

PLANNING COMMITTEE – Thursday 16 July 2026

26/0692/FUL - Removal of single storey front extension and, construction of single storey side/rear extension, removal of chimneys; alteration to fenestration including relocation of entrance door, external materials including render at 42 MARLIN SQUARE, ABBOTS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD5 0EG

Parish: Abbots Langley Parish Council
Expiry of Statutory Period: 29.06.2026

Ward: Abbots Langley And Bedmond
Case Officer: Danielle Kavanagh

Development Type: Minor development.

Recommendation: That planning permission be REFUSED.

Reason for consideration by the Committee: The agent for the application is a District Councillor.

To view all documents forming part of this application, please go to the following website:
[26/0692/FUL - Removal of single storey front extension and, construction of single storey side/rear extension, removal of chimneys; alteration to fenestration including relocation of entrance door, external materials including render at 42 MARLIN SQUARE, ABBOTS LANGLEY, HERTFORDSHIRE, WD5 0EG](#)

1 Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

1.1 No relevant planning history.

2 Description of Application Site

2.1 The application site is located on the eastern side of Marlin Square, Abbots Langley.

2.2 The site contains a two-storey, semi detached dwelling with a pebble dash exterior and a gabled roof form finished in grey slate. The host dwelling has a single storey front projection which houses a front bay window and a porch. This front projection is mirrored on the attached neighbour. To the rear of the dwelling is an existing two storey rear projection and a single storey rear extension, which does not extend across the full width of the host dwelling. A patio extends to the side and rear of the existing dwelling along with a garden area laid to lawn, enclosed by close boarded fencing and hedging. The host dwelling has a shared pedestrian access to the southern flank. Land levels fall from the front to the rear of the site.

2.3 The host dwelling does not have any assigned on-site parking.

2.4 The attached semi-detached neighbour sited to the north of the host dwelling is No. 40 Marlin Square. This dwelling has been extended at the rear to a similar depth as the existing single storey rear extension at the host dwelling. The boundary between the dwellings is marked by a high evergreen type hedge, and fencing towards the rear of the site.

2.5 The neighbour to the south of the host dwelling No. 46 Marlin Square, is a semi detached dwelling. This neighbour is separated from the host dwelling by a shared accessway which is approximately 2m wide. This neighbouring dwelling is set on a similar building line to the host dwelling, and has been extended to the rear.

3 Description of Proposed Development

3.1 This application seeks planning permission for the removal of a single-storey front extension and construction of a single-storey side/rear extension, removal of chimneys, alteration to

fenestration, including relocation of the entrance door, and external materials, including render.

- 3.2 The existing original front projection, which serves a bay window and has been infilled to provide an enclosed porch forward of the front door, would be demolished. The front door would then be replaced with a window, with the remaining opening infilled with a replacement wall, flush with the front elevation of the host dwelling.
- 3.3 The existing single-storey rear extension would also be demolished. The proposed single-storey side/rear extension would wrap around the existing two-storey rear projection and extend approximately 1.1m to the side of the existing flank building line, extending to the full 5m width of the site, up to the neighbouring boundaries. The extension would have a stepped depth, 11.3m deep when measured from the existing two-storey rear projection, and 15.3m deep when measured from the southern flank. The roof form would be hipped and surrounded by a parapet wall, with a maximum height of 3.2m, reducing to 2.6m at the parapet. 10 roof lights are proposed for the roof slopes of the proposed extension. A set of bifold doors is proposed for the rear of the extension. The external finish of the side and rear extension is proposed to be smooth render.
- 3.4 The principal entrance to the host dwelling would be relocated from the front of the dwelling to the front of the side/rear extension.
- 3.5 A patio is proposed to the rear of the extension, which would measure 3.1m deep.
- 3.6 Two chimneys are proposed to be removed as part of the proposal.

4 Statutory Consultation

- 4.1 National Grid: [No response received]

Abbots Langley Parish Council: [Comment received]

Members acknowledge neighbours' concerns over perceived overbearing nature of the extension size. Members have no further comment.

4.2 Public/Neighbour Consultation

- 4.3 **Site notice displayed:** 01.05.2026, expires 23.05.2026

- 4.4 **Press notice published:** Not Required

- 4.5 Neighbours consulted: 6

- 4.6 Responses received: 1 [1 objection]

Summary of objection:

- The scale and proximity of the extension is considered to create a dominant, enclosing, and visually oppressive effect on neighbouring gardens and rear-facing rooms.
- Due to the fall in garden levels, the extension may appear closer to 4m in height from neighbouring properties, intensifying its overbearing presence.
- The depth and positioning of the extension raise concerns about reduced daylight and sunlight to neighbouring gardens and habitable rooms.
- The proposal is viewed as disproportionate relative to surrounding properties, exceeding typical neighbouring extension depths

- The cumulative effect is described as creating an enclosed, overdeveloped, and visually intrusive environment for neighbouring residents.
- The claim that no vegetation would be affected is disputed; the extension would require the removal or significant reduction of boundary hedging that currently provides privacy and screening.

