

**ITEM NUMBER: 5a**

<b>22/03760/FHA</b>	<b>One and a half storey rear extension including room in roof space, extension to existing side dormer, re-roof with new tiles, reconstruct attached garage to side and installation of new doors and windows</b>	
<b>Site Address:</b>	<b>29 Langley Hill, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire, WD4 9HA</b>	
<b>Applicant/Agent:</b>	<b>Mr Chris Baker</b>	<b>Mr Luis Nieves</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Nicole Quinn</b>	
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	<b>Kings Langley Parish Council</b>	<b>Kings Langley</b>
<b>Referral to Committee:</b>	<b>Contrary views of Parish Council</b>	

**1. RECOMMENDATION**

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

**2. SUMMARY**

2.1 The application site is located within residential area of Kings Langley wherein the proposed development is acceptable in principle, in accordance with Policies CS1 and CS4 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

2.2 The overall size, scale and design of the proposed alterations are acceptable, they relate well to the parent dwelling, and would not result in any harm to the character or appearance of the street scene/area. The works 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 significant parking stress in the area.

2.4 Given all of the above, the proposal complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Policies CS1, CS4, CS8 CS11, CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013), Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Local Plan (2004) and the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020).

**3. SITE DESCRIPTION**

3.1 The application site is located within a residential area of Kings Langley. The site comprises a two storey detached dwelling.

**4. PROPOSAL**

4.1 This application seeks permission for a one and a half storey rear extension including room in roof space, extension to existing side dormer, re-roof with new tiles, reconstruct attached garage to side and installation of new doors and windows.

4.2 The application has been amended since the original submission by removing the proposed patio to the rear.

## **5. PLANNING HISTORY**

Planning Applications: None

Appeals: None

## **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 (2021)

Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)

Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Kings Langley Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2038

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 application site is located within a residential area of Kings Langley, wherein in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy (2013) the principle of residential development is acceptable subject to compliance with the relevant national and local policies. The main issues of consideration relate to the impact of the proposal's character and appearance upon the existing dwelling house, immediate street scene and residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

### Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.3 Chapter 12 of the Framework emphasises the importance of good design in context and, in particular, paragraph 134 states that development which is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents. Dacorum's Core Strategy Policies CS11 (Quality of Neighbourhood Design) and CS12 (Quality of Site Design) state that development within settlements and neighbourhoods should preserve attractive streetscapes; integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties in terms of scale, height, bulk and materials. The Kings Langley Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2038 (Appendix B) Policy HO.11 (Extensions and Alterations) state that external alterations should respect or enhance the visual appearance of the original buildings and the character of the wider street scene.

9.4 It is acknowledged that the size of the proposed dormer is in accordance with Saved Policy Appendix 7 (Small-scale house extensions) as the proposed development is both set up and set in from the roof slope. The proposed extension of the dormer window is not much larger than the two dormer windows as existing, therefore the proposed development is considered acceptable. The proposed dormer window is located no closer to the front elevation of the dwelling than what is existing.

9.5 The proposed one and a half storey extension located to the rear of the dwelling and is considered to be a subordinate addition to the host dwelling, the first floor aspect is located off of the shared boundary from both adjoining neighbours. The design of the proposed extension is complimentary to the existing dwellinghouse and is considered acceptable. The proposed development is located to the rear of the dwelling and will therefore not have a negative impact on the street scene or the surrounding area.

9.6 The proposed materials slightly differ to that of the existing dwellinghouse, however as all dwellings within the street scene are made up of a range of materials and as the application site is not located within a sensitive location, it is therefore considered acceptable.

9.7 The application site is located between Conservation Areas, but not located within a Conservation Area itself. Following on from comments received objecting to the proposed development, I sought informal comments from the Conservation and Design officer who confirmed that the proposed development would not have a negative impact on the area.

