

ITEM 5.06

4/01228/15/FUL - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH INTEGRAL GARAGES AND CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND REVISED VEHICULAR ACCESS. THE PENNANT, DOCTORS COMMONS ROAD, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3DW. APPLICANT: EXIMIUS DEVELOPMENTS LTD - MR J HAYDON.

[Case Officer – Sally Styles]

Summary

This proposal is recommended for approval.

The provision of new dwellings in the built up area is acceptable in accordance with the NPPF and Policy CS4 of the adopted Core Strategy. The proposal would respect adjoining properties in terms of site coverage, scale, height, bulk and layout and would enhance the general character of the street scene and the Conservation Area. The contemporary design is in keeping with the mixed approach taken on this side of Doctors Commons Road and the amendments to the materials and colour palette relate to the locality. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policies CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy 120 of the Local Plan. The level of parking is acceptable in light of the Council's standards and the impact on the amenity of adjacent residents is acceptable.

Site Description

The application site comprises a detached bungalow with garage and associated curtilage located on the south-eastern side of Doctors Commons Road, approximately half way between the junction with Charles Street and Graemesdyke Road.

To the front there is a paved open parking area served by two vehicle crossovers to Doctors Commons Road. A high close boarded fence exists to the street frontage.

To the rear the site falls steeply away from the bungalow and at the end of the garden is a mature tree line which separates the application property from the rear garden of 25 Kings Road.

The surrounding area comprises a mix of development; although primarily residential, the site is close to Berkhamsted Preparatory School. This side of the road is characterised by small detached properties which, with the exception of the school buildings, are generally of a contemporary style. On the opposite side of the road, the houses are on an elevated position and are more traditional Victorian or Edwardian dwellings.

The application site is located in the Berkhamsted Conservation Area.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the construction of two contemporary designed detached dwellings each with three bedrooms.

The proposed dwellings would be part two-storey part three-storey with a two-storey

presence to Doctors Commons Road and a three-storey elevation at the rear. The dwellings would have a flat roof and have a stepped frontage at first floor level. Glazing would wrap around the corners of the proposed dwellings and each would have a side roof terrace with glazed balustrade. At the rear, the ground and first floor would over sail a terraced area at lower ground level.

Each dwelling would have a single integral garage and a further parking space to the front. The remainder of the space at the front would be hard and soft landscaping, and a lightwell to the lower ground floor. Each front door would be accessed via a bridge over the lower ground floor lightwell.

The two dwellings would be of similar style, although there would be a variation in the tones of the materials.

Each dwelling would be 8.9m in width and have a maximum depth of 12.2m at ground level. From ground level on Doctors Commons Road, the buildings would be approximately 6.3m high, but from the rear, the buildings would be 9.2m in height.

Following negotiations with the applicant during the consideration of this application, changes have been made to the scheme as listed below. These have been discussed in detail in the relevant sections below, but in summary include:

Amendments to the materials and colour palette

Reduction in glazed screen / ballustrading to the front of the building

Reduction in bulk of plot 2

Additional soft landscaping to the frontage

Referral to Committee

The application is referred to the Development Control Committee due to the contrary views of Berkhamsted Town Council who objects to the modern design, the balconies in the streetscene, the loss of amenity caused by the balconies, the scale, height, mass and bulk of the rear elevation and inadequate garden sizes.

Planning History

Application 4/00173/14/FUL for demolition of existing dwelling and construction of three two-storey three-bedroom terraced dwellings with parking, landscaping and creation of vehicle crossovers was withdrawn on 6 May 2014.

Application 4/01358/14/FUL for demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of two storey semi-detached pair and detached dwelling to provide three three bedroom dwellings and alteration of existing vehicle crossovers was refused on 6th August 2014.

There was one reason for refusal which was:

The proposed dwellings, by reason of their layout, site coverage and landscaping

together with their amenity space would result in a tightly configured and overdeveloped site that would fail to relate to adjoining properties, with a car-dominated frontage providing minimal opportunities for landscaping.

Additionally, the proposed dwellings, by reason of their design, as well as excessive scale, height and bulk giving them a two-storey appearance to the front and a three-storey elevation to the rear would fail to provide an appropriate transition between the lower profile neighbouring properties either side, to the detriment of the appearance of the street scene and the Berkhamsted Conservation Area.

