

ITEM NUMBER: 5c

23/00960/FHA	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.	
Site Address:	29 Langley Hill, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire, WD4 9HA	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr Chris Baker	Mr Luis Nieves
Case Officer:	Laura Bushby	
Parish/Ward:	Kings Langley Parish Council	Kings Langley
Referral to Committee:	Contrary view of Parish Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be GRANTED

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) and Policy KL4 of the Kings Langley Neighbourhood Plan (2023)

2.2 This is a resubmission of an application previously heard at Development Management Committee and refused by members. The resubmission is for a largely similar scheme, with the principle difference being the removal of a balcony, which members concluded, would harm adjacent properties. The gable roof of the previously approved one and a half storey rear extension has now also been slightly hipped in an attempt to limit the mass and bulk.

2.3 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.

2.4 Furthermore, the scheme would not have a significant adverse impact on the road network or create significant parking stress in the area.

2.5 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), Policy KL4 of the Kings Langley Neighbourhood Plan (2023) 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, a private driveway and front and rear gardens.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 The proposal is 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 This application is a resubmission of a previously refused scheme (ref 22/03760/FHA) which is currently at appeal. That application also sought permission for a one and a half storey rear extension and was refused for the following reason;

The proposed development by virtue of the rear facing balcony, will result in overlooking of, and an unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring residential properties. As such, the development fails to comply with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy

4.3 The size, scale, siting and design of the proposal all remain largely as previously proposed, the principle difference between the previously refused scheme and the current scheme is the removal of the first floor balcony which Members concluded would harm adjacent properties. The one and a half storey rear extension now also includes a small hip to the roof in place of a previous gable and an additional roof light is now proposed to the western roof slope (two are now proposed).

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications:

22/03760/FHA - 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
REF - 28th February 2023

Appeals:

23/00034/REFU - 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
INPROGRESS -

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 Large 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.

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 the large village of Kings Langley whereby in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy appropriate residential development is acceptable in principle subject to a detailed assessment of the impact. In this instance the primary considerations relate to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance on the existing dwelling and surrounding area, as well as the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.3 Chapter 12 of the NPPF 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 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that local authorities should have special regard to preserving heritage assets. The impact of the development proposals on local conservation areas must be assessed as required by section 72(1) of the Act.

9.5 Paragraph 199 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets when considering the impact of a proposed development. Policy CS27 requires development to protect, conserve and where appropriate enhance the integrity, setting and distinctiveness of heritage assets.

9.6 On the western elevation the proposal seeks to extend an existing dormer window. Whilst larger, the new dormer would not dominate the roof slope and would conform to policy requirements outlined in Saved Appendix 7 in relation to small-scale house extensions by being set down from the ridgeline of the existing roof, set in sufficiently from the front and rear elevation and is proposed to be clad in materials to match the roof.

9.7 In relation to the one and a half storey rear extension whilst it would not be clearly visible from public vantage points, it will respect the character of the existing dwelling by way of its mass, scale, design and use of facing brickwork to match the existing dwelling. The design harmonises with the existing dwelling by retaining the same roof pitch, and simple design seen in the original dwelling, and by not introducing new architectural features to the rear elevation. The small hip now introduced to the front and rear of the main roof would not result in any visual harm. At both ground and first

floor, the patio doors (ground floor) and window (first floor) are proposed to substantially increase in size; however, they would not appear out of keeping on a residential dwelling of this nature, or appear alien in this location. Furthermore they are sited to the rear and would thus be concealed from public view. It is important to note that openings of this size could be introduced to the existing property without the need for consent and this would have the same overall visual impact.

9.8 Objection comments have been received in relation to the mass and bulk of the proposed one and a half storey rear extension. Concerns are raised in relation to site layout and scale of the proposed extension with the comments referring to the proposed extension increasing the floor area of the property by 49%. Policies CS4 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy do not refer to a maximum percentage increase in property size in this location (large village of Kings Langley), however does require due consideration be given to whether an application respects adjoining properties in relation to scale and site layout. In this instance the proposal would not result in the application site appearing cramped or over developed or for the scale of the property to appear out of keeping or at odds with the neighbouring properties.

9.9 The proposed replacement garage is of similar design, scale and mass such that it will not adversely impact the street scene character or appear out of keeping.

9.10 The proposal seeks to replace the existing windows (white UVPC) with powder coated aluminium windows, in either black or grey. This is a change from the existing dwelling, however would not appear out of keeping with the original dwelling or surrounding area. IN addition, the application seeks to remove the existing roof tiles and replace with new slate tiles. Whilst the existing tiles are brown clay, which is typical of the surrounding area, the surrounding area is made up of dwellings using a variety of materials, such that this would not appear out of keeping. Objection comments have been received in relation to the replacement of the brown clay tiles with slate tiles, however as outlined above, given the variety of materials seen in the existing street scene, the use of slate tiles in this location would not appear sufficiently incongruous to be considered a reason for refusal. As such, on balance, the materials proposed for the external surfaces of the existing dwelling would respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal seeks to construct the extension in materials to match those of the amended parent property such that they would harmonise well.

9.11 The application site is not located within the Kings Langley Conservation Area, but given its proximity the development proposed may affect its setting. On the previous application, which proposed an extension of the same size, scale and design (albeit with a balcony at first floor) the Conservation and Design officer offered informal comments to the Planning Officer advising the design did not raise concerns and would not result in any harm to the setting of the Kings Langley Conservation Area. Given the current proposal is almost identical in design terms especially with regard to the elements visible from the public domain it follows that no concerns would be raised in this regard. The proposals are concluded to have a neutral impact on heritage assets (setting of the Conservation Area).

9.12 It is considered that the proposal would be sympathetic and respect the character of the existing dwelling, adjoining properties and surrounding area such that there would be no significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the street scene in the setting of this part of the Kings Langley Conservation Area. The application is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan and Policies CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy and Policy KL4 of the Kings Langley Neighbourhood Plan (2023).

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.13 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 visual intrusion, loss of light and privacy.

9.14 A previous application at this application site (22/03760/FHA) was refused at Development Management Committee earlier this year. The application was refused on the grounds of the overlooking of, and unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring residential properties as a result of a first floor balcony only. As such, the application was not considered to be in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy. There were no other reasons for refusal.

9.15 The current scheme has omitted the balcony to the rear elevation, integrating the floorspace into the extension (bedroom) and replacing it with floor to ceiling windows. Whilst the window will still offer views of neighbouring gardens, the window will not allow the same views into the garden that would be afforded from a balcony as occupants cannot step out.

27 Langley Hill

9.16 No. 27 is located to the east of the application site. The proposed extension to the dormer on the side elevation is on the west of the application site such that it will not impact no. 27 as it is sited behind/beyond the existing dwelling.

9.17 In relation to the proposed one and a half storey rear extension, this extends beyond the existing rear wall of the application dwelling by 4.5 metres. Due to the existing rear projection at no. 27 and existing stagger between the properties, the proposed extension projects at ground floor 3 metres beyond the rear wall of no. 27 and at first floor approximately 6.5 metres. The proposed extension is set off the boundary with no. 27 at ground floor by 0.8 metres, with the proposed first floor set in by 1.5 metres.

9.18 It is acknowledged that there is a change in ground level between the application site and no. 27, with no. 27 being lower than the application site, such that the overall height of the proposed extension will appear greater to the occupants of no. 27.

