasons were omitted from that letter. I have received the amended application and have noted the balcony has been removed. However, my objections remain as before; the context for our period Victorian cottages is totally out of keeping, together with our loss of light from the enormous 'hub' on the rear of the roof. Additionally, I note that the Parish Council have raised objections for exactly the same reasons, despite the removal of the balcony. This build will cause an undue sense of enclosure.</p>