Consequently, the development would fail to positively conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Berkhamsted Conservation Area, would be incongruous with the typical density of the area, failing to achieve a suitable degree of integration with the streetscape character, and would not enhance the spaces between buildings. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (September 2013) and saved Policy 120 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.

An appeal against this refusal was dismissed on 16th January (PINS ref APP/A1910/A/14/2225583). The reasons for dismissing the appeal can be summarised as:

Design would be different from the immediate context of low profile, modern 20th century development

Interrupts views out of the conservation area, across the valley with the proposed scheme omitting visibility between dwellings and across the site

Extent of solid form across the site frontage would be harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area

Detailed appearance would be at odds with the built form on this side of the road which comprise clean lines and a restrained approach

The extent of car parking would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area given the extent of unrelieved hard surfacing

The three storey projections at the rear would be dominant structures given their proximity to the side boundaries and also resulting in garden depths of 8m

The proposal would appear cramped

Policies

The site lies within the built up area of Berkhamsted and within the Berkhamsted Conservation Area.

National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Adopted Core Strategy

NP1 Supporting Development

CS1 Distribution of Development

CS4 The Towns and Large Villages

CS11 Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 Quality of Site Design

CS17 New Housing

CS18 Mix of Housing

CS27 Quality of Historic Environment

CS29 Sustainable Design and Construction

CS31 Water Management

CS35 Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policy 13 Planning Conditions and Planning Obligations

Policy 18 The size of new dwellings

Policy 21 Density of Residential Development

Policy 58 Private Parking Provision

Policy 99 Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands

Policy 120 Development in Conservation Areas

Appendix 3 Layout and Design of Residential Areas

Appendix 5 Parking Provision

Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

Clarification Note on the Provision of Affordable Housing

Berkhamsted Conservation Area Statement

Summary of Representations

Conservation and Design

Initial Comments:

The scheme seeks to demolish The Pennant and replace it with a two detached dwellings two storey to the street scene and three storeys at the rear.

Though the principle of development remains acceptable, it should be noted that historically plots along this side of the street contain either semi or detached dwellings.

My concern remains the same as they were expressed at pre-application: and at both of the previous full applications: these latest proposals appear out of character within the street scene out of character with the location. I refer to my comments made on Applications 4/001816/13/PRE; 4/00173/14/FUL; and 4/01358/14/FUL.

I have quoted in much of this report the concerns I raised in the two FUL reports as I see no point in reinventing the wheel and also because I consider that many of the issues I raised in my previous reports have been repeated in this latest endeavour.

To put the location in context, Doctors Commons Road has two distinct characteristics at this point: on the north is a mixture of late Victorian/Edwardian detached or semi-detached dwelling houses of varying architectural styles but with a rhythmic scale and density. These are also located on higher ground as the land rises upwards on this side of the road. On the east where the school site is also located, and where the land falls away, there is a mixture of dwellings but again the common theme is single or semi-detached dwellings, mainly 20th century and of varying architectural styles. However, the only place where a terrace is visible is at the entrance to Doctors Commons Road from Charles Street when one is met by rather unfortunate terrace of modern 20th century dwellings of no great architectural merit. However, the school site allows a breathing space between this and the next developments. These form a mixture: from a Victorian stable block (converted into housing), two recent detached modern developments, followed by The Pennant which is adjacent to two innovative developments which have an empty plot dividing them, which are followed by detached garage link 20th century range of dwellinghouses.

Because the land falls away so steeply on the east side of the road, the view of the ridge height of buildings in this location including The Pennant is low.

I consider this proposal entirely alien within the environment and negative. The form and materials used appear entirely alien in the street scene. Though as I have stated previously pastiche is not the way forward, the buildings do need to at least attempt to coalesce with the other nearby structures. I consider that this staggered glass box approach does little to enhance the street scene or locality and the predominating materials offer no cohesion with the setting.

As I stated previously and is again the case, the design of the dwellings would introduce an unacceptable variation into the mix of buildings in the area, would sit uncomfortably on the site and would adversely affect the character or appearance of the area.

I remain of the view that the development introduces a building type which is out of keeping with the rhythm, pattern and design of the existing dwellings which would result in incongruous structures out of keeping with the rhythm of development locally. The only positive I can include is that the plot has benefitted from two dwellings rather than three as previously submitted.