9.19 At ground floor, the proposed extension will extend beyond the rear wall of No. 27 by approx. 3 metres. In relation to the impact on light into the habitable rooms to the rear of the property. The closest habitable room to the application site at ground floor is a kitchen / dining room, which is served by patio doors and a skylight. Due to the size of the patio doors and position of the skylight it is considered that this room will continue receive sufficient light. This is demonstrated by the BRE daylight plan submitted by the agent which confirms there will be no breach of the 45 degree lines.

9.20 From the patio area, which is located directly outside the kitchen patio doors it is evident that the proposed extension would be highly visible, however it is concluded it would not be so unduly prominent or overbearing so as to be detrimental to residential amenity. From this area, the extension is of limited depth (3m) and despite its total height (7.5 metres) and slightly elevated position, it is set away from the boundary, now comprises a small hip and the roof slopes away from the common boundary, which would offer sufficient relief. There is existing mature vegetation between the two sites at this point which would screen some of the proposed development from view, but given this could be removed at any time it has not been relied upon to assess to the proposals. Even without the existing vegetative screened the proposals are, on balance considered acceptable. The rest of the garden would maintain its current open aspect.

9.21 At first floor, the proposed extension would extend beyond the rear wall of no. 27 by approximately 6.5 metres. The closest rear facing windows of no. 27 serves a bedroom. From a site visit and plans submitted it is evident that whilst the 45 degree line is breached in plan form, it would not breach it in elevation such that there would still be sufficient light reaching this room from over the extension. Given its depth, the extension would clearly be visible from this room but given the separation distance and the fact the roof form slopes away it is not considered that it would not be unduly overbearing or visually intrusive to the point it would be detrimental to residential amenity. The bedroom window would continue to have an acceptable level of open aspect. The second rear-facing window, which is further away is a set of patio doors which serve the master bedroom and lead onto a small balcony. Due to the separation distance from the doors and the balcony the proposed extension would not adversely impact light into this room and or balcony.

9.22 In relation to loss of privacy, there are no side facing windows within the rear extension, and the balcony, which was previously concluded as unacceptable has been omitted from this scheme. In relation to the amended scheme, whilst the replacement of the balcony with the rear-facing window is considered a betterment, concerns have been raised from no. 27 about the size of this rear-facing window. The concern is that due to the size of the window similar views of the rear garden will be afforded from the window as would have been afforded from the balcony, such that they still feel it will result in an unacceptable loss of privacy. Comments state that the scale of the window will result in views being possible across the whole of the garden, such that both their privacy and the security of their property will be impacted.

9.23 Whilst it is acknowledged that a larger window may afford a slightly greater view when stood at a distance, the overall view would be similar to that of a smaller window when stood directly in front of the window itself. The window now proposed is not considered to have the same adverse impact as a balcony in this location due to the inability to walk out onto the space and gain views looking sideways. The views from a window are more limited in range, and will be at an angle such that they will be reduced. Furthermore, due to the first floor extension extending beyond the rear wall and patio area at ground floor of no. 27 it will not be possible to look back towards the house to gain views of the immediate garden and patio area. Policy CS12 seeks to protect the privacy of neighbouring residents, however the existing situation must also be taken into account. In this instance the application site is located within a built up residential area whereby a relatively high degree of mutual overlooking already exists between properties. In this instance there are existing rear facing bedroom windows, which afford views over the rear garden of no. 27 at a similar level/angle to those proposed. The proposed extension and enlargement of the window would not significantly increase the overlooking, or offer the occupiers additional opportunities to overlook the garden.

9.23 Again it is important to note that large floor to ceiling window openings could be introduced to the existing property without the need for permission (provided they are of materials similar in appearance to the existing windows) and these windows would afford similar, in not worse views over the rear garden of No. 27 to those proposed.

9.24 On balance the proposals not result in an unacceptable level of harm to the residential amenities of no. 27 with regard to loss of light, privacy or causing visual intrusion.

31 Langley Hill

9.25 No. 31 is located to the west of the application site. The application seeks to construct a one and a half storey rear extension (including two velux roof lights), and to extend the existing side dormer facing this property.

9.26 The proposed extension to the existing dormer window is only slightly larger than the existing window openings, with the new windows annotated that they will be obscure glazed. Taking into

account the lack of windows on the side elevation of no. 31 itself, and the existing openings the extended dormer will replace, this element of the proposals would not significantly alter the existing situation or have an additional impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring property. A condition requiring obscure glazing and that the windows are non-opening below 1.7m would be necessary and reasonable to ensure no overlooking.

9.27 In relation to the one and a half storey rear extension, this has an approximate depth of 4.5 metres, however much of the mass and bulk of this extension will be built behind the existing single storey, pitched roof detached garage which is located along the shared boundary with no. 31. Taking into account the existing structure built between the proposed extension and the separation distance between the proposed extension and no. 31 the proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the residential amenities of no. 31 with regard to light, privacy or visual intrusion. By virtue of their siting and angle the two velux roof lights would not result in any harm.

No. 29 – the application site

9.28 Adequate garden and amenity space is retained at the property (beyond the proposed extension) for the existing and future occupants of the application site.

9.29 On balance, the proposal is concluded to not result in significant harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties by way of loss of light, privacy or causing visual intrusion. The balcony previously considered unacceptable by Members has been omitted and replaced with windows, which whilst large will not result in an unacceptable level of overlooking, especially when compared to existing and surrounding levels. As such the application accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Saved Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan and Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.30 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.

9.31 The application does seek to demolish the existing garage and re-build a new one; however, neither the existing, nor the proposed garage would meet the minimum space dimensions for a garage to be considered as a parking space. In policy terms there would therefore be no net change in the parking provision. The proposal does not increase the number of bedrooms within the property such that no additional parking would be required. The proposals would have a neutral impact on parking at the application site. Adequate off street parking is available on the private driveway to the front of the property such that there are no significant concerns regarding parking or highway safety in relation to this planning application.

9.32 Overall, the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding highway network or parking stress in the vicinity.

Other Material Planning Considerations

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.33 The application form states that there are trees or hedges within falling distance of the proposed development, they are annotated on the plans, however it also states 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 or landscaping. As such, there are no concerns regarding the impact on trees and landscaping in relation to this planning application.

Parish Council Comments

9.34 The Parish Council objected to the application, 'Grounds for objection remain the same', based on the objections to the previous application.

Their objection on the previous application was;

Objection

Loss of daylight and impact on privacy.

Overbearing and cramped nature of the development on the plot itself and adjoining properties.

Ground levels have been mis-described and plans have failed to take in to account the difference between the highest and lowest elevations

9.35 The concerns raised by the Parish Council have been addressed in the above report. It is important to note that Members resolved to refuse the previous application on the grounds of overlooking from the balcony only. The previous application was not refused on its visual impact, or harm to the street scene. The current application is similar to the refused scheme with the exception of the omitted balcony.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.36 Representations have been received from no. 27, objections have been received from the neighbour and also a consultant working on their behalf. The report sent by the consultant covers the key points of objection, which are summarised in italics below:

Overlooking and loss of Privacy

Whilst they acknowledge that the removal of the balcony is a betterment, the objection in relation to overlooking and loss of privacy remains. The concerns relate to the floor to ceiling windows in the rear bedroom, which they believe afford views of the whole of the garden of no. 27 such that the privacy of the occupants of no. 27 will be adversely impacted. Further reference is made to these views of the garden impacting the security of the application site.