5 Reason for Delay

5.1 The committee cycle.

6 Relevant Planning Policy, Guidance and Legislation

6.1 Legislation

6.2 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).

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

6.4 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.

6.5 The Environment Act 2021.

6.6 National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

In 2024 the new National Planning Policy Framework was published. This is read alongside the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The determination of planning applications is made mindful of Central Government advice and the Local Plan for the area. It is recognised that Local Planning Authorities must determine applications in accordance with the statutory Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, and that the planning system does not exist to protect the private interests of one person against another. 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 states that 'good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities'. 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.

6.7 The Three Rivers Local 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.

Abbots Langley Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum Version Plan March 2026). Relevant policies include AL3 and AL4.

7 Planning Analysis

7.1 Impact on the character and appearance of the host building and streetscene

- 7.2 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'.
- 7.3 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, particularly with regard to the roof form, positioning and style of windows and doors, and materials.
- 7.4 As set out Appendix 2, new development should not be excessively prominent in relation to adjacent properties or general street scene and should not result in a loss of light to the windows of neighbouring properties nor allow for overlooking.
- 7.5 Policy AL3 of the Abbots Langley Neighbourhood Plan (March 2026) states that all new development should reflect the character of the Character Area in which they are located. Policy AL4 further states that development proposals should demonstrate a high quality of design, which responds and integrates well with its surroundings, and meets the changing needs of the population of the neighbourhood area.
- 7.6 The removal of the front bay projection is considered to result in an unbalanced appearance when compared to the attached neighbour. While there is no objection to the relocation of the principal entrance door to the proposed side/rear extension, it is considered that the front projection with mono-pitched roof is a characterful feature of the house and the pair of semi detached dwellings. Whilst acknowledging that the bay has been infilled, the front projection still positively contributes to the dwelling, pair of dwellings and the streetscene. As such, its loss would dilute the character of the houses and wider streetscene, contrary to the above local planning policies.
- 7.7 Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD sets out that with regard to single storey rear extensions, generally the maximum depth should be 3.6m in the case of semi-detached dwellings. The proposed rear extension would have a maximum depth of 15.3m, reducing to 11.1m from the original rear elevation of the dwelling, which exceeds the guidelines set out within Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD. In addition, a 3.1m patio is proposed to be set up to the rear of the proposed extension. The proposed rear extension would exceed the guidance by a significant margin. Furthermore, the proposed single storey side / rear extension with rooflights is considered to be disproportionate in scale to the host dwelling, resulting in an extension which would not be respectful to the scale of the dwelling, thus detracting from its character, of which would be evidently visible from both neighbours as the extension would extend across the whole plot width. The 10 proposed roof lights on the extension's roof slopes are considered out of character with the host dwelling, and the number required is indicative of the excessive depth of the rear extension.

- 7.8 The two chimneys on the host dwelling's roof are proposed to be removed. It is considered that the chimneys contribute positively to the character and appearance of the dwelling and streetscene. However, it is accepted that the removal of these chimneys could likely be carried out under permitted development, and as such, there is no objection to their removal, recognising that other chimneys have been removed within the vicinity. Nevertheless, it would be officers' preference that the chimneys are looked at being retained in any future scheme.
- 7.9 In summary, the removal of the front projection and the proposed single storey side/rear extension would have a harmful impact on the character of the dwelling (including eroding the group value of the pair of semi detached dwellings) and area, contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (2013), and Policies AL3 and AL4 of the Abbots Langley Neighbourhood Plan (Referendum Version Plan March 2026).
- 7.10 Impact on amenity of neighbours
- 7.11 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'.
- 7.12 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.
- 7.13 As set out above, the proposed single storey side / rear extension would have a maximum depth of 15.3m, reducing to 11.1m from the original rear projection of the dwelling, which exceeds the guideline of 3.6m depth for semi-detached dwellings, set out within Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD. The proposed rear extension would extend past the extended rear elevation of the attached neighbour No. 40 by approximately 8.5m. This depth of the extension past the rear building line of No. 40 is considered to result in an excessively overbearing and un-neighbourly form of development, which would have a harmful impact on neighbouring amenity. Additionally, when considering the orientation of the sun, the sheer depth of the extension would have a harmful impact on the level of resultant light received including overshadowing the garden, thus adversely affecting the residential amenity of the occupants of No. 40. The existing hedge which marks the boundary line between the host dwelling and this neighbour would be removed to facilitate the proposed extension. It is noted that the existing hedge is tall, and that it is likely that the hedge is having some impact on the light of this neighbour, as the sun moves around the site during the day. However, it must be noted that the hedge could be trimmed or removed and replaced with a different type of boundary treatment. Therefore, the existing situation is not comparable to an 8.5m deep 2.8m high wall set up to the shared boundary, which would visually have a greater impact.
- 7.14 The proposed rear extension would extend past the single-storey rear extension of No. 46 by approximately 11.4m, and it would be set up to the shared boundary with this neighbour. This neighbour is set off the shared boundary by approximately 1m. The proposed rear extension would bring the built form closer to this neighbour; the existing rear projection and extension at the host dwelling are set off the shared boundary by approximately 2m. The proposed extension would be set up to the shared boundary for a total depth of 15.3m, which is considered to result in an overbearing, overly deep form of development adjacent to the shared boundary. It is noted that as No. 46 is sited to the south of the host dwelling, the proposal is unlikely to have an impact on the light as experienced by the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling. Notwithstanding this the extension is not considered to be an acceptable form of development with regard to its impact on amenity of the neighbouring dwelling, No. 46, through its excess depth which would create an un-neighbourly and prominent form of development.