The main issue in my consideration is whether the proposal both preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area, and respects the townscape and general character of the area in which it is set. The scale, bulk, height and especially materials of the buildings, and the effect of the development on the street scene. The National Planning Policy Framework aims to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

The form and materials of the proposal would detract from the character of this part of Doctor's Commons Road, and would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of this location. The proposed size and position of the buildings, their bulk and form and architectural detailing would be visually intrusive and detract from the character of the local landscape, thereby failing to maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the area, and fail saved Policy 120, the Act, and NPPF policies quoted. I consider this particularly apparent regarding the rear elevation where words almost fail me to describe the architectural mish-mash and over-glazing this view presents.

When looking at the street scene it is very obvious that the built environment differs from one side of the street to the other. Therefore it is my opinion that the visual relationship between the different sides of the street needs an appropriate and different architectural approach. To my mind this is part of the character of the road and its contribution to the street scene and the conservation area, and is a noticeable and prominent feature that draws attention; the 20th century developments on the lower slopes actually helping to draw attention to the higher placed and dominant heritage buildings, rather than intruding into the dominance of the older parts. I consider that these two buildings would intrude and have an over-bearing uncharacteristic form within the street scene.

I remain of the view that this is a sensitive site and whatever is allowed here could have a significant impact going forward. I consider that the proposal would have a negative effect on the setting of the conservation area, and the location and the street scene and therefore strongly recommend it for refusal.

Further comments:

I've been looking at the amended scheme and reading the previous Inspectors comments.

Further amendments are necessary since the scheme currently does not address the Inspectors comments "extent of solid form across the site frontage would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area". I also think we need to address the garden depth, particularly for plot 1.

Overall the design is moving in the right direction.

In response to the CGI:

I've taken a look at the CGI and I am still of the view that the amended scheme does not address the Inspectors comments concerning the extent of solid form across the site frontage. The Inspector noted that a solid form would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; the layout and distance around the buildings has not materially altered from the previous refused scheme. Hence this concern remains.

Berkhamsted Town Council

Object.

The proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Berkhamsted Conservation Area in this part of Doctors Commons Road.

The proposed design of two dwellings would stand in too stark a contrast to the neighbouring properties of Treetops and Greensleeves, as well as the more modern property Darul Aman, and thus detract from the streetscene in this locality.

The proposed balconies/roof terraces would also introduce an alien element into the streetscene as well as posing privacy issues and a loss of amenity for neighbouring properties.

The scale, height, mass and bulk of the rear elevation is excessive and the depth is such as to provide inadequate garden depths which are well below the depths of adjacent properties and unacceptable for these family dwellings - a point highlighted in the report of Diane Fleming, the Planning Inspector, who dismissed a recent appeal for the development of this site (APP/A1910/A/14/2225583 - attached)

Hertfordshire Highways

Doctors Commons Road is an unclassified local access road. The proposal is for the construction of two detached houses, each served with its own vehicle crossover and one off street parking space in front of each garage.

Notice is given under article 16 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the conditions regarding visibility splays, size of car parking spaces, drainage of the parking area and storage and delivery of materials, plus a suggested informative regarding the vehicle cross over.

Thames Water

Standard comments regarding waste and drainage.

Trees and Woodlands

Comments remain outstanding at the time of writing. Any comments received will be reported at the meeting

Public Comment

Comments have been received from 4 neighbouring properties and the Berkhamsted Citizens Association. They make the following points (please note these comments are in response to the original scheme, at the time of writing, no comments have been made to the amended scheme):

- No objection to the demolition of the bungalow
- The latest proposal is a welcome improvement on the previous plans
- The improvements to the previous application with a reduced number of houses and reduction in height are appreciated
- Proposal had addressed previous concerns in terms of density, roof line and parking
- Design is bizarre and ugly and does not sit well within the Conservation Area
- To introduction of two virtually identical houses of very modern design is too great a contrast with the existing properties, additional differentiation between the designs would reduce this impact
- The design and architectural style is not appropriate for the conservation area and does not blend with the surrounding houses and mix of architecture and has an urban / city feel
- Contemporary architecture is not objected to, but the design of the Pennant is disappointing and harsh
- The front terraces will look directly into the houses opposite
- Overlooking from the new terraces

Considerations

The main issues of relevance to the consideration of this application relate to the policy and principle justification for the proposed dwellings, the impact of the development (in terms of scale, height, bulk and design) on the character and appearance of the street scene and Conservation Area, the impact on neighbouring properties, and the impact on car parking.