Loss of sunlight / daylight

Further concern is raised in relation to the impact on the sunlight / daylight into the house, specifically the kitchen / dining room at ground floor and the bedroom at 1st floor.

Mass, bulk and scale

Finally, the neighbour raises concerns regarding the application being in accordance with CS12, and not respecting neighbouring properties by way of mass, scale and bulk and materials used. Whilst they agree with most of the materials, concerns are raised in relation to the removal of the brown clay tiles and replacement with slate tiles as they feel this is out of keeping with the local area.

9.37 A full assessment of the concerns and points raised has been covered in previous sections of the report. Specifically the sections on visual impact and impact on residential amenities.

9.38 Representations have also been received from No. 25 raising concerns over a loss of light to their patio and roof lights. Given the separation distance between the application site and No. 25 and having regard to the structures between them (namely No. 27) whilst the extension may result in slight loss of light in the late afternoon / evening this would not be at such a level as to warrant a refusal on planning grounds.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.38 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 Given their size, scale, siting and design the proposed extensions respect the parent property. The materials, whilst different, would not appear out of keeping in this varied area. The proposals would not have an adverse impact on the appearance of the dwelling or harm the character and appearance of this part of the Langley Hill. Whilst highly visible given its size and siting, the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Sufficient light would continue to reach all habitable adjacent rooms, and an acceptable level of open aspect would be retained such that the proposals would not appear visually intrusive or overbearing. With regard to privacy, whilst large, the rear facing windows would not give rise to an unacceptable level of overlooking especially when compared to existing and surrounding levels. There would be no harm to highway safety and sufficient car parking is provided within the site.

10.2 Based on the above, the proposal is acceptable in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, Saved Appendix 3 and 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan Policies CS11 CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy 2006-2031 and Policy KL4 of the Kings Langley Neighbourhood Plan.

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 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:**

**2230/02-1F
2230/02-4A
2230/02-2G
2230/02-3A
2230/01-0**

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/documents.**

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 western elevation of the dormer extensions hereby permitted shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass (of no less than level 3 Pilkington) and non-opening below a height of 1.7m from the floor of the room the windows serve.**

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
Parish/Town Council	<p>Objection Grounds for objection remain the same.</p>
Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)	<p>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.</p> <p>Good afternoon Laura,</p> <p>Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Application: 23/00960/FHA Description: 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. Location: 29 Langley Hill Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9HA</p> <p>With reference to the above planning application, please be advised the Environmental Health Pollution Team have no objections or concerns re noise, odour or air quality. However I would recommend the application is subject to informatives for waste management, construction working hours with Best Practical Means for dust, air quality and Invasive and Injurious Weeds which we respectfully request to be included in the decision notice.</p> <p>Working Hours Informative Contractors and sub-contractors must have regard to BS 5228-2:2009 "Code of Practice for Noise Control on Construction and Open Sites" and the Control of Pollution Act 1974.</p>

As a guideline, the following hours for noisy works and/or deliveries should be observed: Monday to Friday, 7.30am to 5:30pm, Saturday, 8am to 1pm, Sunday and bank holidays - no noisy work allowed.

Where permission is sought for works to be carried out outside the hours stated, applications in writing must be made with at least seven days' notice to Environmental and Community Protection Team ecp@dacorum.gov.uk or The Forum, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1DN. Local residents that may be affected by the work shall also be notified in writing, after approval is received from the LPA or Environmental Health.

Works audible at the site boundary outside these hours may result in the service of a Notice restricting the hours as above. Breach of the notice may result in prosecution and an unlimited fine and/or six months imprisonment.

Construction Dust Informative

Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or by carrying out of other such works that may be necessary to suppress dust. Visual monitoring of dust is to be carried out continuously and Best Practical Means (BPM) should be used at all times. The applicant is advised to consider the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance, produced in partnership by the Greater London Authority and London Councils.

Waste Management Informative

Under no circumstances should waste produced from construction work be incinerated on site. This includes but is not limited to pallet stretch wrap, used bulk bags, building materials, product of demolition and so on. Suitable waste management should be in place to reduce, reuse, recover or recycle waste product on site, or dispose of appropriately.

Air Quality Informative.

As an authority we are looking for all development to support sustainable travel and air quality improvements as required by the NPPF. We are looking to minimise the cumulative impact on local air quality that ongoing development has, rather than looking at significance. This is also being encouraged by DEFRA.

As a result as part of the planning application I would recommend that the applicant be asked to propose what measures they can take as part of this new development, to support sustainable travel and air quality improvements. These measures may be conditioned through the planning consent if the proposals are acceptable.

	<p>A key theme of the NPPF is that developments should enable future occupiers to make "green" vehicle choices and (paragraph 35) "incorporates facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles". Therefore an electric vehicle recharging provision rate of 1 vehicle charging point per 10 spaces (unallocated parking) is expected. To prepare for increased demand in future years, appropriate cable provision should be included in the scheme design and development, in agreement with the local authority.</p> <p>Please note that with regard to EV charging for residential units with dedicated parking, we are not talking about physical charging points in all units but the capacity to install one. The cost of installing appropriate trunking/ducting and a dedicated fuse at the point of build is miniscule, compared to the cost of retrofitting an EV charging unit after the fact, without the relevant base work in place.</p> <p>In addition, mitigation in regards to NOx emissions should be addressed in that all gas fired boilers to meet a minimum standard of 40 mg NOx/Kwh or consideration of alternative heat sources.</p> <p>Invasive and Injurious Weeds - Informative Weeds such as Japanese Knotweed, Giant Hogweed and Ragwort are having a detrimental impact on our environment and may injure livestock. Land owners must not plant or otherwise cause to grow in the wild any plant listed on schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Developers and land owners should therefore undertake an invasive weeds survey before development commences and take the steps necessary to avoid weed spread. Further advice can be obtained from the Environment Agency website at https://www.gov.uk/japanese-knotweed-giant-hogweed-and-other-invasive-plants</p>
--	---

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
5	2	0	1	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
25 Langley Hill Kings Langley Hertfordshire	Double storey in reality, not single storey as stated. Will impede late afternoon/evening sunlight on patio for our residence and through our velux single storey roof windows into our house.

