



DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
Thursday 10th November 2016 at 7.00 PM

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item 5a

**4/00029/16/MFA - DEMOLITION OF ALL EXISTING BUILDINGS.
CONSTRUCTION OF 32 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS, ALTERATIONS TO THE
EXISTING VEHICULAR ACCESS ONTO AYLESBURY ROAD, LANDSCAPING
AND THE INTRODUCTION OF INFORMAL PUBLIC OPEN SPACE.**

**CONVENT OF ST FRANCIS DE SALES PREPARATORY SCHOOL, AYLESBURY
ROAD, TRING, HP23 4DL**

A superseded plan has been published in the agenda. The current proposed site sections for consideration are shown below. These have been subject to consultation dated 29 June 2016).



Zone B Elevations H.3 - H.9 > main centre access road > Zone E Flank Elevation H.32 & access road down to Aylesbury Road



Zone B Flank Elevation H.9 > Gardens > Zone C Flank Elevation H.10 - H.15 > forecourts access > Flank Elevation H.16 - H.21 & down to Zone D H.22 - H.23



Abstacle Hill properties > gardens to Zone D H.22 - H.23 & access up to Zone E H.24 - H.27 & H.28 - H.32



PRINCIPAL STREET SCENES

Planning Issue 21.12.15

PL12A

TH/NSA/15/-
TRING HEIGHTS
Aylesbury Road
Tring HP23 4DL

1:200 @ A1 Dec 2015
Client : Mountleigh Development Holdings Ltd

Page 34 of the agenda includes a section on Sport England and the loss of playing pitches. The relevant policy for assessment is paragraph 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Under the same section, page 35 of the agenda states that discussions with Sport England, the applicants and the Council's legal team are on-going and further clarification will be reported to the Committee. The Council's stance as noted in the report is maintained; that further funding would not be requested beyond the CIL contribution. The CIL charge incurred by the development could be spent on infrastructure to compensate for the loss of playing pitches.

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5b

4/02488/16/FUL - CONSTRUCTION OF DETACHED HOUSE (AMENDED SCHEME)

THE WALLED GARDEN, STOCKS ROAD, ALDBURY, TRING, HP23 5RZ

Additional neighbour representation

2 Pendley Bridge Cottages, Tring Station – Supports. Positive unobtrusive contemporary architectural statement in an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Congratulations

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5c

4/01413/16/FUL - FENCE SCREENING TO THE FRONT AND SIDE OF THE SITE USING 2.4 M PLYWOOD SHEETS. FENCING USING PRO-MESH PERMENANT FENCING ALONG THE REAR AND SIDE OF THE SITE 2.4 M IN HEIGHT

NASH MILLS METHODIST CHURCH, BARNACRES ROAD, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 8JS

Recommendation

As per the published report

Summary of Reps (Not Contained within Officer Report)

Nash Mills Parish Council

Councillors object to the amended/additional planning proposal most strongly. They commented that the overall proposal is unacceptable and not fit for purpose. They do not consider the fencing adequate to secure the site against trespass. They do not agree with the removal of the hedge and suggest that this should be retained in order for it to be an effective barrier. They have grave concerns for the amenity of the neighbours and the degradation of the outlook.

Trees and Woodlands

Boundary treatment beyond that of delineation needs to be functional but aesthetically pleasing. In this case we appear to be losing what is an aesthetically pleased hedge and gaining a rather unsightly metal mesh fence. Clearly security is a consideration but what is the point of having half the site only with very secure mesh fencing while the rest is much less secure although 'screening' as described at the front is yet to be defined.

It is possible to have both secure and green by planting adjacent to a metal fence and then treating the hedge (by cutting) so you end up with a hedge that has a grown through and softened the appearance of the metal but don't lose the security that a metal fence provides.

Are you able to condition boundary treatment? Worth spending a bit of time on, it's a prominent site.

1 and 5 Fairway Court

A metal fence is ugly and intrusive, will spoil our outlook and will not hide the building.