Policy and principle

The NPPF states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption of sustainable development. Similarly, Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy directs residential development to the towns, including Berkhamsted and within

established residential areas, where the application site is located. Policy CS17 seeks to promote residential development to address a need for additional housing within the Borough.

Specifically, the provision of new dwellings is supported in principle by Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy, and saved Policy 18 of the Local Plan.

The proposed development would result in a density of 34 dwellings per hectare (based on two dwellings on a plot of approximately 587m²). This would sit within the expected range of 30 to 50 dwellings per hectare outlined under saved Policy 21.

The existing bungalow does not have any particular architectural or historic merit and as such, there is no opposition to its demolition, subject to the quality of the replacement scheme.

The principle of the development is therefore considered acceptable in light of the relevant policies.

Impact of height, scale, bulk, layout and detailed design on street scene and Conservation Area

The existing bungalow does not have any particular architectural or historic merit and as such there would be no opposition to its demolition.

The application site is bounded by detached properties on this side of Doctors Commons Road and these are typically of a varied but modern, low profile design. The principle of a modern design is therefore not objected to and as noted by the Inspector, the previous pastiche scheme would not have been appropriate.

The overall height of the buildings has been kept low; the flat roof design means that the overall height will be lower than the buildings either side. It is however, noted that the neighbouring properties achieve some of their height in the form of a sloping roof and their eaves height is therefore lower than the parapet height of these proposed dwellings. Notwithstanding this, the proposed dwellings will not represent a greater bulk to the streetscene than the neighbouring buildings. This is achieved by a notable part of the first floor of each of the proposed dwellings being set back from the main front building line by 6m in the case of Plot 1 and 5m in the case of Plot 2. Thus, the two storey front building line will be broken, not only by the impact of this staggered building line, but also as a result of the gaps between the buildings. Furthermore, as a result of negotiations with officers, plot 2 has been reduced in depth by 2m and set back 1m within the plot to reduce the bulk in relation to the streetscene (when viewed from the south-west and in relation to Holly House).

It is therefore considered that the scale, height and bulk of the proposed development is acceptable given the context of the immediate surroundings and having regard to the comments of the previous Inspector and the Council's Conservation Officer.

In terms of site coverage across the width of the plot (taken at the front building line), this is set out as follows at ground level:

Existing bungalow - 93% (21.5m built form, across the total plot width of 23m)

Proposed scheme - 77% (17.8m built form, across the total plot width of 23m)

Refused and dismissed scheme - 87% (20m built form, across the total plot width of 23m)

At first floor, this is as follows:

Existing bungalow - 0% (although there is a low lying pitch roof to the bungalow)

Proposed scheme - 52% (12m built form, across the total plot width of 23m)

Refused and dismissed scheme - 87% (20m built form, across the total plot width of 23m)

In terms of the layout of the development within the plot a gap of 2m exists between the two proposed dwellings. To Holly House to the south-west, the gap is 2.3m, which is an increase compared with the existing by virtue of the fact that existing garage to the Pennant sits on the site boundary. To the north east, the gap between proposed Plot 1 and Treetops is reduced by 0.2m from 2.7 - 2.5m at the closest. The position of the dwellings within the plot allow 10.5m rear gardens with the inclusion of the covered lower ground floor terrace. The subdivision of the plot into 2, results in plot widths of 11 and 12m (plot 1 and plot 2 respectively). This is not at odds with the general plot widths in the area and wider than that of Treetops and Greensleaves. The design of the dwellings, with an integral garage, requires only 2 parking spaces on the frontage of the development. This will result in a considerable amount of the site frontage being available for soft landscaping. In overall terms therefore, the layout is considered appropriate to the context of the site and the gaps between buildings would still allow views out of the conservation area and across the valley.

It is therefore considered that the scale, height, bulk and layout of the proposed development is acceptable given the context of the immediate surroundings and having regard to the comments of the previous Inspector and the Council's Conservation Officer regarding the amount of solid form across the site. In particular, the Conservation Officer notes that that the proposal is moving in the right direction and the main outstanding point is that of solid form and gaps. However, for the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable given the context of the site and the planning history.

