

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - Thursday 11 September 2025

### **25/1160/RSP – Part Retrospective: Removal of existing shed/outbuilding and replacement with new carport/garage at 2 PRANGNELL HILL HOUSE, 23 TROWLEY RISE, ABBOTS LANGELY, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD5 0LN**

Parish: Abbots Langley Parish Council  
Expiry of Statutory Period: 03.09.2025

Ward: Abbots Langley And Bedmond  
Case Officer: Nicholas Withers

**Development Type:** Householder development.

**Recommendation:** That part retrospective planning permission be refused.

Reason for consideration by the Committee: An Employee of Three Rivers District Council resides at the property.

To view all documents forming part of this application please go to the following website:

<https://www3.threerivers.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=SYVS7OQF0FA00&documentOrdering.orderBy=drawingNumber&documentOrdering.orderDirection=ascending>

## **1 Relevant Planning and Enforcement History**

- 1.1 06/2137/FUL - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two, three bedroom dwellings with off street parking and associated access. Approved 26.01.2007
- 1.2 25/0055/COMP - Erection of building to front. Pending Consideration, subject to the outcome of this application.

## **2 Description of Application Site**

- 2.1 The application site contains a semi-detached dwelling located along Trowley Rise. The dwelling was part of a previous development consisting of a pair of semi-detached dwellinghouses that are finished in brickwork and white render with a hipped, dark tiled roof.
- 2.2 The front of the host dwelling is a driveway which is designed to accommodate two parking spaces with a small front garden. Currently, a detached garage structure is located on one of the parking spaces. To the front of the driveway is a small strip of highway grass verge which separates the driveway with the pavement. There is no front boundary treatment.
- 2.3 The neighbouring property to the east (No.1 Prangnell Hill House, 23 Trowley Rise) is the adjoining semi. It has a similar building line to the front and is finished with a gabled front and white render. The appearance of the host dwelling and No.1 mirrors could be viewed as a single dwellinghouse, and the houses share one vehicular access from the highway.
- 2.4 The neighbouring property to the west (No.25 Trowley Rise) is of a similar design to the building that accommodates No.1 and No.2 Prangnell Hill House with a hipped roof and gable front. It is built on a similar building line to the host dwelling.

## **3 Description of Proposed Development**

- 3.1 This application seeks part retrospective planning permission for the removal of the existing garage structure and the erection of a carport and garage.

- 3.2 The proposed structure would be located to the front of the dwelling in the current location of the two parking spaces, one of which is currently occupied by a metal framed garage structure.
- 3.3 The new building would have a width of 5.2m, a depth of 6.1m on the elevation nearest to the dwelling and 4.1m at the elevation nearest the highway. It would have an eaves height of approximately 1.9m with a pitched roof design that results in a ridge height of 2.3m
- 3.4 The proposed garage would be sited up to the front boundary and will be set approximately 0.1m from the boundary with No.25 Trowley Rise, while being set back approximately 4m from the front elevation of this neighbouring. It would be approximately 2.1m from the front elevation of neighbouring property No 1 Prangnell Hill House.
- 3.5 The building would be constructed from timber framing and cladding with the car port open sided against the front boundary.

## **4 Consultation**

### **4.1 Statutory Consultation**

4.1.1 National Grid – No response received. (Date of Expiry 05.08.2025)

4.1.2 Abbots Langley Parish Council – Concerns expressed.

*'Members expressed concerns that the proposed location of the structure on the front drive is intrusive and negatively impacts the overall street scene. The submitted plans lack sufficient detail regarding the structure's design and construction, making it difficult to fully assess the proposal.'*

*Members consider the proposed metal shed/garage to be excessively large and visually intrusive. They noted that, historically, similar structures have been set back to align with the building line, and this proposal is therefore considered out of character with the surrounding area. Members believe the scale and positioning of the structure are overbearing and would result in a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the street.'*

4.1.3 Hertfordshire County Council (Highways) – [Comments awaited]

### **4.2 Public/Neighbour Consultation**

4.2.1 Number consulted: 4. No of responses received: 0. (Date of Expiry 05.08.2025)

4.2.2 Site Notice: Not required.

4.2.3 Press notice: Not required.

## **5 Relevant Planning Policy, Guidance and Legislation**

### **5.1 Legislation**

Planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise as set out within S38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and S70 of Town and Country Planning Act 1990).

The Localism Act received Royal Assent on 15 November 2011. The Growth and Infrastructure Act achieved Royal Assent on 25 April 2013.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and the Habitat Regulations 1994 may also be relevant.