9.8 The re-construction of the detached garage and alterations to openings do not raise any concerns in terms of design.

9.9 Therefore it is considered that the proposal would be sympathetic and in keeping with the surrounding area, respect adjoining properties and would therefore result in no significant adverse effects on the character and appearance of the streetscene in terms of visual and residential amenity. This accords with the local and national policies mentioned above

#### Impact on Residential Amenity

9.10 The NPPF outlines the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact upon neighbouring properties and their amenity space. Thus, the proposed should be designed to reduce any impact on neighbouring properties by way of visual intrusion, loss of light and privacy.

9.11 No. 27 Langley Hill:

No. 27 is located to the East of the application site. The proposed extension to the existing dormer window is screened by the existing dwelling and therefore will not have a negative impact on the neighbouring amenity of the occupiers at No. 27. The proposed one and a half storey rear extension has a depth of approx. 4.5m, however it does not extend beyond the rear of No. 27 by more than 3m and as it is located off the shared boundary with No. 27 at ground level and first floor level, it therefore does not have a negative overbearing impact, cause any visual intrusion or intrude into the 45 degree line causing a loss of light to the occupiers of No.

27. There are no privacy concerns as there are no proposed openings to the side elevation facing towards No. 27. The proposed balcony also does not raise any privacy concerns as the wall from the proposed rear extension screens any proposed views towards No. 27, and as there are already rear facing windows to the rear elevation of No. 29 the proposed balcony facing to the rear will not have a detrimental impact on privacy in comparison to what is already existing on site.

#### 9.12 No. 31 Langley Hill:

No. 31 is located to the West of the application site. The proposed extension of the existing dormer window does not raise any neighbouring amenity concerns as the size is only slightly larger than the dormer windows already existing on site and would not have additional impact on the neighbouring amenity of the occupiers of No. 31. Furthermore, there are no existing windows on the side elevation of No. 31 and therefore there are no privacy concerns. The proposed one and a half storey rear extension has a depth of approx. 4.5m, however there is an existing single storey detached garage located along the shared boundary with No. 31 and due to the sufficient separation distance of approx. 4.5m between the proposed extension and the dwelling of No. 31, it therefore does not have a negative overbearing impact or cause a loss of light to the occupiers of No. 31 as the proposed extension will not intrude into the 45 degree line. There are two proposed windows at first floor facing towards No. 31, however, as these both occupy non-habitable rooms which are to be obscure glazed, it raises no privacy concerns. The proposed balcony also does not raise any privacy concerns as there is a wall on the side elevation facing towards No. 31, and as there are already rear facing windows to the rear elevation of No. 29 the proposed balcony facing to the rear will not have a detrimental impact on privacy in comparison to what is already existing on site. The new proposed garage does not extend any further along the boundary than the existing garage as it is to be replaced at the same size and in the same location as the existing and will therefore not have a negative impact on the neighbouring amenity of the occupiers of No. 31.

9.13 The proposed balcony does not raise any concerns facing dwellings to the rear of the application site due to the sufficient separation distance between the proposed development and the dwellings. Furthermore, there are already rear facing windows, this will not have a detrimental impact in comparison to the site as existing.

9.14 Adequate garden amenity space would also be retained at the rear for the use and enjoyment of occupiers of the extended dwelling.

#### Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.15 The NPPF (2021), Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013), and the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020) all seek to ensure that new development provides safe and sufficient parking provision for current and future occupiers.

9.16 The application does seek to demolish the existing garage and re-build a new one, however both the existing and proposed are not large enough to be considered a parking space and therefore does not result in a loss or addition of parking. The proposal does not increase

the number of habitable rooms within the property. Furthermore adequate off street parking is provided by way of a private driveway. As such there are no significant concerns regarding parking or highway safety in relation to this planning application.

9.17 Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

### Other Material Planning Considerations

#### *Impact on Trees and Landscaping*

9.18 Section 6 of the application form states that trees or hedges are within falling distance of the proposed development and that no tree or hedges need to be removed or pruned in order to carry out the proposal. The proposal would not affect any significant trees/landscaping as the application site is not within a Conservation area and there are no TPO's on site.