In terms of garden space to the proposed dwellings, each would be provided with a rear garden of 10.5m including a lower ground floor terrace set underneath the projecting ground floor. This would fall short of the 11.5m standard garden depth; however it is important to note that the proposed dwellings each contain three bedrooms and for smaller family homes the allocated private amenity space would not be unacceptable. The neighbouring properties at Treetops and Greensleaves have slightly longer gardens, but they are narrower plots and in terms of garden area are not therefore dissimilar. In addition, each dwelling will also have a roof terrace. In

isolation, therefore, the shortfall of garden length for each dwelling would not be a reason for refusal.

The appearance of the proposed buildings is of a contemporary design. The principle of the contemporary approach is not objected to given the context surrounding the site on this side of Doctors Commons Road which comprises a mix of non traditional buildings. Following the original submission of the application, negotiations have been held with the applicants to try and address the concerns of the conservation officer. This has resulted in modifications to the design and materials. In particular the central panels will be brick: two different types are proposed in the form of a red brick for one plot and a yellow brick for the other plot. The remainder of the facades will be rendered off white. This is considered to be a better reflection of the materials and colour palette found within the street scene and immediate conservation area surrounding the site allowing the modern design to coalesce with its surroundings in response to one of the key concerns of the conservation officer to the original scheme. Furthermore, the amount of glazing in the form of balustrades as it would be visible in the streetscene has been significantly reduced as a result of the roof terraces being set back from the frontage.

The building has a three-storey presentation to the rear that would be visible from the rear of the neighbouring properties, particularly those either side. However, the depth of Plot 2 has been reduced to address the impact on Holly House and this in itself is not considered to constitute a reason for refusal given that no visual intrusion will be caused (see impact on residential amenity below). It is noted that the adjacent dwelling at Treetops is visible above rear garden vegetation from the perspective of Kings Road (between numbers 23 and 25), however, these views are just glimpses and the proposed dwellings are lower overall.

All aspects considered, the proposal would respect adjoining properties in terms of site coverage, scale, height, bulk and layout and would enhance the general character of the street scene and the Conservation Area. The contemporary design is in keeping with the mixed approach taken on this side of Doctors Commons Road and the amendments to the materials and colour palette relate to the locality. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policies CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy 120 of the Local Plan.

Conditions are recommended removing certain permitted development rights such that the integrity of the scheme can be controlled.

Impact on neighbouring properties

The application site has three directly adjoining properties, including the dwellings either side at Treetops and Holly House, and the dwelling to the rear at No. 25 Kings Road.

Neither Holly House nor Treetops appear to have side-facing windows that would directly face the application site. The submitted plans demonstrate that the development would not intrude into a 45° line taken from the nearest rear-facing

windows within both dwellings. The proposed building would achieve a separation of 1m from the shared side boundaries and would not project excessively beyond the rear of both dwellings so not to result in unreasonable levels of visual intrusion or loss of light.

The proposed roof terraces to each property will be partially screened at each rear corner in order to prevent overlooking. Other than that, the terraces will look towards the rear garden areas of each of the properties, or will be along the sides of the proposed dwellings where no windows exist.

A distance of approximately 31.5m would be achieved between the rear walls of the proposed dwellings and No. 25 Kings Road. This property is set on lower ground relative to the application property, but given the distances involved, it is not considered the development would not result in unreasonable levels of overlooking. Furthermore, a tall, thick evergreen treeline exists between the two properties which appears to be on the neighbouring property outside the application site. Although the development would bring three three-storey elements closer to the shared rear boundary with No. 25 Kings Road, given the distances of the building from the boundary and the wide and generous rear garden dimensions (approximately 24m wide and at least 23m in depth) of the neighbouring property, it is not considered the proposal would have an adverse impact in terms of visual intrusion. The substantial landscaping within the neighbouring property would assist in screening of the development.

As such, the proposal accords with Policy CS12 (c) of the Core Strategy.

Conditions are recommended removing certain permitted development rights in order to preserve neighbour amenity.

Impact on access and car parking

The proposed site layout would provide two spaces for each dwelling which would result in a shortfall of 0.5 spaces from the maximum standard under Appendix 5 of the Local Plan. However, this is not considered to cause undue stress on the surrounding road network. The highway authority has raised no concerns with the proposals, subject to conditions regarding visibility splays and drainage.

Impact on Trees

At the time of writing, the comments of the tree officer are outstanding. However, the previous scheme, which had a greater level of built form, was not refused for impact on trees. There are no significant trees on the site, albeit that conditions are proposed regarding tree protection as the vegetation on the boundaries of the site form an important screen.