WD4 9HA	
<p>27 Langley Hill Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9HA</p>	<p>We are objecting to this revised application as follows:(See attached photos 1-10 for FURTHER details)</p> <p>The new design statement suggests that the balcony issue was the only reason for refusal. We dispute this, as having spent 2hrs at the DBC committee meeting, witnessing the discussion of the balcony, there was no discussion whatsoever, regarding all the other objections we and our neighbours at no 31, had submitted. The officer's initial flawed recommendation for approval, meant that the recommendation was drawn up, without taking our objections into account. (This was due to an error of published dates on the DBC site.) However, the previous submission was finally refused at the committee meeting, on grounds of loss of privacy, due to the extensive 1st floor glass balcony and the huge glazed doors, referring to Policy CS12 on loss of privacy and overlooking. The balcony has now been removed from the design, but the extensive, floor to ceiling, wall of glass, still remains! The existing rear window has an area of 2.08sq metres, whilst the proposed one is nearly 5 square metres! It will offer us no privacy, as it will give no 29, an 180 degree extensive view right over our garden and number 31's garden. This is particularly pertinent, as 29's floor levels are over 1.5 metre higher than our north west facing property, being on the slope of the Hill. THIS NEW APPLICATION STILL CONTRAVENES POLICY CS12 ON LOSS OF PRIVACY AND VISUAL INTRUSION.</p> <p>Correspondingly, the proposal of 6m wide glass bi fold doors at ground floor level, leading from the kitchen/diner, will give eye level views right across our garden Once again, this is due to the difference in levels between the houses. Next doors floor levels will be nearly 1.5 m above ours, according to the submitted plans. This difference in levels has not been addressed in the architect's design of the extension, CONTRAVENING LOCAL PLAN 2004 Appendix 7.2v on "NO OBSERVATION OF LEVELS OR ORIENTATION" AND CS12 ON VISUAL INTRUSION AND LOSS OF PRIVACY. The levels may have now been "observed" by now being entered onto the new plans by the developers, but they have not been acted on in any way in the design and consequently THIS PROPOSED EXTENSION DOES NOT MEET POLICY CS12 ON QUALITY OF DESIGN, AS THERE HAS BEEN NO RESPECT TO ADJOINING PROPERTIES IN TERMS OF LAYOUT, SCALE, HEIGHT, BULK OR AMENITY SPACE (I.E. USE OF OUR GARDEN)</p> <p>Despite the balcony being removed from the design, the area of the balcony has now been incorporated into the floor area of the main bedroom to the rear, resulting in this 2-storey extension, still being 4.65 metres in depth! Our objections to this visually intrusive, overbearing 4.65m by 8 metre vast extension, remain the same as before.) i.e. as the rear of our property faces north west, the proposed 2 storey extension will block out, all the western afternoon and evening sunlight from our patio, as it will be over 8metres in height from our patio, due to the 1.5m difference in floor levels, and sited only 50cms away, from our boundary! It will block all afternoon and evening sun from our 1st floor study, bedroom and small 1930'3 original roof terrace, as well as our neighbours at no's 25 and 23, etc bedroom windows, ground floor Velux windows and their patios. Additionally, it will also have a big impact on loss of daylight to the patio, our kitchen rooflight, our kitchen/diner and our first-floor study. THIS CONTRAVENES DACORUM LOCAL PLAN 2004 7.2V BY NOT CONSIDERING THE</p>

EFFECT OF THE EXTENSION ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES AT THE OUTSET AND POLICY CS12 ON: LOSS OF DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT AND SCALE, HEIGHT AND BULK.

Also, if extended, this chalet bungalow would change from being 11.10 metres deep, to 15.75 metres deep, that's (over 51ft) in depth (plus 8.m in width and 8.5m height from our patio ! WE SUGGEST THAT THAT THIS PROPOSAL FAILS POLICY CS12 ON QUALITY OF DESIGN: SCALE, HEIGHT AND BULK AND FOR THIS REASON AND THE REASONS ABOVE, WE URGE YOU TO REFUSE THIS AMENDED APPLICATION.

VISUAL INTRUSION, LOSS OF PRIVACY, LOSS OF SUNLIGHT AND QUALITY OF DESIGN REGARDING LACK OF OBSERVATION OF ORIENTATION AND LEVELS. and LACK OF RESPECT TO ADJOINING PROPERTY IN TERMS OF: SCALE, HEIGHT, AND BULK.

1. 29-25 Langley Hill, showing roof colours and heights of the 2 storey properties in the road.
2. This shows the existing rear of no 29 Langley Hill. Please note the size of the existing 1st floor window and compare it to the proposed floor to ceiling glass, nearly 3 times larger in area in photo 4 and diagram 5.
3. Existing rear of no 29 Langley Hill. The proposed extension is for a 4.65m depth, two storey, overbearing, 8m wide extension, extending to 8.5metres in height from our ground levels.
4. This shows the potential loss of privacy to ourselves at no 27, due to overlooking from the proposed floor to ceiling glass at 1st floor level, together with the replacement of windows and doors at ground floor level by 6metre wide, visually intrusive, floor to ceiling, glazed bi-fold doors. Also note that no 29's floor levels will be 1.5 metres above ours, due to the slope of the hill. These differences in levels have not been taken into account in the design of this extension.
5. This diagram shows the difference between the existing 1st floor window with a windowsill to the proposed floor to ceiling glass area. This hugely enlarges the viewing area.
6. This shows the 1.5m height difference between us at no 27 and no 29. The red line, shows the floor levels of the proposed extension at no 29, and how overlooked our garden will be and how this will have a huge impact on our privacy. It also illustrates how the difference in levels has not been addressed in this poorly designed extension.
7. This shows the overlooking issue and the resultant loss of privacy, from the proposed glazed area, over our garden.
8. This shows the floor levels of the proposed extension compared to our property, the proposed full height glazed areas at both ground and 1st floor level.
9. Our house and those of our neighbours, faces northwest. We therefore receive limited sunshine, so any sunshine that we do receive, is really enjoyed. This photo shows the existing outlook from our 1st floor study and the current western route of the afternoon and evening sun. The proposed height of the extension will block all our afternoon and evening sunlight, to our patio, our kitchen French doors and rooflight, our 1st floor study and bedroom and our small original 1937 roof terrace. As we are sited on a hill, there are drops of between 1 to 2 metres between each property, going down the hill. As a result, no's 25 and 23 etc will also have all the evening afternoon and evening

sunlight blocked to their patios, ground floor Velux rooflights and their rear 1st floor bedroom windows.

10. The black outline shows the scale and bulk of this vast, overbearing 8m wide, full width, 4.65m depth, 2 storey extension, and how it will block and overshadow us, resulting in the loss of all afternoon and evening sun from our property and our neighbours.

Please note: the numbering of the objections and comments below are linked to the same numbering on the agents Planning Statement).

1 .INTRODUCTION. The introduction to the Planning Statement, states that it partly relates to an application to "reconstruct attached garage to side." Please note, that the existing garage, as seen on the existing plans, is a DETACHED garage, not an ATTACHED garage ! The existing garage forms the boundary to no 31 on one side and currently offers a side access gate from the back garden to the front garden, on the other side of the garage. By attaching the garage to the side wall of the new proposed extension, the side access is lost, and no 27 then occupies the entire width of the plot , apart from a mere 50-60cm space between ourselves and no29. This contravenes Dacorum Local Plan 2004 7.2v "the permissible outward projection of rear extensions will be assessed with regard to b)the visual effect of the extension on the original building and the retention of space around it."

1.5 Removal of tree on the advice of an arboriculturist in order to help avoid potential damage to surrounding properties. This Cypress tree was chopped down, in order for the applicant to build his proposed extension. It was growing less than 50 cms from our boundary and we did considerable research on the implications of its removal. The soil is heavy clay and the felling of this large tree was against all advice online, which suggested that it could cause heave and subsidence. We informed the applicant of this.

2.5 Site location. The level difference between properties is lesser at the rear than at the front. This is not the case. The difference in floor levels between no 27 and 29 is approximately 1.5metres. It is far less than this at the front of the property.