The Environment Act 2021.

## 5.2 **Planning Policy and Guidance**

### National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

In December 2024 the revised NPPF was published, to be read alongside the online National Planning Practice Guidance. The NPPF is clear that “existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework”.

The NPPF retains a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This applies unless any adverse impacts of a development would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits unless there is a clear reason for refusing the development (harm to a protected area).

### The Three Rivers Local Development Plan

The application has been considered against the policies of the Local Plan, including the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), the Development Management Policies Local Development Document (adopted July 2013) and the Site Allocations Local Development Document (adopted November 2014) as well as government guidance. The policies of Three Rivers District Council reflect the content of the NPPF.

The Core Strategy was adopted on 17 October 2011 having been through a full public participation process and Examination in Public. Relevant policies include Policies CP1, CP9, CP10 and CP12.

The Development Management Policies Local Development Document (DMLDD) was adopted on 26 July 2013 after the Inspector concluded that it was sound following Examination in Public which took place in March 2013. Relevant policies include DM1, DM6, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5.

## **6 Planning Analysis**

### 6.1 Overview

6.1.1 This application follows an ongoing planning enforcement case in which it was reported that a metal building had been placed to the front of the property without planning permission. Following a site visit, officers formed the view that the metal shed erected to the front of the dwelling constituted development and did not benefit from planning permission by virtue of the GPDO. As such the development required express planning permission from the Council.

6.1.2 The owner informed officers that it was not intended to maintain the metal shed at the front of the property but rather submit a planning application for a new larger timber designed building.

### 6.2 Design and Impact on Character and Appearance of the host dwelling and wider streetscene

6.2.1 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) seeks to promote buildings of a high enduring design quality that respect local distinctiveness. Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should 'have regard to the local context and conserve or

enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area' and 'conserve and enhance natural and heritage assets'.

- 6.2.2 Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies Local Development Document (adopted July 2013) set out that development should not lead to a gradual deterioration in the quality of the built environment, have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the area and that extensions should respect the existing character of the dwelling.
- 6.2.3 As set out in Appendix 2, new development should not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties or general street scene.
- 6.2.4 Trowley Rise is characterised by a mix of semi-detached and detached dwellings, generally set back from the highway. The frontages are typically open, with few detached structures. However, some properties feature hedge-lined boundaries.
- 6.2.5 The proposed building would be positioned approximately 4m forward of the dwelling's front elevation. As it would remain separate from the main house, it is considered that the development would not adversely affect the character or design of the dwelling.
- 6.2.6 Notwithstanding the above, the proposed building would be set against the grass verge to the front of the site that forms part of the highway. As such, it is considered that the car port element, by reason of its siting in close proximity to the highway, would appear as an incongruous and unduly prominent form of development that would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. While part of the structure, positioned closer to the front elevation of the dwelling, would benefit from some screening from existing vegetation on the neighbouring property and the curvature of the road would marginally soften views, these factors would not sufficiently mitigate the visual impact described above. Overall, by virtue of its scale and close proximity to the front boundary, the development would introduce an incongruous form of development, uncharacteristic within Trowley Rise, which is defined by its open frontages and absence of built form forward of principal building lines. The proposal would therefore be out of keeping with the established pattern of development and harmful to the character of the street scene.
- 6.2.7 Whilst it is noted that the Abbots Langley Club is sited further forward, this building is distinct in form, scale and function and does not provide a direct or appropriate reference point for additional forward development on neighbouring residential plots. The presence of planting and partial screening would not sufficiently mitigate the visual prominence of the proposal nor be relied upon.
- 6.2.8 It is also considered that whilst the existing structure is forward of the dwelling, by virtue of its scale and set back, it does not have the same impact as the proposed development.
- 6.2.9 As such it is considered that the proposed building would result in demonstrable harm to the character or appearance of the area, in particular to the streetscene. The proposal would fail to accord with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).
- 6.3 Impact on the amenities of neighbours
- 6.3.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should 'protect residential amenities by taking into account the need for adequate levels of disposition of privacy, prospect, amenity and garden space'.
- 6.3.2 Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document set out that development should not result in the loss of light to the windows of neighbouring

properties nor allow overlooking and should not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties.

