

ITEM NUMBER: 5b

24/02805/FHA	Double storey side and rear extension, following the demolition of a single storey garage. Alterations to internal layout and fenestration, as well as a front porch extension and the replacement of front-facing windows.	
Site Address:	20 Fir Tree Close, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire, HP3 8NG	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr Mirvet Shehu	Mr Sukhdev Lota
Case Officer:	Colin Lecart	
Parish/Ward:	Hemel Hempstead (No Parish)	Leverstock Green
Referral to Committee:	Called in by local ward councillor	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be GRANTED.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 Overall, the development would not result in harm to the character of the existing property and surrounding street scene, the residential amenity of adjoining neighbours in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy, and would provide adequate parking provision. The application therefore complies with Policies CS4, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Local Plan (2004) and the Parking Standards SPD (2020).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site comprises a two storey semi detached property located along Fir Tree Close in Hemel Hempstead. The surrounding area is primarily residential in character, and the dwelling is within walking distance of local amenities.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a double storey side and rear extension, following the demolition of a single storey garage. Alterations to internal layout and fenestration, as well as a front porch extension and the replacement of front-facing windows.

4.2 The proposed two storey side extension would be set down from the existing ridge of the property by approximately 0.5m and set back approximately 1m from the principal elevation of the property. The proposed two storey rear extension would extend approximately 4m from the existing rear elevation of the property. The first floor element of this extension would be set in approximately 2m from the common boundary with number 21.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications:

24/02803/LDP - Loft conversion featuring a single rear dormer and 2no. front facing rooflights. Works to include a hip to gable roof extension.
GRA - 17th January 2025

Appeals: None

6. CONSTRAINTS

CIL Zone: CIL3

Parish: Hemel Hempstead Non-Parish

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)

Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Hemel Hempstead)

Residential Character Area: HCA22

Parking Standards: New Zone 3

Town: Hemel Hempstead

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 (2024)

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

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

Relevant Policies:

Core Strategy (2013)

NP1 - Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages

CS8 – Sustainable Transport

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

Local Plan (2004)

Policy 99 – Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands

Saved Appendix 3 – Layout and Design of Residential Areas

Saved Appendix 7 – Small-scale House Extensions

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Place and Movement Planning and Design Guidance for Hertfordshire (2024)

Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2022)

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (2020)

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;
The quality of design and impact on visual amenity;
The impact on residential amenity; and
The impact on highway safety and car parking.

Principle of Development

9.2 The application site is located within an established residential area of Hemel Hempstead wherein accordance with Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy (2013), the principle of residential development and extension is acceptable.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.3 Core Strategy (2013) Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 highlight the importance of high-quality sustainable design in improving the character and quality of an area, seeking to ensure that developments are in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of scale, mass, height and appearance. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) also provides guidance on design in residential areas

9.4 The proposed front porch would be a minor addition and does not project significantly beyond the front elevation of the property.

9.5 A canopy extending from the porch along the front elevation would also be constructed and would be supported by a pillar. Due to this, the submitted proposed front elevation makes this element appear as a full width front extension but the proposed floor plans clarify this element of the proposal. It is considered that when the proposal is constructed it would not appear as a full width extension.

9.6 A similar sized porch (excluding the extended canopy) has been constructed at number 2 Fir Tree Close. It should also be noted that a porch of similar size (albeit slightly smaller in floor area and height) could be constructed without planning permission under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class D of the General Permitted Development Order (2015).

9.7 The proposed two-storey side extension would be set down from the main ridge of the property by approximately 0.5 metres and set back from the principal elevation by 1 metre and due to this it would appear as a subservient addition to the existing property. The set back would largely make the extension imperceptible when travelling down the road from the south west. It would also be set in from the boundary with number 19 by approximately 0.9 metres, providing adequate spacing between the proposed extension and the flank wall of number 19. As a result, no terracing effect between the two sets of semi-detached pairs would occur as a result of the proposed side extension.

9.8 The proposed arrangement of fenestration on the two-storey rear extension would differ to the more conventional window arrangements found on dwellings within the area. However, this element as well as the extension itself would not be seen from public views in the surrounding area.

9.9 The proposal would also involve a hip to gable conversion on the main roof form of the property. There is no objection to this as the street scene exhibits a mixture of gable and hipped

roof forms. It is noted this would result in an imbalance within the semi-detached pair of properties. However, a hip to gable conversion can commonly be constructed under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the General Permitted Development Order (2015). Moreover, this element of the proposal has already been granted by a Lawful Development Certificate under application reference 24/02803/LDP.