3.4 "the previous application was refused because of the rear facing balcony only. " This is not the case. The balcony issue and different glazing options and suggestions, for the 4metre wide glass doors were discussed for nearly two hours by the committee, before a vote was taken by the committee. No other issues/objections were discussed. The planning case officer's report was flawed, as it was drawn up before we or our neighbours had submitted our objections, due to an error on the website regarding dates for objections. The planning officer said she had visited the site and felt the extension was not going to be intrusive or cause loss of privacy! At no time did she ever visit our property, as she would have seen the difference in levels and the implication of this. In her report, there was no mention anywhere about loss of sunlight yet "sunlight" and "daylight" too are important considerations, particularly for a north western facing property. Policy CS12 states that each development should a) avoid visual intrusion , loss of sunlight and daylight".

4.17 ACCESS The developers suggest that" the development will not negatively affect access into the property."

This is untrue and we object to this, as by extending lengthways to the rear, they have opted to rebuild the detached garage, which has an existing side gate giving full access from the front garden to the back

garden, to replacing it with an attached garage/storeroom, therefore blocking off their side access and giving the whole development a cramped appearance. The Dacorum Local Plan 2004 (7.2v) draws attention to" b) The visual effect of the extension and the original building and the retention of the space around it." The space around the property, is being removed, by attaching the garage and losing the side access gate

4.3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT. "The extant planning permission for no 27 has been taken into consideration during the design of the proposed development as has the neighbours existing roof terrace. ". We have already stated that this planning permission extension, dates back to 2009 and is considered unviable now. Our small 1930's original roof terrace on the far side of our property, to no 29, will now receive no afternoon or evening sunlight at all, due to the height and depth of their proposed overbearing extension. We cannot see any sign whatsoever of their "consideration" in their design process. Once again it contravenes Policy CS12, on loss of sunlight.

4.4 "wide variety of extensions and developments." The examples quoted are for much larger properties, ie not 1.5 storey chalet bungalows like no 29. It would have been far better to compare our single storey extension, and the single storey wrap around extensions at no 25 and 23 Langley Hill, where we have all consulted with each other before submitting planning, therefore avoiding loss of light, sunlight and overshadowing. The proposals for no 29 have not used any of the side land available to them, in their design proposal, which if a 1.5 or 2 storey extension was built there, it would have no impact on either of the adjoining properties!

There has been no consultation with ourselves at no 27 or no 31.

5.13 The proposed development will include re-roofing the greyish plain tiles with new slate appearance roof tiles, synonymous with the Kings Langley vernacular.

We object to this misleading description as every house, on the North facing side, from the bottom of Langley Hill from no 1 to 85, consists of properties with brown clay roof tiles. This long hill of 1930s brown clay roofs can be seen from across the valley and are part of the village vernacular. The houses and shops in the High Street and other adjoining roads all have brown clay roof tiles. It is only on the opposite side of Langley Hill, where there is more of a variety of styles, where a few of the 1960-70's houses have been re-modelled and extended. The proposed grey slate roof tiles, for no 29, would be completely out of character in this village.

5.16 and 5.17 ACCESS" Access between the front and rear gardens can be achieved via the Garage". BUT the applicant has stated that this "garage" will become a storeroom. Access will be at right angles and extremely difficult through a store room! By building an extension lengthways to the rear and attaching the garage to the main property, they are losing their current side gate access. This gives the whole design a cramped appearance and leaves no space around the property except for a narrow gap of 50-60 cms on our boundary. The applicant has suggested that there is a 870mm gap between 27 and 29! THIS IS INCORRECT AND WE OBJECT TO HIS STATEMENT.

The developers are contravening The Dacorum Local Plan 2004 (7.2v) which draws attention to" b) The visual effect of the extension and the original building and the retention of the space around it." The space

around the property, is being removed, by attaching the current DETACHED garage and losing the side access gate.

5.13 The developers suggest that " Re-roofing the grey plain tiles with new slate/slate appearance roof tiles, synonymous with the village vernacular", will "match the appearance of the original roof".

We object to this, as the new grey slate tiles will certainly not match the original roof tiles, in terms of materials or colour or match the colours of the roofs in Kings Langley village. No 29 has 1930's brown clay tiles(and more modern thinner green tiles on the vertical sides of the dormer windows, which are later additions.)We have submitted photographs of the existing roof tiles, which can be seen in the Documents section under photos.

5.18 SUSTAINABILITY. The developers say that" The proposed development is designed in a way and in a scale, layout and form, that aims to cause no impact, to adjoining neighbours."

We object to this as, the proposed development is for a 4.65m deep extension and will be 8metres not 7 metres in height, from our patio, due to the difference in levels. The levels have not been considered in the design of this extension. As stated in our previous objections, it will block a large amount of light to our 1st floor bedroom /study and our ground floor kitchen/family room, and block all afternoon and evening sunlight to our patio and to the patios of our neighbours at no 25 and 23, as well as our rear facing rooms upstairs and those of our neighbours. It will have a huge overbearing impact on us. The developers have ignored the CS12 policy on g) i.v. scale, v.height, vi.bulk and loss of daylight and sunlight.

5.20 Providing "large Northward facing windows to increase the overall daylight quality. And 6.17: "New and enlarged openings will help to enhance the availability of natural light".

The proposal for these huge glass areas at ground and 1st floor levels, may improve the daylight to no 29 but it is to the detriment of us, as neighbours, as they will have a 180 degree view into our garden from the floor to ceiling windows on the 1st floor! Yes, the neighbours will enjoy more light, but the design of this extension seriously affects the sunlight and daylight to OUR property and our neighbours down the hill. It is inconsiderate and, negatively affects our quality of life and impacts the existing amenity of our garden.This once more contravenes Policy CS12 on loss of daylight and sunlight and lack of privacy.

We note that a second Velux window has been added, on the latest proposed plans, to the rear bedroom, on the west side of the roof. Surely if this has now been added, the extensive area of glazing to the rear of this same bedroom could be reduced?

5.4 DESIGN STATEMENT. The developers have said that the layout "would not cause any detrimental overshadowing to neighbouring windows".

Dacorum Policy CS12 states that each development should avoid c) 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.

The developer's design statement blatantly contradicts the above policy, and we object very strongly to the contents as the proposed design contravenes many aspects of the policy.

The developers have drawn up their own version of the 45 degree line, without having measured our doors, windows, etc so it is based on their interpretation. They have only measured daylight, not sunlight. It is immediately obvious, that all the afternoon and evening sunlight will be lost by building a 2 storey extension to a height of 8.5m from our patio and only 50/60cms away from our boundary. It is also obvious, on visiting the site, that there will be unacceptable overshadowing to our rear windows and those of our neighbours below us, on the hill. This contravenes Policy CS12 on loss of sunlight and daylight.

our patio and rear facing rooms and those of our neighbours. The design has completely ignored the CS12 policy, stating that "each development

5.9 The developers have suggested that" by extending the pitched roofline-this will help to reduce the sense of scale of the rear extension and maintain the eaves height closer to the boundary." They estimate that the extension would only project less than 3 metres further rearwards than our property but the plans show that the extension will project at least 3m, and the design statement omits the fact that they are proposing a DOUBLE storey extension extending outwards, whereas our extension, like our neighbours below us, is only SINGLE storey. How can this possibly reduce the sense of scale? We object to their statement as the eaves height will be 4.5m in height, from our patio, rather than 3m on a level plot! The proposed pitched roof of the proposed extension, extends 4.65 metres in length, and 8 metres high, alongside our boundary. There is only around 50- 65cms max. in width, between our two properties. NOT a 870mm gap between no 29 and 27, quoted in section 5.16. We object to this statement as it is the 8.5m height of the pitched roof, seen from our patio, that causes us such concern,(and how it will actually appear a metre higher than shown on the plans, due to the change of levels between us and no 29,) and how this roof will completely overshadow us and block all afternoon and evening sunlight and daylight too, to should avoid loss of daylight and sunlight."