*The Town Council have provided the following response:*

9.19 Loss of daylight and impact on privacy – This has been addressed above in the 'neighbouring amenity' section of the report.

9.20 Overbearing and cramped nature of the development on the plot itself and adjoining properties – The proposed development is not considered to appear overbearing or cramped given the plot sizes within this street and most of the development is located a sufficient distance off of each boundary. The proposed garage is located in the same location as the existing garage with a limited extension to the front. Therefore the proposed development is considered a subordinate addition to the host dwelling.

9.21 Ground levels have been mis-described and plans have failed to take in to account the difference between the highest and lowest elevations – The plans provided do show a difference in land levels and after visiting site these are considered acceptable.

### Response to Neighbour Comments

9.21 An objection has been received from No. 27 Langley Hill, raising the following points:

- Inaccurate plans provided – The Site Location Plan submitted clearly shows the outline of No. 29 Langley Hill and is considered acceptable as it is required to show the boundary outlining where the proposed works will take place. There are also previous applications for this site where the Site Location Plan submitted shows the same boundary. The objection states that the elevations do not illustrate a difference in land levels, however both the existing and proposed elevations do illustrate a difference in land levels, and after completing a site visit the plans provided are considered sufficient. It is also not a requirement for the plans to show a labelled illustration of No. 27 within the elevations, therefore this is not required for the planning application.
- Description of proposed development – The description has been amended to ensure that the proposed development is clear and is considered acceptable. The proposed rear extension can be classed as a one and a half storey extension.

- Loss of light, privacy and visual intrusion – This has been addressed above within the ‘neighbouring amenity’ section of the report. The 45 degree line has been illustrated by the agent in the additional information submitted in response to the neighbour objections.
- Quality of design – This has been addressed within the ‘Quality of design/ impact on visual amenity’ section of the report.
- Concerns regarding neighbouring amenity from patio – This has now been omitted from the proposal.
- Tree removal – The tree is not a TPO and as the application site is not located within a Conservation Area, the tree can be removed without any consent if the applicant wishes to do so, and does not affect the outcome of this application.

9.22 An objection has been received from No. 31 Langley Hill, raising the following points:

- Out of keeping with the character of the area – This has been addressed within the ‘Quality of design/ impact on visual amenity’ section of the report.
- Description of proposed development – The description has been amended to ensure what is proposed is clear and is considered acceptable.
- Garage – The new garage proposed is considered a as it is the same size and location as the existing garage on site, this is therefore considered acceptable. The proposed garage also does not raise any neighbouring amenity concerns to No. 31 in comparison to what is already existing on site. The existing garage is along the shared boundary, therefore by replacing the garage along the shared boundary this is considered acceptable and similar to what is already existing on site.
- Overbearing and Loss of light – This has been addressed above within the ‘neighbouring amenity’ section of the report.

9.23 It is not considered a daylight/ sunlight assessment is not necessary as the proposed garage is single storey only and not much larger in comparison to what is already existing on site. The proposed rear extension is located off the shared boundary with both adjoining properties at ground and first floor level which therefore will not have a detrimental impact on loss of light on either neighbour.

#### Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.24 Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy 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 was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on 1 July 2015. CIL relief is available for affordable housing, charities and Self Builders and may be claimed using the appropriate forms.

## **10. CONCLUSION**

10.1 It is not felt that the works would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the dwelling or would significantly impact the street scene. The development would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties or highway safety/car parking. Therefore, the proposal is acceptable in accordance with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy 2006-2031.

## **11. RECOMMENDATION**

11.1 It is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED, subject to the conditions below.

**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:**

Drg No. 2230/02-1E, Proposed Plans  
Drg No. 2230/02-2E, Proposed Elevations  
Drg No. 2230/01-0, Block Plans and Site Location Plan  
Planning Statement

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.**

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 window(s) at first floor level in the west elevation of the extension hereby permitted shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass 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).