9.10 The proposed extensions would be finished in brickwork. Currently, the existing property is rendered at the first floor. However, the proposal would introduce a full brick frontage. If brickwork is found beneath the render this will be made good and retained. If blockwork is found beneath the render once it is removed, then brick slips to match the existing brickwork on the property will be used. There is no objection to this. Whilst the other brick properties on the street scene feature rendering between the ground and first floor windows, it is considered not repeating this effect on the proposed property would result in such harm to the street scene which would justify a reason for refusal.

9.11 It is considered that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing property or surrounding area and therefore complies with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 7 of the Local Plan (2004)

Impact on Residential Amenity

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

9.13 With regards to number 21 Fir Tree Close, a 45 degree angle drawn on plan and elevation from the centre of closest ground floor rear window on the property would not be breached by the proposed rear extension. Therefore, according to Building Research Establishment Guidance, the proposal would not have a significant impact on light or sunlight received by the windows on this property. The angle is also not breached when drawn from the first floor windows on this property.

9.14 In terms of number 19 Fir Tree Close, the proposed rear extension would also not breach the 45 degree angles drawn from the closest ground floor rear window of this property and so would not have a significant impact on light and sunlight received by this opening.

9.15 There are ground floor side facing windows on number 19. However, these are not considered to be the main habitable windows serving the rooms on the inside. One window serves a toilet and the other is a secondary window serving a kitchen, with the main window serving this room being located on the rear elevation. In addition to this, the windows face onto the existing garage.

9.16 There is also a first-floor side facing window on number 19 which would face the proposed two floor side extension. However, this serves a stairwell and therefore is not a habitable window. Furthermore, it is considered that due to the separation distance, a 25 degree angle drawn from the window towards the extension would either be very breached at a very minor level or not breached at all.

9.17 In terms of outlook, the proposed side and rear extensions would be positioned approximately 4.13m away from the flank elevation of number 19 Fir Tree Close, and further away from the rear windows. Due to this distance, it is considered the rear windows of number 19 would not experience a significant sense of enclosure as a result of the proposed development.

9.18 The proposed ground floor extension adjoining the boundary with number 21 would only extend beyond the existing ground floor projection at this property by 1m and so would not unduly

enclose the windows at ground floor level. The first floor rear extension would be set in from the boundary with number 21 by approximately 1.9m which would maintain an acceptable level of outlook to the first floor windows on number 21.

9.19 With regards to privacy, some level of overlooking between rear gardens is expected within built up residential areas. The proposed rear extension would not make the existing situation considerable worse, with similar views being provided from the first floor of the existing property. The proposed side facing windows on the side extension would be obscure glazed.

9.20 Due to the above, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in significant adverse impacts on the residential amenity of the surrounding properties in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy. As a result, the proposal complies with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004)

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.21 In terms of parking, the parking standards are comprised within Appendix A of the Parking Standards SPD (2020). The site resides within Accessibility Zone 3, wherein the parking requirement for a 3-bedroom dwelling is 2.25 spaces and 4-bedroom property is 3 spaces. Properties with more than 4 bedrooms are assessed on an individual basis.

9.22 According to the plans, the property would maintain 3 bedrooms at first floor level. However, a home office is also indicated. For the purposes of the parking assessment this can be considered a bedroom as it could be reasonable be used as such. There are two existing parking spaces serving the property. The proposal would introduce a third, with two of the spaces in a reconfigured layout positioned perpendicular to the front boundary. No new dropped kerb is proposed and these spaces would be in a tandem arrangement with one of the spaces. There is no objection to the tandem arrangement as this is permissible for allocated off street spaces. The plan also shows that a vehicle could reasonable access both of the two perpendicular spaces without being obstructed by existing parking space. Alternatively, 4 vehicles could be parked within the driveway in a tandem fashion which exceeds the standard.

9.23 It is also recognised that to access two of the spaces, a vehicle would either have to perform a three point turn to access the space in forward gear when approaching from the south west, or reverse into the space. There is no objection to this in principle, though it is accepted that this may encourage a third vehicle associated with the property to park on street. However, it is not considered that the surrounding area is significantly parking stressed. If parking stress levels on street were to increase the availability of these spaces would further encourage users to park off street.

