



DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AGENDA

**THURSDAY 10 NOVEMBER 2016 AT 7.00 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBER - CIVIC CENTRE**

The Councillors listed below are requested to attend the above meeting, on the day and at the time and place stated, to consider the business set out in this agenda.

Membership

Councillor D Collins (Chairman)	Councillor Riddick
Councillor Guest (Vice-Chairman)	Councillor Ritchie
Councillor Birnie	Councillor Whitman
Councillor Clark	Councillor C Wyatt-Lowe
Councillor Conway	Councillor Fisher
Councillor Maddern	Councillor Tindall
Councillor Matthews	Councillor Imarni

For further information, please contact Katie Mogan or Member Support

AGENDA

8. **APPENDIX A** (Pages 2 - 56)

Agenda Item 8

Comments received from residents in regards to amended scheme

4 Chiltern Villas - 12 July 2016

Objection

Although it is a suitable site for the construction of some houses, I object to this application on the grounds of over-development. The development would be too dense.

The volume of cars needing to exit on to Western Road from this substantial development of 37 houses, would overload Western Road where it has become impossible for two-way traffic already, because of so many parked cars. This will be even more of a problem when LA5 is expedited along past the cemetery.

The congestion along Western Road is really creating some dangerous passing issues, with it now practically impossible for passing having to make way for each other. Its even more dangerous for cyclists, including young children cycling to school. increasing this traffic towards Tring on a road where cars also drive too fast is going to cause significant congestion and danger. I cannot believe that the planning authorities would consider this acceptable and should monitor this stretch of road to witness the current state of this stretch.

38 Longfield Road - 12 July 2016

Objection

Having studied the Amended Application drawings and supporting information for the Change of Use of this site, we write to confirm our amended objection to the proposed development. We do not object to the general principle of residential development on the site provided it complies Dacorum Planning Policy (which it currently dosent) and provided all avenues to retain Educational Use have been exhausted (no evidence of this is yet provided).

The Amended Application clearly contravenes Dacorums Planning Policy and would result in harm to the character of the area because the high density and general composition of the proposals. Our objections are set out below for the Councils consideration alongside Policies CS11 (Quality of Neighbourhood Design), CS12 (Quality of Site Design), CS13 (Quality of the Public Realm), of the adopted Core Strategy.

Core Strategy Policy CS11

Policy CS11 states that development should respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and respect its general character. The proposals have a density of approximately 30 dwellings per hectare (excluding the amenity areas) whereas the density of the surrounding streets varies between 20 and 23 dwellings per hectare this ratio is therefore around 50% higher resulting in it being the densest open housing development anywhere in Tring. This would suggest that a development of around 20 dwellings would be more appropriate and in keeping with the Character Area Appraisal for TCA 2 (Miswell Lane) which clearly states that development should be maintained in the low range compatible with the existing character. It is therefore apparent that the proposals do not comply with Policy CS11 in that they fail to respect the density of the surrounding areas.

The size of typical rear gardens surrounding the site range from 200 m² to 350 m², whereas the majority of the rear gardens of the proposed dwellings are very small ranging from 75 m² to 120 m². In this regard, the proposals do not respect the character of the surrounding area. The pre-application advice also called for gardens front and rear there are no front gardens.

Core Strategy Policy CS12

Policy CS12 part (c) states that development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties. The Amended Application shows that the majority of the proposed houses are three storeys high (actually 10m high) and will also create an unpleasant engulfing effect on neighbouring properties resulting in a loss of amenity. NB Existing adjoining properties in Longfield Road are generally 6m 7m high and less than this in Cobbetts Ride.

Policy CS12 part (d) states that the development should retain important trees however the Amended Application does not contain a new tree schedule, therefore it is unclear whether all the trees covered by TPOs are retained or not.

Policy CS12 part (g) (reiterated & numbered as in the Policy and in the pre-application advice) states that the development should respect adjoining properties in terms of:

- i.) Layout
- ii.) Security
- iii.) Site coverage
- iv.) Scale
- v.) Height
- vi.) Bulk
- vii.) Materials
- viii.) Landscaping and amenity space

The obvious deviations from this policy relate to the scale of the development being too dense for its location, as discussed above, as well as being too high. The pre-application advice clearly set out that the dwellings should not exceed two storeys in height. The Amended Application has failed to address this point which has resulted in proposals which are far too bulky and obtrusive for their location and as such the proposals are contrary to Policy CS12 part (g). There would be little opposition to the houses in Zone E being three-storey as this is out of view of the neighbouring properties other than the Convent Building which itself is partly three-storey.