4 and 5 Fairway Court

Object on the grounds of the design and visual appearance of the fence, loss of vegetation, creation of a new access and associated disturbance, fence insufficient to prevent unauthorised entry and associated anti-social behaviour.

50 Fairway

Regardless of whether the original fencing was taken down by mistake or not, it needs to be replaced like for like. Also, it needs to be done sooner than later before children get seriously hurt by entering the building or climbing onto the roof, which they do daily. Objects on the grounds of appearance, change of materials and visual intrusion.

362 Barnacres Road

I do not feel that the screening proposed will keep this site safe. I have already had a break-in to my property due to the trees and hedge being cut back before Christmas. Fencing needs to be put round the whole perimeter not just the roadside and area by the Denes.

Mrs Wing (Owner of Property Opposite the Site)

As owner of a property directly adjacent to the property I object to the planning application strongly.

I object to the amended/additional proposal as the overall proposal is unacceptable and not fit for purpose. It also appears to be identical to the original proposal. The removal of the boundary vegetation was unacceptable and replacement of a boundary requires the use of a solid barrier which screens views of the site in the short term and the replanting of the removed vegetation.

The design and visual appearance suggested in the planning application and any possible creation of a new access is not appropriate to the area. Already there is regular antisocial disturbance and the proposed fence will be insufficient to prevent unauthorised entry and associated anti-social behaviour.

I strongly recommend that the property owners immediately replace the removed fencing and vegetation with a solid high fence and replant natural hedging in the short term as a gesture to their neighbours and then resubmit an appropriate planning application which takes into account the safety and appearance of the site.

Design Out Crime Officer

Support for application: I wish to fully support the proposals to secure the site to prevent it being used for Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour, and therefore reduce the call on Police time and resources.

Item 5d

4/02175/16/FHA - TWO-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, SINGLE-STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AND HIP-TO-GABLE ROOF ENLARGEMENT INCLUDING NEW ROOFLIGHTS, BOX DORMER AND LOFT CONVERSION

160 BRIDGEWATER ROAD, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1EE

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5e

4/02508/16/FHA - SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

2 PHOENIX WALK, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 7RR

4 Pheonix Walk Full Objection:

Further to my letter of 3 October I now set out further objections to the above application as follows:-

- The proposed extension infringes a line drawn at 45 degrees from the centre of our living room front window and from our living room's patio doors.
- The proposed extension will not only be visually overbearing and oppressive when viewed from our house and patio but it will create a claustrophobic effect and visual intrusion.
- The break or gap between our house and the Site contribute to the character of the area and Phoenix Walk in particular and reducing the distance between the two will destroy that character to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area.
- The Velux Windows will not only overlook our patio and garden but will also look into one of our living rooms which has large windows and double patio doors. The feeling of being overlooked will impinge on our use and enjoyment of that living room to the detriment of our residential amenity.

I have already stated that in reality the application is for a double storey extension disguised as a single storey extension and that the application ought to be rejected and that remains our position.

If, however, without prejudice to and despite our material planning objections the council are minded to agree to an extension, we have objections to it being built up to the boundary as proposed and the application in its present form ought to be refused and new plans submitted showing the extension at least 1 metre from the boundary:

- to allow access for maintenance
- to avoid any overhanging guttering or facias and
- to preserve a visual break between the two detached houses.

This would at least minimise the change in the appearance and character of the area and Phoenix Walk and avoid creating a terraced or joined up effect (which is out of character

with Phoenix Walk) particularly if we were to build a similar extension ourselves. Anything less than 1 metre from the boundary would not be sufficient to minimise the change in visual appearance and character of Phoenix Walk.

I am writing to you in respect of the planning application made for 2 Phoenix Walk, Hemel Hempstead (the Site) the reference of which is above.

My wife and I are the joint owners of 4 Phoenix Walk and this email is sent on behalf of both of us. Our property is the only one affected by the proposed side extension at the Site. Consequently, the fact that we are the only people to object should not be taken as general acceptance of the application by others and should not diminish our own objections as we are the only ones affected.