**Informatives:**

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

## APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Kings Langley Parish Council	<p>Objection</p> <p>Loss of daylight and impact on privacy.</p> <p>Overbearing and cramped nature of the development on the plot itself and adjoining properties.</p> <p>Ground levels have been mis-described and plans have failed to take in to account the difference between the highest and lowest elevations.</p>

## APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

### Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
5	4	0	4 (including 3 from 1 address)	0

### Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
31 Langley Hill Kings Langley Hertfordshire	<p>Introduction: We live in 31 Langley Hill and have done so for 23 years. We wish to object to the above application for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>Description of existing house: The application site is the central</p>

WD4 9HA

property in Photo 1 below. Our home is to the left.

#### Photo 1

The house is built in a distinctive style, which was originated by a developer called Hicks in the 1930's. Please note that the house is a two storey dwelling and makes a similar contribution to the street scene to that made by no 27 to the right. It is bulked up by substantial dormers that can be seen projecting from the side elevations.

To understand this house type, please refer to Photo 2 below which is taken from the cover of a Conservation Area Appraisal published by Hertsmere Borough Council concerning the "Royds Estate" in Potters Bar (which was developed by Hicks) and is now designated as a Conservation Area. The house on the immediate left-hand side appears to be very similar to 29 Langley Hill.

#### Photo 2

The photograph shows there is a considerable difference in scale between a house like 29 Langley Hill and the neighbouring bungalows (also developed by Hicks). The analysis by Hertsmere described this house type as a detached house type that is characterised by a wide gabled roof extending forward and over a single front projecting wing with a bay window and adjacent veranda style entrance porch. It is explained that deeply recessed to the rear of the veranda is a central angled main entrance and the veranda style porch is supported by either elegant columns. A number of variants were used, including two, three, and four bedroom versions. All versions were designed to have the bedrooms at first floor level with the additional space required being provided by dormer windows.

In our opinion the proposed development should be described as the full height extension of a two storey house with a ridge height of 7+ metres which extends approx. 4.5 metres into the rear garden. That would convey the potential impact of the proposed development on the character of the area and on the amenities of adjoining properties more clearly than the description of the development which is reproduced above.

#### Objection to proposals for the garage

We have included Photo 3 below which is taken from within our garden towards the application site. The garage is in the location that is similar arrangement to those found on the Royds estate. The garage is sited to the rear of the house and overlaps the gap between the house and the boundary wall which means a part of the garage is set behind the house.

The external wall of the garage facing our property is sited on the property boundary which means there is no fence in this location.

However the application proposes that the garage should be rebuilt in the same location.

We assume the reason it is kept in its current location is that the proposed development is very cramped. By extending the house by approx. 4.5m the extension will be built alongside the garage for approx. 60% of the garages length. This means that the wall of the extension will also have to form the side wall of the garage and as a result there will be no space available to enable the garage to be brought back from the application site boundary.

We propose that the garage should be moved away from the boundary and object to the application as we consider that the appropriate location for the garage would be set back from the boundary in the normal way to allow for fencing and for maintenance.

We also object to the proposals as the extension to the house, combining with the garage will lead to a dense and overbearing form of development which will be harmful to the character of the area.

Photo 3

Objection on the basis of the impact on the residential amenities of no 31 Langley Hill.

The proposed development will have a harmful effect on our kitchen which is the heart of the house. In particular there is a window which faces east at ground floor level which allows the kitchen to be lit by the morning sun and provides an outlook over the valley.

First, we looked at the impact on someone moving about the kitchen. Photo 4 is taken from a standing position looking through the window towards the application site. This viewpoint was chosen as it shows the rear of the existing property on the application site beyond our house. If you look at the photograph you will see in the foreground through the window the bay window of our property and then you can see the north elevation of the application site. Please note that the ridge of No 29 Langley Hill cannot be seen as it is too high.