Core Strategy Policy CS13

Policy CS13 states that new development will be expected to contribute to the quality of the public realm by promoting pedestrian friendly spaces and including appropriate lighting, among other things. Apart from the steep path leading into the site from Aylesbury Road, there are no pedestrian walkways within the site. There are also no details submitted as to how routes through the site will be lit. This will have to be undertaken sensitively to minimise any light pollution to existing properties. As such, the proposals are contrary to Policy CS13.

Other Issues

The Developer should be requested to provide additional drawing to demonstrate the relationship with surrounding buildings and streets or add this information to the submitted drawings. Drawing PL26 needs to be corrected as it does not accurately show the outlines of the existing properties as seen between the new blocks of houses.

We understand that the Developer had originally only proposed infilling of the gap in Longfield Road with a single detached house. It is a very narrow plot - about the width of the neighbouring bungalow and of our plot and of several others nearby. Two parking spaces for two houses are insufficient and will create further problems in Longfield Road. Shouldn't the Developer revert to the original proposition to avoid overwhelming the single-storey properties on either side?

Many previous planning applications have been turned down in the vicinity because of overlooking issues and others been allowed only on the basis that modifications are incorporated to prevent overlooking. We trust the same rigorous attention will be applied to this Amended Application.

The Developer is proposing mineral-fibre slates to be used as one of the roofing materials. Neighbouring properties are roofed with natural slates as are the new houses in the adjoining development known as High Drive. Therefore this development should only be approved if natural slate is specified.

A Construction Plan or Condition should be included that precludes the use of Longfield Road & Longfield Gardens for demolition & construction traffic and prevent parking of operatives vehicles.

Summary

In summary, we contend that this Amended Application is contrary to Dacorum's Core Strategy Policy and will result in a loss of residential amenity to neighbouring properties and will have a negative impact on the character of this part of Tring.

A wonderful opportunity to create an attractive and desirable place to live on this important site will be lost if this Amended Application is approved.

Many think Tring deserves something better that complies with Dacorum's policies on respecting the character of local area in terms of massing, density, respecting privacy and providing decent homes with decent gardens.

Please confirm that these objections will be made known to members of your Development Control Committee.

Please inform us if any additional information becomes available so we can review prior to further consideration being given to the Amended Application or before it is put to a future meeting of the Committee.

Attached is an image of a typical proposed three-storey house compared to one of the two-storey houses. This emphasises the unacceptable impact that their proposal will have on the neighbouring properties.

Comparison of 3-storey house with the 2-storey version:

The 3-storey houses are 2.75m (9ft) higher than the 2-storey ones.

Further comments

We welcome the small changes included in the Amended Application for the Change of Use of this site, but would only support it if it were further modified as follows:

Proper evidence is provided to demonstrate that continued educational use is not possible. For instance, the secluded nature of the school might prove to be suitable for a school for Special Needs pupils – has this been explored?

The density and bulk is reduced so that its current impact on adjoining properties and on ANOB views is minimised to ensure it complies with Dacorum's Core Strategy Policy – otherwise what is the point of having Local Character Area policies in the first place? This is expanded upon below.

A single detached dwelling is provided to infill the gap in Longfield Road as original proposed by the developer but changed on the suggestion of the Planning Authority – this will be less bulky and will not overwhelm the single-storey buildings either side.

Natural slates are used for roofs instead of the specified mineral-fibre slates – neighbouring properties (including the recently approved new houses on the adjoining development known as “High Drive”) are roofed in natural slates. A Condition is included to prevent unwelcome light pollution to neighbouring properties.

A Condition is included that precludes the use of Longfield Road & Longfield Gardens for demolition & construction traffic and prevents parking of operatives’ vehicles.

Details are provided to clarify which trees are to be removed and comprehensive methodology provided to show how all retained trees (including roots) are to be protected during demolition and construction period.

Dacorum’s Core Strategy Policies CS11, CS12 & CS13

The Amended Application clearly contravenes Dacorum’s Planning Policy and would result in harm to the character of the area because of the high density and general composition of the proposals. The relevant Policies of the adopted Core Strategy are:

CS11 (Quality of Neighbourhood Design)

CS12 (Quality of Site Design)

CS13 (Quality of the Public Realm)

Core Strategy Policy CS11

Policy CS11 states that development should respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and respect its general character. The proposals have a density of approximately 30 dwellings per hectare (excluding the amenity areas)

whereas the density of the surrounding streets varies between 20 and 23 dwellings per hectare – this ratio is therefore around 50% higher resulting in it being one of the densest open housing development anywhere in Tring. This would suggest that a development of around 20 dwellings would be more appropriate and in keeping with the Character Area Appraisal for TCA 2 (Miswell Lane) which clearly states that development should be “maintained in the low range compatible with the existing character.” It is therefore apparent that the proposals do not comply with Policy CS11 in that they fail to respect the density of the surrounding areas.