9.24 The development provides for an acceptable level of parking provision and would not result in significant impacts on the safety and operation of the adjacent highway. Therefore, it complies with the Parking Standards SPD (2020) and Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Other Material Planning Considerations

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.25 The proposal would not result in detrimental impacts on any trees of high amenity value. This stretch of the street does not exhibit a high level of landscaping along the frontages which would be significantly reduced by the proposal

Waste Management

9.26 The proposal would maintain side access to the rear garden, where bins could be stored and brought out the front of the property on collection days

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

9.27 The application is for a householder development and is therefore exempt from mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain Requirements.

Surface Water Run Off and Sewage

9.28 A comment from a resident has been received which notes that increase in surface water run off as a result of the increase in roof area of the property and the proposed shower room at ground floor will cause capacity issues in terms of the sewer network. There is currently no evidence to suggest that the development itself would result in capacity problems on the sewer network. Thames Water is responsible for maintaining the system and it is considered that a development of this size would not result in a substantial increase in surface water run-off and increase in flood risk elsewhere.

9.29 The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and the government's surface water flood mapping shows that the site has a very low chance of surface water flooding.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 In conclusion the proposed extensions would not result in harm to the existing property or character of the surrounding area, the residential amenity of adjoining neighbours in terms of loss of light, outlook and privacy, and adequate car parking provision would be provided for.

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be GRANTED.

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:**

**FTC 03 C
FTC-12 F
FTC 13 F
FTC 14 F
FTC 15 F
FTC 16 F
FTC 17 F
FTC 18 F
FTC 19 F**

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).

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. 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) Order 2015.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
-----------	----------

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
8	6	0	6	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
21 Fir Tree Close Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8NG	<p>1. Privacy</p> <p>The rear extension at the proposed depth and height with the current design which includes a number of large windows at the 1st floor will without a doubt overlook and reduce privacy in the garden amenities at both our property Number 21 as well as Number 19.</p> <p>2. Dimensions & Over Development</p> <p>- The proposed extension area nearly doubles the area of the existing property, without taking into the account the proposed loft conversion, it is not in proportion with other neighbouring properties and the extension seems excessive.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The extension going into the rear is approximately 0.75m longer in size than the existing single storey extension we have on the premises at Number 21. - The proposed rear extension size would increase the loss of light at our property, Number 21 and at Number 19 on the opposite side <p>3. Design</p> <p>It is apparent that the proposed roofline is out of keeping with the pitched end roof design at our premises at number 21. This would impact the aesthetics of our property and other neighbouring existing extensions.</p> <p>4. Parking & Highway Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emergency Vehicle Access: With cars and vans currently parked on both sides of the road and pavements, emergency vehicles may find it difficult to navigate the close, especially if the proposed extension leads to an increase in the number of vehicles. This could significantly delay response times in emergency situations, which is a serious concern. - Increased Parking Congestion: Should the extension go ahead, it's reasonable to expect that more people will live in the property, leading to more cars being parked in an already congested area. The close may not be able to accommodate the additional vehicles, worsening the current parking issues and potentially blocking access to other residents. - Visibility and Safety Issues for Driveways: On-street parking, especially when it's already congested, can limit visibility when exiting driveways. This creates a potential hazard for pedestrians, who may not be visible to drivers until it's too late, especially if cars are parked too close to driveways or on corners.
<p>19 Fir Tree Close Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8NG</p>	<p>Objections to Plans of Extension</p> <p>As the owner & resident of the adjacent property, my home for 40 years, I present to you the following material considerations to support my objections to the above plan.</p> <p>Notes: With the absence of dimensions on the plans, the dimensions mentioned below have had to be calculated/estimated using manual scaling. Marked up plans & photos mentioned below will be forwarded under separate cover.</p> <p>1) Loss of light & overshadowing:</p> <p>a) Whereas the 45 degree line of sight rule has been applied to No. 21 at the West End - (Rear Elevation Proposed & First Floor Plan Proposed) this has not been applied to the considerable impact to No.19 at the East End of the plan from both a vertical & horizontal perspective. In particular, to the reduction of light to the ground floor</p>

kitchen window & the landing/stairwell window which is a safety feature. (See marked up plans - Rear Elevation & Roof Plan),

b) The loss of existing afternoon sunlight hours will be significant.