Sustainability

The applicant has only submitted a sustainability checklist from Appendix 1 of the Local Plan. However, it is stated in the design and access statement that the proposed

building would be highly sustainable and energy efficient, particularly given the modern building system proposed. Specific details regarding the sustainability credentials of the building, and about how the proposal would accord with the objectives of Policy CS29 of the Core Strategy, could be secured by condition as is recommended.

Planning Obligations

In March 2015 the Council prepared a Clarification Note which confirms that planning obligations are not sought on schemes of less than 10 units in the urban area as set out in the governments Ministerial Statement from 2014 and the subsequent amendments to National Planning Policy Guidance. It is therefore not appropriate to seek planning obligations, or contributions towards affordable housing in connection with this proposed development.

RECOMMENDATION - That determination of the application be **DELEGATED** to the Group Manager, Development Management and Planning , following the expiry of the consultation period and no additional material considerations being raised, with a view to grant for the following reasons.

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun 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 No development shall take place until samples of the materials proposed to be used on the external walls (bricks and render) and roofs of the development shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall include a sample panel of the proposed brick work should the panelled system be utilised, including mortar. The approved materials shall be used in the implementation of the development.**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in the interests of the visual amenities of the Conservation Area in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (September 2013) and saved Policy 120 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991 – 2011.

- 3 No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include:**

- **hard surfacing materials;**
- **means of enclosure, indicating the positions, design, height, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected to the north-eastern and south-western (side) boundaries and the south-eastern (rear) boundary;**

- **soft landscape works to the front of the properties which shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate;**
- **trees to be retained and measures for their protection during construction works;**
- **proposed finished levels or contours; and**

The approved landscape works shall be carried out prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 4 Pedestrian visibility splays of 0.65m by 0.65m shall be provided, and thereafter maintained, on both sides on the entrances to the site, within which there shall be no obstruction to visibility between 0.6m and 2m above the carriageway.**

Reason: In the interests of the safety of persons using the access and users of the highway

- 5 The proposed car parking spaces shall have measurements of 2.4m by 4.8m respectively. Such spaces shall be maintained as a permanent ancillary to the development, shall be paved and shall be used for no other purpose.**

Reason: To ensure the adequate provision of off-street parking at all times to minimise the impact on the safe and efficient operation of the adjoining highway.

- 6 The development shall not begin until details of the disposal of surface water from the parking area have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.**

Reason: To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to highway users.

- 7 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order amending or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within the following classes of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written approval of the local planning authority:**

Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A, D and E.

Reason: To enable the local planning authority to retain control over the development in the interests of safeguarding the residential and visual amenity of the locality, and to ensure adequate private amenity space for the dwellings in accordance with policies CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Core Strategy and saved policy 120 of the DBLP 1991-2011.

- 8 Notwithstanding any details submitted, prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, plans and details showing how the development will meet objectives of sustainable design and construction shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved measures shall be provided before any part of the development is first brought into use and they shall thereafter be permanently retained.**

Reason: To ensure the sustainable development of the site in accordance with the aims of Policy CS29 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

- 9 Notwithstanding any details submitted, prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, plans and details of the privacy screening shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved measures shall be provided before any part of the development is first brought into use and they shall thereafter be permanently retained.**

Reason: To enable the local planning authority to retain control over the development in the interests of ensuring adequate private amenity space for the dwellings and for protecting the amenity of the adjacent residential dwellings in accordance with Policies CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (September 2013)

- 10 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:**

9424-L-00-09-A

9424-L-00-10-A

9424-L-00-11-A

9424-L-00-12-B

9424-L-00-13-A

9424-L-00-14-A

9424-E-00-15

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

Informatives

HIGHWAY INFORMATIVE:

The highway authority require the construction of the vehicle cross-overs to

be undertaken by approved contractors so that the works are carried out to their specification and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. This includes any work to the existing street furniture that is required by the highway authority to which all costs will be borne by the applicant. The applicant will need to contact www.hertsdirect.org or telephone 0300 1234 047 for further instruction on how to proceed. This may mean that the developer will have to enter into a legal Section 278 agreement.

All areas for storage and delivery of materials associated with the construction of this development shall be provided within the site on land, which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the use of the public highway, in the interest of highway safety and free and safe flow of traffic.

Article 31 Statement – negotiations required, then the development was acceptable.