Unfortunately, the developers have completely ignored the fact that this proposed extension is situated on a sloping site and there has been no consideration of the difference in levels between the properties in their design, or the Northern orientation, in their poor design proposal, once more contravening Policy CS12 on Quality of Design and the Dacorum Local Plan 2004 Appendix 7.2v with regard to individual site factors such as orientation and levels.

6.21 The previous planning application for a 5 metre wide glass balcony was refused on 28/2/2023 due to "overlooking and an unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring residential properties. It failed to comply with Policy CS12 ". The proposed balcony area has now been incorporated into the rear bedroom area so the extension STILL remains the same depth of 4.65 metres. The new plans have kept the previous 4.65m depth, dimensions of the extension, but the floor to ceiling glass window/door area has been moved out to where the glass balustrade would have been ! The overlooking issues are still exactly the same! It will give the new occupants of no 29, a 180 degree view of our garden and their neighbours at no 31 and there will

not be a single part of our lawned garden that will not be overlooked. The new proposed plans from Eagle design, actually show an armchair, sited looking out through the glass area towards our gardens, so it has basically become an "indoor balcony area" ! In view of the increased size of the rear bedroom, and the chair indication, it is obvious that this will become a sitting area. The proposed glass area is nearly 3 times the size of the existing window and by being floor to ceiling, they drastically increase the viewing area. The existing window, being a third of the size of the proposed glass area is a conventional window with a window sill, therefore not offering such extensive views across our gardens compared to the floor to ceiling glass that has been proposed. Additionally ,due to the 1.5 metre difference in levels, the elevated glass area, both at ground and 1st floor levels, will be visually intrusive and will tower over our garden area resulting in a severe and unacceptable loss of privacy contravening Policy CS12, as before.

6.3 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS The developers state that "Form, materials and details, help it integrate both with the existing building and local vernacular

We object to this, as grey slate tiles will not integrate into the local vernacular, due to the proposal of a totally different colour of tile to the brown clay tiles that are a feature of so many of the village roads. .

6.7 to 6.11 NEIGHBOURLINESS The planners suggest that " the rear extension will be set away from the boundaries, so as not to cause harm to the amenities enjoyed by either neighbour." We object to this, as it is obviously NOT set away from the boundaries. It is only 50cms from our boundary, and the plans show that the current DETACHED GARAGE will be attached to the boundary wall of no 31 Langley Hill and then be attached to number 29 as well! It will be a cramped development, contravening Dacorum Local Plan 2004 on "the visual retention of space".

The developers say that " the continued roof form over the rear extension, reduces the sense of scale and massing". This is not the case as the continuous roofline will measure over 55foot in length ! It fails Policy CS12 on respecting adjoining properties in terms of scale, height and bulk.

The Planning Officer said "after visiting the site, the difference in levels are acceptable".Acceptable to whom?? We have had no site visit. It would be impossible to evaluate the impact of the proposed extension and the overlooking issue without visiting our property sited 1.5 metres below. The difference of levels have not been addressed in any way into the design of this extension. It is a poor design and fails Policy CS12 on Quality of Design and the Dacorum Local Plan 2004 Appendix 7.2v with no regard of individual site factors such as orientation and levels.

6.10 " the development comfortably passes the relevant tests. " However, this proposed two storey extension fails the 45 degree test according to our measurements. The drawings submitted by the developers are based on guessed measurements.

7.1 The proposal will result in a development which "Does not negatively affect the quality of life nor negatively impact the existing amenities of neighbours" We disagree with this statement , as the proposed extension, with full height floor to ceiling glass at both ground

and 1st floor, set on an elevated plot, has not been designed to reduce the impact on adjoining neighbours, for all the reasons stated above.i.e loss of privacy and visual intrusion in all areas of our garden plus loss of sunlight and daylight to our rear doors , windows and our patio. contravening Policy CS12.

We disagree with the statement , that it "provides a sensitively designed proposal , which takes advantage of the opportunities presented by the site.". It is poorly designed as there has been no consideration of the levels or orientation of the site, scale or bulk of the extension in relation to adjoining properties in the design, therefore failing Dacorum Local Plan 2004 and CS12 and NPPF. The availability of the land on the western side of the property, which adjoins no 31, where there are no windows on the flank wall, would have provided an ideal site for development, and being on a lower plot to no 31, would have had no impact of overlooking to either of the adjoining properties. The rear of the property could also then have just been extended at a single storey level, if required , therefore reducing the impact of a two storey extension described in our objections in other sections here.

Ref 7.3 CONCLUSION." The developers state that it is clear that the application meets the aims and objectives of local and regional planning policies and in accordance with the adopted National Planning Policy Framework and should be" approved without delay".

OUR CONCLUSION

We refute the above statement for the above and following reasons:

The NPPF paragraph 132 states that "Applications that can demonstrate early, pro-active and effective engagement with the community, should be looked at more favourably than those that cannot."

Unfortunately, there has been no consultation with the neighbours to either side at any stage. This has resulted in a poor, insensitively designed, cramped, overbearing extension, with no consideration of levels, orientation, loss of daylight and sunlight, together with a severe loss of privacy and intrusion to our garden at no 27 plus no 31. It will negatively affect the quality of our life and will severely impact the existing amenities of ourselves and our neighbours. The proposed extension has NOT been designed in accordance with the Dacorum Local Plan 2014 or the CS12 policies or the NPPF. The NPPF paragraph 134, states that "Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design guidance."

Having studied the planning application and the above planning statement, it is clear that this application DOES NOT meet the aims and objectives of local and regional planning policies and should be refused. .

With reference to planning proposal 23/00960/FHA 29 Langley Hill, Kings Langley WD4 9HA,

We wish to make the following objections: FURTHER DETAILS AND PHOTOS 1-10 , WITH A DETAILED KEY OF THE PHOTOS/PLANS , ARE AVAILABLE IN THE DOCUMENTS SECTION ON THE WEBSITE.

REAR GLAZING/ REMOVAL OF THE BALCONY FROM THE DESIGN:The previous application (22/03760/FHA) was refused on grounds of loss of privacy and overlooking, due to the glass fronted balcony spanning the entire width of the property, in an elevated position on the rear of the property. The huge floor to ceiling glass doors were discussed for over 2 hours at the committee meeting, with various options of glazing being discussed i.e. blacked out glass, obscure glass etc and at what heights they could be placed at. The discussion went on for 2 hours with many councillors expressing concerns over the overlooking issue to ourselves (no 27) and the occupants of no 31. A vote was then taken and the application was refused. Unfortunately there has been no consultation, at any stage, by the applicant with us or other neighbours. He has now chosen to move the SAME SIZE GLASS AREA out to the rear wall, where the balcony railings would have been, instead of taking the 2m depth of the original balcony, out of the design. If the 2m balcony area was removed from the plans, then many of our objections above, would be resolved, particularly on loss of sunlight and daylight, overshadowing and scale and bulk. However by moving the floor to ceiling glass area out to the maximum depth of the extension and now integrating the balcony area into the main bedroom, the applicant has basically created an "indoor balcony". In fact, he is obviously intending to use this as a sitting area, as the "proposed plans" show an armchair placed in this area, angled to overlook our garden! The proposed glass area is nearly 3 times the size of the existing window and basically, the issue of overlooking of our entire garden and the resultant lack of privacy, is exactly the same, as in the previous application, and SHOULD THEREFORE BE REFUSED.