- 7.15 In terms of overlooking the proposed bi-fold doors in the rear elevation of the host dwelling are not considered to result in any additional overlooking of neighbours, as the doors would overlook the dwelling's own rear amenity space. It is not considered that the proposed 10 roof lights in the rear extension would result in any overlooking of neighbours due to their position high in the roof slope. These elements of the proposal are acceptable with regard to their potential for overlooking of neighbouring properties.
- 7.16 A 3m deep patio is proposed to the rear of the single-storey rear extension. The land levels fall from the front to rear across the site. As the patio is not shown on the side elevation drawings, its height is unknown, and therefore, the impact of a potential 3m deep raised patio on neighbouring and overlooking properties cannot be fully assessed.
- 7.17 The proposed demolition of the single-storey front projection is not considered to have a harmful impact on the light or amenity, or result in any additional overlooking of either neighbouring dwelling and is acceptable in this regard.
- 7.18 In summary, the proposed development would result in an adverse impact on the neighbouring dwellings, and the development would not be in accordance with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD.
- 7.19 Highways and parking provision
- 7.20 Core Strategy Policy CP10 (adopted October 2011) requires development to make adequate provision for all users, including car parking. Policy DM13 in the Development Management Policies document (adopted July 2013) states that development should make provision for parking in accordance with the Parking Standards set out within Appendix 5.
- 7.21 The proposed extension would not result in any additional bedrooms. It is noted that there is no assigned parking at the application site. As the existing 2-space parking shortfall would be maintained, the parking arrangement for the host dwelling would not be impacted and is acceptable in this regard.
- 7.22 Wildlife considerations
- 7.23 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.
- 7.24 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 document. 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.
- 7.25 A Biodiversity Checklist was submitted with the application and 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 bats (or other protected species) within the immediate area that would necessitate further surveying work being undertaken.
- 7.26 Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain
- 7.27 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, and an exemption applies in relation to planning permission for a development which is the subject of a householder application, within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order (2015).

7.28 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 householder development.

7.29 Rear amenity

7.30 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy states that development should take into account the need for adequate levels and disposition of amenity and garden space. Section 3 (Amenity Space) of Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies document provides indicative levels of amenity/garden space provision.

7.31 The proposed development would encroach on the dwelling's rear amenity space with 61 sqm (13.9m-long) usable garden space retained. This would represent a shortfall of 23 sqm compared with the Appendix 2 guidance for amenity space, which states that a three-bedroom dwelling should have 84 sqm of amenity space.

7.32 This shortfall in isolation is considered sufficient, as the resultant amenity area would still meet the everyday needs of the future occupants. Additionally, the site is within walking distance to local green space by way of Manor House Recreation Ground. Notwithstanding, it is recognised that the shortfall of amenity space highlights the excessive depth of the proposed rear extension for the application site.

7.33 Trees and landscape

7.34 Policy DM6 of the DMP 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.

7.35 The agent confirmed that the hedge along the northern rear flank boundary would be removed to facilitate the proposal. The hedge is not protected, and there would be no objection to the removal of this hedge.

8 Recommendation

8.1 That PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

R1 The proposed single storey side/ rear extension by virtue of its significant depth, would result in an overbearing and visually intrusive form of development to the detriment of adjacent neighbouring properties (No. 40 and 46 Marlin Square). Additionally, by virtue of the depth of the extension it is considered that the extension would result in an unacceptable loss of light to No 40 Marlin Square, adversely affecting the occupants' enjoyment of their property. Therefore, the proposed single storey side/ rear extension would be contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and Policy AL4 of the Abbots Langley Neighbourhood Plan 2026-2041 (March 2026 version).

R2 The proposed removal of the front projecting feature would result in harm to the character of the host dwelling (including eroding the group value of the pair of semi-detached dwellings) and streetscene. In addition, the scale of the side/ rear extension would result in a disproportionate form of development, which would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the visual amenity of the area. The development would therefore fail to accord with Policies CP1 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management

Policies (adopted July 2013), Policies AL3 and AL4 of the Abbots Langley Neighbourhood Plan (March 2026 version) and the NPPF (2024).

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.