As the proposed extension would extend across any line of sight from the window this means that if the extension were to be carried out as proposed that all that could be seen through the window would be the garage and the extension. Photo 5 shows this effect by blocking out in dark red the sky and trees that can be seen at present.

Photo 4

Photo 5

We then analysed the impact on somebody sitting at the table. Photo 6 shows the current view from one of the dining chairs, and Photo

	<p>seven shows how much of that view would be lost due to the proposed extension. As someone sitting at the table would have a lower viewpoint than someone walking around the kitchen, some sky would be visible over the ridge of the extension when sitting at the table which would not be visible when walking about. However that would be of limited benefit as the head would have to be tilted upwards.</p> <p>Photo 6</p> <p>Photo 7</p> <p>We therefore wish to object to the application on the basis that the proposed development would be completely overbearing and would remove daylight and sunlight from this critical window.</p> <p>Concluding Remarks</p> <p>On the basis of our analysis of the above application we wish to object to the proposed development for the reasons set out above.</p> <p>As a result we have concluded the proposal would have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area;</li> <li>- A detrimental impact on the residential amenities of 31 Langley Hill.</li> </ul> <p>In the event that, notwithstanding our objections, you give consideration to the possibility of granting planning permission for this development, we request that you do not do so without obtaining a full daylighting and sunlighting assessment and fully accurate plans including ground levels.</p>
<p>27 Langley Hill Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9HA</p>	<p>Comments: Following my objections as submitted below, on 12/1/22, I wish to add the following additional information regarding :</p> <p>The tree shown on the pictures, posted on Documents 20221227_145057 and 20221277_143743 showing a large, tall evergreen Cypress ( Sempervirens?), is not described on the initial application as , when asked about whether any trees need to be removed, the applicant has stated "No". However, this tree is shown on the existing plan 2230/01, but is not shown on any of the proposed extension plan, implying that this tree will be removed! As this tree is growing on a heavy clay soil, the risk of subsidence/ progressive heave is highly likely, if the tree is removed.</p> <p>The tree is sited exactly on the proposed building line and I currently have grave concerns over the tree's removal, rather than keeping it there and pruning as necessary.</p> <p>Re; 22/03760/FHA 29 Langley Hill, Kings Langley WD4 9HA</p>

I wish to Strongly object to this planning application as it does not seem to meet Dacorum Planning policies:

Re Core Strategy CS12, these plans seem to contradict this particular policy as follows:

- 1) Visual intrusion ( THE PROPOSAL DESCRIBES A ONE STORY EXTENSION BUT, IS, IN FACT A TWO STORY EXTENSION)!!!
- 2) Loss of sunlight and daylight due to length, and height of the proposed extension and the ground levels.
- 3) Loss of privacy, due to the full width north facing glass balcony overlooking our garden.
- 4) No regard to adjacent properties re: Scale, Height, Bulk, Materials- grey slate tiles are out of character.

Re: The Dacorum Local Plan (2004) Appendix 7.2v, these plans seem to contravene this policy as follows:

1) Effect on neighbouring properties (Sunlight and daylight) and overshadowing.

2) Extent of height and length of extension, seriously effects the daylight and sunlight to our garden and property, especially as the rear of the property is north facing, and the extension will seriously block all the afternoon and evening sun , both to our patio and our neighbours below us.

3) The 45 degree line of sight from my study window, being the nearest window to the boundary, dissects the extension plan at approx. 2.3metres. (The proposed length of the extension is 4.65m). This shows that the dimensions of the proposed extension are unacceptable.

4) Individual site factors such as orientation and levels. The ground levels have not been considered on the plans. There is no sloping site plan and no illustration of the 1 metre plus, drop between 29 and 27 and all the other houses on this sloping hill. The proposed 7m height extension will therefore be over 8m in height from our house and garden. It will of course overbear us, especially, as its under a meter's width from our boundary!