Further objections as follows:

LOSS OF SUNLIGHT AND DAYLIGHT to our property and patio. The vast scale and height of this extension would result in us losing all afternoon and evening sunlight from our patio, our rear bedroom and study, and our kitchen. We will lose considerable daylight to these rooms and our kitchen rooflight as well.

LOSS OF PRIVACY AND VISUAL INTRUSION to our garden. The proposal to replace the existing window which has a window sill, with a wall of floor to ceiling glass, nearly 3 times the size is not acceptable. It will give the new occupants a 180 degree view over our garden, resulting in a total loss of privacy to ourselves. It will also be extremely overbearing, due to the height differences explained below. The 6mtr glass bi folds on the ground floor will also provide eye level views across our garden, due to the height differences.

The difference in levels between us and no 29's FLOOR LEVELS is 1.5 metres. The difference has not been taken into account in the design of the extension. IT IS A POOR DESIGN. It has also not taken into account the availability of land on the west side of the property, which is not overlooked by either of the neighbours at ground or 1st floor.

The design does not respect our property in terms of SCALE, HEIGHT AND BULK. The extension is 4.65m deep and is double storey, sited on an elevated plot. It is an overbearing, towering design which will seriously affect our quality of life. Our extension and those of our neighbours, below us down the hill are SINGLE storey to prevent loss of light and sun and privacy.

The design proposal to attach the existing detached garage , to the main property will result in the loss of a generous side access and will block off all access. The applicant has stated that he intends to use the garage as a storeroom. Access from front to back would therefore be through a store room , entering it at an awkward right angle. It also means that the property and storeroom occupy the entire width of the property except for a 50cm gap next to our boundary. THIS IS A CRAMPED DEVELOPMENT AND IS OF A POOR DESIGN.

The proposed grey slate tiles do not match the village vernacular of dark brown clay tiles. Every property from the bottom of Langley Hill to the top of the road, on this side, have these brown tiles.

ALL THESE OBJECTIONS HAVE BEEN RAISED, AS THIS EXTENSION PROPOSAL CONTRAVENES POLICY CS12, ON LOSS OF SUNLIGHT AND DAYLIGHT, LOSS OF PRIVACY AND VISUAL INTRUSION, QUALITY OF DESIGN, AND SCALE, HEIGHT AND BULK PLUS DACORUM LOCAL PLAN 2004 AND THE NPPF AND IT SHOULD BE REFUSED.

This response has been prepared on behalf of the owners and residents at no. 27 Langley Hill, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire, WD4 9HA following the extensive consultation response issued to Dacorum Borough Council on the 22nd May 2023. Although the neighbour consultation period has ended, it is understood that a further response will be reviewed and taken into consideration. This objection to the development at no. 27 Langley Hill summarises previous responses made to date. This response also reflects the objection issued by Kings Langley Parish Council, the details of which can be found in their objection to the previous application (application reference number 22/03760/FHA).

This objection is in relation to the following proposed development at 29 Langley Hill, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire, WD4 9HA (application reference number 23/00960/FHA):

"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."

It is important to acknowledge that this application follows the refusal of a similar planning application on the 28th February 2023 at 29 Langley Hill (application reference number 22/03760/FHA), with the same description of development.

This application was refused at planning committee for the following reason.

"The proposed development by virtue of the rear facing balcony, will result in overlooking of, and an unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring residential properties. As such, the development fails to comply with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy."

As set out in the submitted planning statement for the latest application (23/00960/FHA), the proposals have been updated to omit the rear facing balcony and include the floor area internally within the proposed extension. The balcony is replaced by a floor to ceiling window on the first floor, facing onto the garden. It is acknowledged that this appears to address the reference to the rear facing balcony in the reason for refusal. However, this response has been prepared to present why the proposed development still fails to comply with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy, particularly due to the impact of

overlooking, the loss of privacy and loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring residential properties.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Town and Country Planning Act 1990 require that the determination of planning applications be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The adopted development plan is Dacorum Borough Council's Core Strategy, 2013. Therefore, the local planning authority should undertake a detailed assessment of the proposed development against the Core Strategy when determining the application. This includes each part of Policy CS12 as it is considered the most relevant policy to the proposed development.

The below table provides an assessment of the proposed development against each element of Policy CS12. Policy CS12: Quality of Site Design on page 63 of the Core Strategy states that each development should adhere to the following:

Policy CS12: Quality of Site Design requirements

Assessment against the proposed development

a) provide a safe and satisfactory means of access for all users;

The proposed development is not understood to impact the existing access arrangements.

b) provide sufficient parking and sufficient space for servicing;

The number of proposed bedrooms remains consistent with the existing dwelling and the proposed development does not result in a reduction in off-street car parking spaces allocated to the dwelling. Therefore, the development is considered to provide sufficient parking.

c) avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties;

As set out within detailed responses to this live planning application and refused application (22/03760/FHA), which are still relevant due to the similarity of the proposals, the design will result in significant harm to surrounding properties due to the visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance. The proposed two storey extension is 4.65m further north than the existing rear boundary wall of No.29, resulting in an approximate 3m protrusion beyond the rear façade of the single storey extension of No.27, and protruding 6.9m in depth from the rear façade of No.27 at first floor level. This is a considerable area for an extension and due to the height of the extension (7.5m appearing 9m due to the level differences between residential plots), this will result in a significant loss of sunlight and daylight to the rooms located at the rear of No.27. These rooms only receive natural light from the north due to the close proximity of the east and west boundaries and neighbouring boundary walls. This loss of sunlight and daylight caused by the proposed development will have a detrimental impact to the living environment within No.27. The extension will not only reduce the light internally within No.27 but will also reduce the area of the garden that receives sunlight. This will impact the way No.27's private amenity space can be used as well as the condition of existing vegetation which is currently thriving. The submitted Planning Statement refers to the BRE Daylight and Sunlight Guidance and states there is "no unacceptable overshadowing to neighbouring properties." It is understood a high-level review of the previously refused scheme (22/03760/FHA) against the BRE Guidance was undertaken. However, this was based on assumptions made without a site visit, comprised of a simple high-level review and a detailed daylight and sunlight assessment has not been submitted to

support this application. In addition, as the orientation of No.27 faces north west and benefits from the late afternoon and evening sunlight into the rooms located at the rear of the house, the extension is likely to remove this sunlight entirely. It should also be noted that the policy states "development should avoid loss of sunlight and daylight". As the acceptability of this loss is not included in the policy, the reference to "unacceptable" within the submitted Planning Statement's statement "no unacceptable overshadowing to neighbouring properties", is not relevant. From the information provided within the application material, the proposed development will result in the loss of sunlight and daylight to neighbouring property No.27. Therefore, the application is contrary to this section of Policy CS12. Although the extension will not be able to look directly into the rooms at No.27 due to the orientation, the loss of privacy within the rear private amenity space of No.27 is considerable. The scale of the extension means that there will be no area within the rear garden at No.27 that cannot be viewed by No.29. Although an improvement to the previously proposed balcony, this risk of invasion of privacy and disturbance to the owners of No.27 is still substantial due to the large 2m floor to ceiling window facing out onto neighbouring rear gardens. This risk is increased as the area next to the window within the large master suite is likely to act as an internal balcony. This is likely to result in residents of neighbouring properties, including No.27 feeling watched by the residents of No.29. This loss of privacy caused by the proposed development results in another element of the proposals being contrary to Policy CS12. If an alternative extension design is explored, retaining the existing window height of 1.3m with an area of around 2.08sq.m, compared to the proposed 2m height and 4.6sq.m size, would be more acceptable from an overlooking and privacy perspective. However, this amendment in isolation would not be sufficient to comply with Policy CS12.