The size of typical rear gardens surrounding the site range from 200 m² to 350 m², whereas the majority of the rear gardens of the proposed dwellings are very small ranging from 75m² to 120 m². In this regard, the proposals do not respect the

character of the surrounding area. The pre-application advice also called for gardens front and rear – there are no front gardens.

Core Strategy Policy CS12

Policy CS12 part (c) states that development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties. The Amended Application shows that the majority of the proposed houses are three storeys high (virtually 10m high) and will also create an unpleasant engulfing effect on neighbouring properties resulting in a loss of amenity. NB Existing adjoining properties in Longfield Road are generally 6m – 7m high and even less than this in Cobbetts Ride.

Policy CS12 part (d) states that the development should retain important trees – however the Amended Application does not contain a new tree schedule, therefore it is unclear whether all the trees covered by TPOs are retained or not.

Policy CS12 part (g) (reiterated & numbered as in the Policy and in the pre-application advice) states that the development should respect adjoining properties in terms of:

- i.) Layout
- ii.) Security
- iii.) Site coverage
- iv.) Scale
- v.) Height
- vi.) Bulk
- vii.) Materials
- viii.) Landscaping and amenity space

The obvious deviations from this policy relate to the scale of the development being too dense for its location, as discussed above, as well as being too high. The pre-Application advice clearly set out that the dwellings should not exceed two storeys in height. The Amended Application has failed to address this point which has resulted in proposals which are far too bulky and obtrusive for their location and as such the proposals are contrary to Policy CS12 part (g).

See diagram in attached Appendix which illustrates the resulting impact of the 3-storey houses compared to that of a normal 2-storey houses.

Many previous planning applications in the immediate vicinity have been turned down because of overlooking issues and others only been allowed on the basis that modifications are incorporated to prevent overlooking. We trust the same rigorous attention will be applied to this Amended Application.

Core Strategy Policy CS13

Policy CS13 states that new development will be expected to contribute to the quality of the public realm by promoting pedestrian friendly spaces and including appropriate lighting, among other things. There are also no details submitted as to how routes through the site will be lit. This will have to be undertaken sensitively to minimise any light pollution to existing properties. As such, the proposals are contrary to Policy CS13.

Summary

Having studied the Amended Application drawings and supporting information for the Change of Use of this site and for the reasons stated above, we reconfirm our objection to the proposed development as it currently stands.

A wonderful opportunity to create an attractive and desirable place to live on this important site will be lost if this Application in its current form is approved. Attached is an image of a typical proposed three-storey house compared to one of the two-storey houses. This emphasises the unacceptable impact that their proposal will have on the neighbouring properties.

Appendix

Diagram to illustrate the impact of a 3-storey house compared to that of a 2-storey one:

The 3-storey houses are 2.75m (9ft) higher than the 2-storey one

56 Longfield Road - 12 July 2016

Objection to the 2 dwellings proposed for Longfield Road at the current entrance and driveway to the grounds. This is due to increasing pressure on parking in the road. I do not believe there is enough parking space to facilitate 2 new houses and the additional cars this will bring to the road, especially with the development of 3 new houses currently underway further down the road.

31 Longfield Road - 13 July 2016

Objection

I have already submitted my comments earlier, especially in relation to the parking problems in Longfield Road when the planned houses have been built. Clearly there must not be any access, for cars or pedestrians, from Longfield Road to the new houses being built. Also the two new houses planned to build facing Longfield Road

must each have enough parking space for at least two cars. These houses are next to the scout hut and this part of the road is completely jam-packed when events are on in the hut, which is on most days. I live opposite this hut and it is often impossible for me to get my car out of my drive.

83 Beaconsfield Road - 13 July 2016

Objection

As a Cub Leader and regular user of the Scout Hut on Longfield Road, I am aware of the problems in parking - this new development will only make matters worse. I would like to see a garden area at the back of the Scout Hut available for the young people to use.

33 Cobbetts Ride - 13 July 2016

Objection

We wish to object to the revised application our comments and requests for more information are set out below.

Will a revised Design & Access statement be required to reflect the revisions to the application, in particular the change in the number of proposed dwellings and parking provision?

We have been unable to view any revised elevation drawings showing Plots H.22 and H.23 (3 bed houses) in Zone D and wish to see what other amendments have been made in addition to the recent change from a terrace of three houses to a pair of semi-detached houses.