There have also been no full , patio/terrace measurements or plans submitted for planning. In view of the differences in levels, to prevent overlooking, it needs to be set down on the site. I am very concerned that if the patio is built according to the one "step" as shown, the levels are likely to be at an unacceptable level ,causing/leading to more privacy issues in our garden.

I therefore strongly object to the above plans in their current

	form.
<p>27 Langley Hill Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9HA</p>	<p>OBJECTIONS RE: 22/03760/FHA. I am objecting to this revised application, which is now described as “a one and a half storey extension”, rather than the “one storey extension” described on the previous application submitted on 20/12/2022. As the plans have not changed in any way, and the fact that the applicant, Mr Baker, has verbally described his proposal, to me, as a DOUBLE STOREY EXTENSION, I am therefore objecting once again on the same 4 main grounds: (Photographs and drawings are available to view in the separate DOCUMENTS section)</p> <p><b>1.LOSS OF DAYLIGHT &amp; SUNLIGHT DUE TO OVERSHADOWING &amp; DIFFERENCE IN GROUND LEVELS</b></p> <p>Dacorum Policy CS12 states that any new development should avoid a) visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to surrounding properties, and g) respect adjoining properties in terms of: scale, height and bulk.</p> <p>Dacorum Local Plan (2004) 7.2v states the following: The effect of an extension on neighbouring properties should be considered at the outset. The projection of rear extensions from the parent building should not excessively enclose or seriously affect the daylighting to an adjoining owner’s habitable rooms (kitchen, lounge/dining room, bedroom). Such extensions should be avoided on a boundary wherever possible and should be of limited length. The permissible outward projection of rear extensions will be assessed with regard to: (a) individual site factors such as orientation and levels; (b) the visual effect of the extension on the original building and the retention of space around it; and (c) the following generally acceptable dimensions: (i) for single storey extensions, up to 3 m on the party wall boundary between semi-detached or terraced housing; (ii) for first floor or two storey extensions, up to the lines of 45o angles taken from the nearest windows of habitable rooms in the adjacent properties. In addition, a 23 m distance should remain between the extension and nearest facing rear wall (as in Appendix 3. Layout and Design of Residential Areas, (iii) Spacing of Dwellings)</p> <p>These proposed plans totally contravene the Dacorum Local Plan (as above), and Dacorum Policy CS12, as they show a huge, visually intrusive two storey extension, less than a metre away from our boundary. This proposed extension cuts right across the 45degree line of sight, from our first- floor study/bedroom window, (See section c) (ii) above) which is the sole source of light to this room.(see attached plan in separate Document section) My husband uses this room as a study for much of the day. The extension would not only severely block daylight and overshadow this room, but will also reduce the daylight, through our kitchen rooflight, our ground floor French doors and our other 1st floor bedroom. (photos available in separate document section).</p> <p>The Dacorum Local plan (2004) states that “The projection of the rear extension from the parent building should not excessively enclose or</p>

seriously affect the daylighting to an adjoining owners' habitable rooms.

The Dacorum Local Plan 2014 (as above), states that rear extensions will be assessed with regard to a) individual site factors such as orientation and levels. And Policy CS12 states that each development should: c) avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight.

This application contravenes the Local Dacorum plan and Core Strategy CS12, as the vast roof will not only overshadow our property and cause a significant loss of light, but also block all the afternoon and western evening sunlight from our patio and garden, together with the patios and gardens, to numbers 25 and 23 Langley Hill, below us. Our north facing gardens, receive limited sunshine, except from this western afternoon and evening sun. 29 Langley Hill's floor levels are approximately 1m higher than ours, so an extension of 7m in height, will be 8m in height, from our ground levels and would result in severe overbearing and loss of light and sunlight. Correspondingly, no 25 is set down, just under a metre below our property and so on, down the hill. Because of these levels, any 2-storey extension blocks everyone's light, so, living on a sloping site, we have all kept to single storey wrap around extensions, using the side space as part of the extension. The difference in levels between the properties, which incidentally have not been shown on the developer's plans, together with the extreme depth and height, of this build, would severely impact everyone's daylight and sunlight. These factors have NOT been taken into consideration in the design of this extension.