2) Visual Intrusion / Appearance:

From the (South) back door of No.19, I would be presented with an approx 13.6 ft long x 17 ft high (4.14 x 5.2m) overbearing brick wall just 1m approx from the boundary fence. Very unpleasant & representing a substantial loss of a visual amenity.

3) Dimensions / Footprint / Infrastructure / Over Development:

a) The footprint / area of the proposed extension is approx 389 Sq.ft which when added nearly doubles (95% of) the existing approx 408 Sq.ft of the existing property.

b) With the increased footprint comes the inevitable increase in roof area resulting in double the run-off of rain water into an already under strain drainage system (Thames Water Utilities have had to attend to sewer issues on 3 occasions in December alone). Add to that the proposed shower room (Ground Floor Plan Proposed) then it is not difficult to foresee the potential for further, more serious issues with the sewer system arising from such a development.

c) The extent to which the proposed building extends into the rear garden area appears to be approx 2.5 -3.0ft (0.76 - 0.91m) further than the existing single story extension at No.21.

d) The overall size & 'wrap around' design of the proposed extension is therefore considered to be overbearing, unreasonable, excessive, out of proportion & out of character. As such It also substantially increases the impact of light reduction on No.19 & No.21.

4) Privacy / Overlooking:

At that depth into the garden & with eaves height, large & extensive first floor windows to the rear (Rear Elevation proposed) it will without doubt overlook and reduce the privacy of the garden amenity of the two immediate neighbouring properties at No.19 and No 21. An amenity which has existed for over 70 years.

5) Design / Appearance:

a) From the road (Front Elevation Proposed), the gable end of the roofline is out of keeping with the pitched end roof design of the attached property No.21, and also with adjacent & opposite properties in the Close.

b) Consideration should have been given to the roof line which should be pitched to maintain the aesthetic appearance of comparable properties. (See marked up plan). This would also serve to substantially reduce the impact of light loss on the stairwell/landing window of No.19.

c) An uninterrupted walkway between the proposed extension and the garage of No.19 would require the removal of the existing supporting pillar of the garage party wall, leaving the modified single brick wall without support on the walkway side. There is no indication in the plans as to how this would be addressed.

d) In addition to 5b above, should this plan proceed, consideration should be given, within the construction plans, to the risk of subsidence, as the subsoil is clay & there have been instances of considerable subsidence in the immediate vicinity Eg : The grounds of the nearby St. Albert the Great School, plus other instances affecting extensions within the Close itself.

6) Parking Arrangements: Particularly affecting the western access end of the close, up to & including No 18.

Bearing in mind that It is proposed to demolish the existing garage without adequate replacement.

a) The so-called garage/store (Ground Floor Plan Proposed) at approx 7.5 ft depth cannot be considered as a garage. It would not accommodate one of the smallest cars, (eg. a 2013 Fiat 500), which has a published length of 3.546m (11.63 ft). This reduces an off-road parking amenity at No.20, in a small Close already blighted with parking problems, including the parking of commercial (Transit style) vehicles. See photo.

b) The existing off road parking facility at the property, including the existing garage is for 3 vehicles. At present there are 5 vehicles associated with the new occupier of the property, parked both off road & on road but obstructing the pathway.

c) Therefore, this also makes the applicants answer to the 'Parking' question within the 'Planning & Regeneration' document, incorrect. The proposed works will affect existing parking arrangements.

7) Road Capacity / Pedestrian Safety & Access:

a) On road parking capacity is very limited in this small Close. The road is only approx 5m wide. As things stand, if vehicles were to be parked correctly, kerbside & on one side only, at best this would result in single lane access to the Close.

b) However, in reality, vehicles are parked on both sides of the Close, so drivers are already unable to park their vehicles safely on the road without blocking access to the Close completely. Vehicles parked over halfway onto the pathway cause a considerable obstruction & risk of harm to all pedestrians including children, children in pushchairs, the able bodied & the disabled, who are forced to deviate from the footpath onto the road to avoid said parked vehicles, therefore creating a risk of harm.