Will Plots H.22 and H.23 be traditional single or two storey houses? This would be in keeping with the local area (Tring Character Areas 1 and 2) and policy CS12 part (g) for detached and semi-detached properties not exceeding 2 storeys of a type and design that relate to nearby adjacent properties. Given the levels in this part of the site it would be beneficial for homes built on H.22 and H.23 to be bungalows to mitigate the issues outlined below.

We are of the opinion that anything more than two storeys in height in this particular location near the top of the hill would not be compatible with the local development principles and would create issues with overshadowing and loss of natural daylight for the existing neighbouring properties in Cobbetts Ride, Abstacle Hill and Cherry Gardens, especially given that many of the existing homes are single storey.

We do however consider the reduction in the number of proposed homes in Zone D as a positive move by the applicant. Does the proposal comply with the typical densities of the surrounding area as set out in Policy CS11?

We have concerns over loss of privacy due to overlooking from the habitable rooms of the proposed plots H.22, H.23 and H.24 into the bedrooms, living room, kitchen and rear garden of our home. No doubt most of the residents in the homes adjoining this proposed development site have similar concerns. How will privacy be protected? Will the proposed homes be required to have obscured glazing and non-opening windows where they overlook habitable rooms of neighbouring properties? As there do not appear to be any revised elevation drawings for Zones D and E of the site included within the latest submissions we have been unable to ascertain the position and number of windows in Plots H.23 and H.24.

We would like to see detailed landscaping proposals to ascertain the measures proposed to screen neighbouring properties, without reducing daylight. The choice of trees close to the boundaries of the site needs to be carefully considered.

Policy CS12 part (c) states that development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties. How is the applicant proposing to address these matters in order to comply with the policy as the information provided appears insufficient?

The application is not clear about exactly how many or specifically which properties are to be designated as affordable housing and we would therefore wish to receive more details regarding this aspect to enable full consideration and comments to be made regarding the proposed unit and tenure mix.

We seek confirmation of the permitted uses of the proposed amenity space adjacent to plot H.24 due to potential for noise and anti-social behaviour issues, for the protection of the existing (particularly 31 and 33 Cobbetts Ride) and the proposed residents. All should have the right to quiet enjoyment of their home.

The ecology of the site needs to be respected to protect the bats, owls and other important wildlife on the site and as such an independent verification of trees to evaluate their current condition and ensure they are protected during any building works as well as in the future should be made a planning condition if consent is granted. The TPOs should be respected and no trees removed unless diseased or supported by an independent expert. Where trees are removed they should be replaced with suitable species in order to comply with policy CS12 part (d).

Since the original application submission there does not appear to be any further detail supplied by the applicant regarding suitable surface water drainage provisions to reduce the risk of rain water run-off onto neighbouring lower lying land, particularly

in Cobbetts Ride and Asbstacle Hill. The removal of trees and the tennis courts from the site will only exacerbate the issue. A thorough investigation with submission of independent reports and verification that surface water run-off has been mitigated should be included as a planning condition if the application is granted.

It is not clear what changes, if any, have been made by the applicant to the access onto Aylesbury Road/Western Road to improve road safety at what would be a busy junction where cars are often parked on this major route (used by buses and delivery vehicles) into and out of Tring town. Of particular concern is that cars from the proposed development would be approaching the main road down a steep hill, and if the junction is similar to the Miswell Lane/Western Road junction where visibility is extremely poor due to parked vehicles, it will be dangerous. If the proposal is granted permission, then a condition should be included to satisfy road safety concerns and meet the requirements of the Highways department.

8 Gordon Villas - received 14 July 2016

Objection

There are several unresolved highways issues on Longfield Road already, exacerbated by the new development at High Rise. The junction with Aylesbury Road is not fit for purpose and this end of Longfield Road is already used as overspill parking for residents on Chiltern Villas/Gordon Villas as well as elsewhere on Longfield Road. This end of the road cannot accommodate 2 new 2-bedroom houses (H1.2B and H.2.2B) with the likelihood of an additional 4 cars and the loss of parking for existing residents and users of the Scout Hut. I recommend that this aspect of the plans is replaced with one 3-bed house which is likely to generate 2 rather than 4 additional cars. I note with approval that the application no longer requires the removal of the line of mature trees now accommodated within area B. These provide considerable enhancement to the area and in particular provide screening for existing residents of Longfield Road who will be affected by this proposed development and who have already been affected by the 3 new houses on High Drive. However, it is unclear who will benefit from this amenity area. I would suggest that at least part of this area is made available to the Scouts. Their hut borders on to this area. Their existing activities make a substantial contribution to the health and well-being of young people throughout Tring, but they are currently limited by a lack of outside space connected to their hut. The proximity of this amenity space is an ideal opportunity to use this development to benefit the wider community. Ideally, part of this space could be gifted to the Scouts. If this is not possible, at least some legal agreement should be formed to ensure that they can use this space for their activities.