## 2.LOSS OF PRIVACY AND VISUAL INTRUSION

Dacorum CS12 Quality of Site Design, states: each development should c) avoid visual intrusion and loss of privacy.

There will be a significant loss of privacy, from the full width glass balcony which will overlook our rear garden. If we are going to lose the sunlight to our patio, due to the height and depth of the two-storey extension, then we will have to move right down the garden, to sit in the sun, in full view of our neighbours, from their balcony.

There have been no proper patio plans submitted for planning permission, with full dimensions including proposed height, width and depth of the patio. The patio levels need to be considered as part of the planning permission application. There are only details of one step down from the kitchen bi-fold door threshold. As mentioned above, there is a 1 m ground height difference between us and no 29, due to the sloping ground of the Hill. The entire patio needs to be dropped down to match our ground levels, to prevent overlooking and a complete loss of privacy to our garden. At no 23, (despite having a raised step and further steps down to their lawn), they are still approximately a metre higher, than their neighbours patio, resulting in the full height fence, being at waist height!

## 3.IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY AND QUALITY OF THE DESIGN.

Dacorum CS12 Quality of site design, states: each development should: g) respect adjoining properties in terms of: vii.materials.

	<p>The proposed grey slate roof tiles would. would have an adverse impact on the visual appearance of this side of the Hill , which consists of a long row of 1930's character detached houses , all with dark brown roof tiles. situated between 2 Conservation Areas, one at the lower end of the Hill, and the other at the top of the Hill. (photos available in the separate documents section) (Incidentally, it was one of the conditions imposed on the development of Le Corte Close, to the rear of Langley Hill, that brown roof tiles were used, in order to blend into the village landscape.)</p> <p>4.MIS-DESCRIPTION OF THE PLANNING PROPOSAL</p> <p>29 Langley Hill is a large 3 bedroom and 2 bathroom, 1930's detached, 2 storey chalet bungalow. (photos of the size and scale of 29 Langley Hill are available in separate documents section). This planning application, is now described as a one and a half storey extension, with a room in the loft. The proposal is in fact, for a TWO storey extension of 4.65 metres in depth, 8 metres in width and approximately 7metres in height, (and actually 8 metres in height, from our floor levels, due to the ground level differences described above) with a full width glass balcony! This is not a room in the loft! Additionally, the boundary lines between nos 27 and 29, have been drawn incorrectly. I have already submitted an objection and request for these to be re-drawn and re-submitted.</p> <p>I hope you will give my objections, serious consideration, especially in view of the number of contraventions in the plans, to the policies in the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) Appendix 7.2v and Core Strategy CS12.</p>
<p>27 Langley Hill Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9HA</p>	<p>- Not enough info given on application</p> <p>With reference to planning application 22/03760/FHA, we are formally rejecting this submission of plans , as an inaccurate submission and is therefore not valid.</p> <p>Ref: Location Plan boundaries. The boundary line, shown in red on the Location plan, shows the external walls of no 27 Langley Hill, forming the boundary between 27 and 29. This is inaccurate, as there is 15.5cms or thereabouts, between the exterior walls of no 27 and the boundary fence .</p> <p>Ref : Existing Plan This shows the exterior walls of no 27, being built up to the boundary with no 29. This is incorrect as above.</p> <p>Ref: Existing Elevation Plan. The rear elevation plan shows no change in ground level between 27 and 29 Langley Hill. This is incorrect. No 27 is set over a metre below no 29.</p> <p>Ref: Proposed elevations. There is no labelled illustration of the adjacent property at no 27 and no illustrative change in ground level, as above.</p> <p>For the above reasons, we consider the above application, as submitted, to be invalid, but is stated without prejudice to any subsequent objections, that we intend to raise.</p>