	<p>c) Adding to this problem by reducing off-road parking can only serve to exacerbate the issue & increase the hazard of harm to pedestrians.</p> <p>d) Squeezing larger vehicles into an inadequate space will also add to this hazard. See Photo examples.</p> <p>8) Access / Highway Safety:</p> <p>a) In addition to 7) above, there have been instances where on road parking would have impeded access to the Close for emergency vehicles such as ambulances & fire appliances with the obvious potential for increased harm to residents and/or property.</p> <p>b) There is also the potential of large delivery vehicles & large utility vehicles such as the weekly refuse collection vehicle, being unable to access the Close.</p> <p>c) With more on-road parking (as a result of reduced off-road parking) comes the added difficulty & hazard of a vehicle exiting a driveway without a clear view of on-coming traffic. This represents a risk of harm to road users.</p> <p>9) Planning, Design & Access Statement. This has not been included in the documents to review. This denies those informed the rite to comment upon or respond to the statement.</p> <p>10) Planning notice: The absence of a planning notice for this development, which should have been displayed in the Close, has denied all residents the rite to reply.</p> <p>In conclusion, substantial consideration should be given as to the acceptability of the significant adverse impact of an overbearing, full height, full length 'wrap around' design on the eastern end of the proposed extension, which is without precedent & out of character for similar & opposite in-line properties within the Close, & also considered together with the amenity, utility & safety issues mentioned above.</p> <p>Additional Comments sent via post received on the 6th January 2025 can be viewed under Neighbour Letter with a description of '19 Fir Tree Close further comments'.</p>
<p>5 Fir Tree Close Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8NG</p>	<p>Objections to Extension plans</p> <p>We are residents of 5 Fir Tree Close and live directly opposite 20 Fir Tree Close. We have lived here for 31.5 years.</p> <p>We have a few concerns regarding the proposal of this extension plan.</p> <p>Parking Logistics</p> <p>At present, number 20 has parking spaces for three cars-two on the driveway and one in the garage. However, as many as six cars are being parked on and around the property, including on pedestrian paths and in random spots within the close. This has been an extreme</p>

	<p>obstruction for us when we need to get off our driveway. With the planned proposal this will affect current parking arrangements.</p> <p>Road Access</p> <p>Our road is a small cul-de-sac, and vehicles are already being parked on both sides, blocking the pathways and creating significant obstacles for pedestrians. This has effectively narrowed the road to a single lane, impeding access for emergency vehicles and large utility vehicles, such as those for weekly bin collection.</p> <p>Appearance</p> <p>The proposed roofline does not match the design of the neighbouring property at number 21. This would disrupt the visual harmony of the close and is out of character with the other existing extensions.</p>
<p>4 Fir tree close Hemel Hempstead HP38NG</p>	<p>We are concerned about the adequacy of parking at number 20 Fir Tree Close. Cars are currently being worked on and parked on the road outside the property and cause obstruction to neighbours parking on their own property. The concern this will get worse with any developments.</p> <p>The design does not match the plans and will be a large development not in keeping with the other properties of neighbours. Visually this will not be in keeping with the area.</p> <p>It is a quiet close and has been impacted already with parking on the road overflowing from driveways. Cars parking inconsiderately has an impact on emergency services and other large vehicles accessing the close.</p>
<p>15 Fir Tree Close Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8NG</p>	<p>With regards to the above Planning Application we would like to make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It would appear from the architectural drawings that no additional parking for the premises. The property currently has six vehicles regularly parking overnight at the front, on the pavement and at other locations around the Close. o The Close is blighted by the parking of commercial vehicles which cause problems with access/egress to driveways/parking areas, restricting access by emergency vehicles and delivery vehicles. o The adhoc parking by commercial vehicles is causing damage to the pavements, is a hazard to pedestrians and does occasionally cause friction between the residents.
<p>22 Fir Tree Close Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8NG</p>	<p>1. Dimensions/Footprint and Over Development.</p> <p>The proposed rear extension is showing it will approximately be 2 to 3 feet bigger in depth compared to the existing single storey at number 21.</p> <p>The overall size of the proposed extension seems excessive, not in proportion with other neighbouring properties and would impact light reduction to properties either side of the proposal.</p> <p>2. Appearance.</p>

The proposed roofline is not in keeping with the attached property of number 21. This would impact the aesthetics of the properties in the close and would not be in keeping with other existing extensions.

3. Parking and Emergency Vehicle Access.

The proposed works are going to seriously affect a close that is already having to deal with many current parking issues.

Concerns have already been raised as to how emergency vehicles access the close as we have numerous cars/vans being parked on both sides of the roads & pavements which results in limiting access to such vehicles.

Should the proposed extension go ahead larger occupancy of the property is likely to impact the number of vehicles parking in an already congested close.

Another concern would be access into and out of existing driveways with on street parking restricting and hindering visibility which could result in a risk to pedestrians.