d) retain important trees or replace them with suitable species if their loss is justified;
It is understood that the proposed development will not result in the loss of any important trees.

e) plant trees and shrubs to help assimilate development and softly screen settlement edges;
Although soft landscaping could soften the appearance and bulk of the proposed extension, additional vegetation is more likely to increase the impact of overshadowing to neighbouring properties which is not encouraged. Therefore, the absence of soft landscaping proposals to accompany this scheme is considered appropriate.

f) integrate with the streetscape character; and
The extension is considered to not impact the streetscape character of Langley Hill as it is located at the rear of the property. However, the roof tiles proposed and on the existing property are shown to be removed and replaced with new slate or slate appearance tiles. This does not align with the brown clay tiles on the existing property which match the materials used for each roof on the northern side of Langley Hill. It is suggested that the design is amended to propose brown clay tiles that will integrate with the existing built environment and streetscape character along Langley Hill.

g) respect adjoining properties in terms of:
The proposed development is not considered to respect adjoining properties as set out against each section of the policy below.

i. layout;

The layout of the proposed development is not considered to be primary reason for the scheme not respecting adjoining properties other than due to the relationship between layout and scale. Alternative layouts including moving the en-suite bathroom to the rear of the property with obscured glass to reduce the impact of privacy and overlooking could be explored but the impact of the scale and bulk of the extension will remain the same.

ii. security;

Due to the direct relationship between privacy and security, the proposed development is not considered to respect adjoining properties in terms of security. Although this may not be a high risk, the occupiers in No.29 will be able to overlook the entire garden of No.27. Detailed understanding of No.27s private amenity space, boundaries, access and routine could potentially impact their security. As a result, the design does not respect the security of adjoining properties.

iii. site coverage;

As set out in the Policy CS12 part c assessment section above, there is minimal respect to adjoining properties in terms of site coverage as the proposed rear extension will result in considerable loss of sunlight and daylight to the rooms at the rear of No.27 and the garden by covering the site. Other neighbouring properties will also be impacted by site coverage from the scale of the rear extension.

iv. scale;

It is noted in the submitted planning statement that the proposed extension will increase the internal area of No.29 from 115.8sqm to 172.2sqm. This will increase the internal area of the property by 49%. This increase in scale is disproportionate to the existing building and neighbouring buildings. The significant increase in scale does not respect neighbouring properties due to its imposing design and impact on privacy and loss of daylight and sunlight. As a result, the proposed development is not compliant with Policy CS12. Reducing the scale of the extension considerably would be welcomed by the owners of No.27.

v. height;

Due to the extension protruding north by 4.65m on the first floor, the height should be a key consideration in the determination of this application. The measurements from the proposed elevations show the extension to be 7.5m high. The elevations also indicate indicative levels of adjacent residential plots to the east and west. These indicative ground levels show No.27 to be 0.5m lower than No.29. However, the proposed elevation plans, plus a review of photographs and on-site measurements at No.27 show that the floor levels for No.29 will be 1.25-1.5m higher than No.27. As a result, the proposed rear extension will tower approximately 9m over the rear northern façade and private amenity space of No.27. A site visit is encouraged by the case officer and any members determining the planning application to appreciate the difference in levels.

As reflected in the sections above, it is clear how this would significantly reduce the daylight and sunlight currently enjoyed by the owners of No.27. The suggestion in section vi. to reduce the extension to 3m on the first floor, should adequately reduce the perception of the extension towering over No.27. This should result in an improved respect to adjoining properties in terms of height.

vi. bulk;

The bulk of the extension is viewed as substantial as despite creating a continuation of the roof shape, it seeks to maximise the proposed envelope of the building. The design is likely to appear large and boxy with no breaks in the façade other than the large, plain windows. This would result in an imposing presence over neighbouring properties.

It is suggested that a more appropriate extension would reduce the 4.65m extension on the first floor to 3m, keeping the proposed Dutch hip gable and match the design of the front of the property. As the previously refused application included an extension of the internal area on the first floor by 3m, this is considered a reasonable alternative design solution. Crucially, this would also reduce the impacts presented above relating to privacy and loss of daylight and sunlight. The amended extension would still create a considerably sized master suite, with an ensuite and a more modest walk-in wardrobe featuring ample storage. The proposed increase in floorspace to the ground floor by extending out 4.65m could be retained with a sloping brown clay tiled roof and velux windows to provide ample light to the ground floor extension whilst preventing overlooking and impact to light to neighbouring properties. This would significantly reduce the bulky and imposing appearance of the extension by breaking up the depth of the rear façade. This will create architectural interest, complimenting the front façade of the property and also reduce the impact of scale on neighbouring properties as set out above.

vii. materials; and

The proposed render and cladding proposed on the extension are considered acceptable subject to the final details including colours and quality samples being approved by the local planning authority via a discharge of condition application. As set out above, the roof tiles proposed for the extension in slate or slate appearance tiles should be replaced with brown clay tiles to match the existing property and remain consistent with the type of roof tiles used along the full extent of the northern side of Langley Hill which will retain the character of the existing built environment.

viii. landscaping and amenity space.

The site photographs within the Planning Statement assist in demonstrating that there will be minimal landscaping lost where the extension will be located. However, the impact to landscaping and the private amenity space at No.27 will be considerable. Over the past 36 years, the owners of No.27 have invested significant amounts of time and money to create a garden that they can enjoy. This space acts as a sanctuary to the owners of No.27, as well as creating a safe space for their grandchildren to play outside in the sunshine. The loss of daylight and sunlight from the proposed extension at No.29 will provide a challenging environment for existing landscaping to survive. In addition, the space overshadowed by the extension will be significant, changing the way the space can be used and enjoyed. The overlooking and invasion of privacy will also discourage the amount of time that is spent within this private amenity space, particularly with younger members of the family.

As presented above, the proposed development in its current form is contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS12 and therefore should be recommended for refusal unless changes are made to reduce the scale of the extension sufficiently to cause no impact to neighbouring

	<p>properties and their private amenity space in terms of privacy or loss of daylight and sunlight.</p> <p>The applicant is encouraged to engage with the local planning authority to find an appropriate alternative proposal. The suggested changes as set out in vi section of the table above are welcomed as part of an updated submission pack to this application prior to determination of the application. If any updated proposals are submitted, we would appreciate receiving notification of any further consultation.</p>
--	---