6.3.3 The building is positioned approximately 2.5 m in front of the main façades of both No. 25 Trowley Rise and No. 1 Prangnell Hill House, and it is set slightly offset from the neighbouring windows. This separation, combined with its modest height of just 2.3 m, ensures that there is no material impact on daylight or outlook to those properties. The scale and siting mean that the structure does not appear bulky or intrusive, and its presence does not result in any harmful effect on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

6.3.4 Overall, the proposal would accord with Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

#### 6.4 Trees and Landscaping

6.4.1 Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD sets out that development proposals should seek to retain trees and other landscape and nature conservation features, and that proposals should demonstrate that trees will be safeguarded and managed during and after development in accordance with the relevant British Standards.

6.4.2 The application site is not located within a conservation area nor are there any protected trees on or near the site which would be affected by the development. Therefore, no objection is raised in this regard.

#### 6.5 Highways and Parking

6.5.1 Core Strategy Policy CP10 sets out that development should make adequate provision for car and other vehicle parking and Policy DM13 and Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies document set out requirements for parking provision.

6.5.2 Paragraph 9.3 of the 'Roads in Hertfordshire Design Guide (January 2011)' states that Garages must have a width of 3m and depth of 6m.

6.5.3 Whilst the proposed building would provide two parking spaces with the garage and carport, it is noted that both fail to accord with the Roads in Hertfordshire Design Guide (January 2011) as the garage measures 6.1m in depth and 2.8m in width whilst the car port measures 4.2m in depth and 2.4m in width. Whilst it is noted that the purpose of the garage and carport are for the storage of classic cars and therefore are suitable for vehicles of that size, the overall development would fail to accommodate for the day-to-day parking needs of the dwelling as the spaces would not be suitable for the modern car.

6.5.4 It is further considered that, if constructed and used for storage purposes, the proposal would not practically meet the day-to-day parking needs of the dwelling, for which the driveway was purposefully designed for. This would likely result in additional vehicles continuing to park on the forecourt area shared with the attached neighbour. Such parking, as identified in planning permission 06/2137/FUL, would interfere with the required turning area and manoeuvrability within the site. The loss of these spaces raises concerns in respect of highway safety through the reduction of available turning space and parked cars on the highway verge.

6.5.5 Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development would fail to accord with Policy DM13 of the Development Management Policies as the two parking spaces proposed in the form of a garage and carport would be insufficient in size and would predominantly used for vehicle storage rather than vehicle parking. As such it would result in additional demand for forecourt parking. This, in turn, would compromise highway safety and amenity and is therefore considered harmful.

#### 6.5.6 Wildlife and Biodiversity

6.5.7 Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 requires Local Planning Authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. This is further emphasised by regulation 3(4) of the Habitat Regulations 1994 which state that Councils must have regard to the strict protection for certain species required by the EC Habitats Directive. The Habitats Directive places a legal duty on all public bodies to have regard to the habitats directive when carrying out their functions.

6.5.8 The protection of biodiversity and protected species is a material planning consideration in the assessment of this application in accordance with Policy CP9 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD. National Planning Policy requires Local Authorities to ensure that a protected species survey is undertaken for applications where biodiversity may be affected prior to the determination of a planning application. The application is accompanied by a biodiversity checklist which states that no protected species or biodiversity interests will be affected as a result of the application. The Local Planning Authority is not aware of any records of protected species within the immediate area that would necessitate further surveying work being undertaken.

#### 6.6 Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain

6.6.1 Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 sets out that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the 'biodiversity gain condition' requiring development to achieve a net gain of 10% of biodiversity value. This is subject to exemptions.

6.6.2 The applicant has confirmed that if permission is granted for the development to which this application relates the biodiversity gain condition would not apply because the application relates to a householder application.

### 7 **Recommendation**

7.1 That part retrospective planning permission be **refused** for the following reasons:

R1 The proposed building by virtue of its scale and proximity to the highway would appear as an incongruous and unduly prominent form of development that would adversely affect the character and appearance of the streetscene. The development would fail to accord with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013).

R2 The proposed development would fail to provide adequate parking for the day-to-day parking needs of the dwelling. As a consequence, additional vehicles would park on the forecourt and highway verge, restricting the shared turning area. This would likely lead to unsafe manoeuvring, to the detriment of highway safety, contrary to Policy CP10 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM13 of the Development Management Policies (adopted July 2013).

Informative:

I1 The Local Planning Authority has been positive and proactive in considering this planning application in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority encourages applicants to have pre-application discussions as advocated in the NPPF. The applicant and/or their agent did not have formal pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority and the proposed development fails to comply with the requirements of the Development Plan and does not maintain/improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the District.