The application is described as single storey. However, the proposed extension has a steeply pitched roof which takes its height above the level of the eaves of the existing building. Furthermore, no height measurements are given on the plan and there are four Velux windows in the roof. The information on the plan refers to "timber floor joists." At ground floor level the floor would usually be concrete to match the existing and timber floor joists would only be needed for an upstairs floor. So all of these items indicate an intention of being able to create a two floor extension at some stage and the application should be refused accordingly as such an extension would be entirely inappropriate for the Site.

We have not been able to check the planning history of the Site because no such information is on line. Indeed the application itself is not on line and we have had to visit the Civic Centre to obtain a copy. We were provided with a copy of the Householder Application form, a plan as existing and a plan as proposed. If there are any other relevant documents please let me know.

Because we have not been able to check the planning history of the Site we have not been able to find out whether permitted development rights were removed by the planning permission for the development of which the Site is part. But I would like to make the point that if permitted development rights were removed this was done to emphasise the importance of preserving the amenities of the development as they were designed, without the addition of extensions. And the application should be refused on this ground alone.

Also, the council's own brief for developments states that there should be strong and consistent control of "building lines with appropriate breaks" between buildings. If the application is granted it will be in breach of the council's own brief for developments because the existing break between the Site and our house will be substantially reduced, leading to a lop sided appearance and destroying the present symmetry of the two houses.

Furthermore, the three houses in Phoenix Walk and the first house in Brockwood Drive are all detached and are identical in design. The four together present a symmetrical appearance which would be destroyed by a side extension at the Site.

If the application is granted it will create an undesirable precedent making it difficult to resist similar proposals and this would lead to an adverse change in the character of the area. Phoenix Walk is a pedestrian walkway, with no vehicular access. If the other houses are granted similar applications for side extensions, the houses will lose their identity as detached houses and will become linked and this will lead to an increased risk of fire spreading to all of the houses. Without direct vehicular access by the Fire Brigade this presents an unacceptable safety risk.

The existing garden at the Site is already very small and if the application is granted an unacceptably large part of the garden will be covered by the extension. This will be an over development of the Site and produce an overbearing effect. This will have a detrimental effect on our residential amenity as will the proximity of the extension which will be just over 2 metres away from our own house and will abut right up to our patio.

The outlook from our kitchen through its double patio doors is focused towards 2 Phoenix Walk and the closer proximity of the extension to our house will severely restrict that outlook and will present an overbearing appearance because of its height and position. There is also a potential loss of privacy and amenity by reason of the extension being so close to our house and having Velux windows in the roof.

Also, we will suffer increased noise nuisance by reason of the close proximity of the extension to the living room of our house, particularly in summer when doors and windows are left wide open. This will have an adverse impact on our residential amenity.

For these reasons my wife and I object to the application and ask that it is rejected. In summary our objections are:

- In reality the proposal is for a two storey extension and should be refused
- It would be inappropriate to grant consent if permitted development rights were removed on the original planning permission
- It is in breach of the council's own planning brief for spaces between houses
- The symmetry of buildings would be destroyed by the extension producing an ugly effect
- It will create an increased fire risk
- It is an over development of the Site
- It will have an adverse and overbearing effect to the detriment of our residential amenity
- It is too close to our house and will restrict our outlook because of its height and position
- It will create overlooking from the Velux windows
- It will increase noise nuisance by reason of its proximity to our house
- For all these reasons it will have an adverse effect on our residential amenity.

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5f

4/02258/16/FHA - INSTALL A DROPPED KERB

45 WATER END ROAD, POTTEN END, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 2SH

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5g

4/02292/16/FUL - INSTALLATION OF 16 PARKING BAYS ON THE AMENITY GREEN - 8 AT EACH END AND TWO ASSOCIATED VEHICLE CROSSOVERS.

AMENITY LAND, FLATFIELD ROAD, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD

45 WATER END ROAD, POTTEN END, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 2SH

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5h

4/02407/16/FUL - EXTENSION OF EXISTING PARKING WITH 4 ADDITIONAL BAYS ON AMENITY GREEN

AMENITY LAND, HETCHLEYS, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD

Recommendation

As per the published report