31 Cobbetts Ride

We have reviewed the revised plans submitted by agents Strutt & Parker. Notwithstanding the reduction of 5 dwellings, we would like to place on record that the changes made have not addressed the significant majority of our points of objection as sent through to you on 19th and 20th January. With the passage of so much time between then and the submission of revised drawings in late July our expectation would have been for a far more detailed and considered resetting of the plans than has been re-presented to you.

Our major objection was over loss of privacy and overlooking. We were particularly most concerned over the position of Plot H27 (now re-numbered as H24) in relation to our dormer bedroom window here at 31 Cobbetts Ride. Nothing has been done to mitigate these genuine concerns. It appears that no changes have been made to plots H24 to H32 as now numbered. We estimate that there will still be a new dormer in an elevated position, only approx 16 metres from our own existing dormer bedroom window. Given our earlier direct correspondence with the Architect on this issue we would have hoped for some form of considered revision on the issue.

Our previous letter also focussed on concerns over several other issues, upon which we would like to further comment:

We commented on the inadequacy of parking spaces for a 'single access' site of this nature. The developer has elected to reduce these from 74 to 64. In our view it would have been well considered to maintain the levels of parking spaces despite the reduction to 32 dwellings, thereby increasing visitor parking provision for the estate. We commented on the lack of suitability of the proposed access driveway up from Western Road. The revised drawings look remarkably similar to the original application drawings.

We questioned what the 3m high framed structure was on the drawings (item 2 of our 19/1/16 letter). We have not had the courtesy of any response on this from the developers team and this structure has not been revised out from the elevations. We also suggested that details the planned boundary treatment and landscape screening to the boundaries would be of benefit, particularly to the boundaries with Nos 29 to 35 Cobbetts Ride which are overlooked. Again this has been ignored. We pointed out the lack of clarity over which of the plots were to be designated for affordable housing. We suggested that any ambiguity be removed by the applicant. This has not been clarified to our knowledge.

We remain strongly opposed to this application.

Further comments

Thank you for the amended and/or additional information that was posted on the planning portal and as notified by your most recent letter of 14 July 2016.

Firstly please may I advise that this additional information has not altered any of my further points of objection, as raised in my previous email to you on 12th July 2016 at 9.10am. I note that this communication has not yet been posted on the public record/planning portal and would ask that this is done. I attach the email below for your convenience.

Secondly I would comment that the additional information has not eased our areas of concern. In fact some of the expanded drawings only act to highlight the extent of damaging visual intrusion, loss of privacy and disturbance to the Cobbetts Ride properties. The developer has now included Supplementary Sheets 1 and 2 showing the existing Cobbetts Ride streetscape as exists with the School Hall and as proposed with the rear elevations of Plots H24 to H32. The proposed illustration only serves to demonstrate how elevated and tall these dwellings are, particularly the 3 storey dwellings, the ridge line for which remains even higher than the existing School Hall. The existing School Hall is a blank gable wall and this building of educational use has never caused any overlooking issues towards Cobbetts Ride. A solid bank of 2/3 storey homes with multiple windows above ground floor level is a totally different planning proposition. The rear windows to plots H24 to H32 will hugely impact on Cobbetts Ride with multiple overlooking and resultant loss of privacy.

In order to satisfy the Planning Department around the year 2000 when Nos 29-35 Cobbetts Ride were developed, these were excavated down and built into the hillside to mitigate overlooking of the existing lower properties. Also No 37 Cobbetts Ride was amended to a bungalow. If this is not also done on the Convent site with its already elevated position over Cobbetts Ride then the 3 storey houses as proposed will give the impression of a 4 storey building mass.

Whilst I accept that this land will probably be changed to residential use, this must be with a design that respects the position of neighbouring properties. Despite the overwhelming objections to the scheme as lodged in January 2016 and in particular the overlooking issues with Cobbetts Ride, the Applicant has made little change to mitigate these genuine concerns. These can only be satisfied by significantly dropping the height of Plots H24 to H32 and also Plots H23 and H22. It would not be unreasonable for the Applicant to lower these plots by the incorporation of bungalows and some dormer bungalows in these areas of greatest overlooking. This would also be more in keeping with the housing stock mix in the immediately neighbouring areas of Tring.

1 Longfield Road

I have looked at the revised plans for the Francis House site online. Though they are certainly an improvement on the earlier plans, I would like to make the following

comments, some of which I believe were also made at a recent Tring Town Council meeting:

1. Are 32 houses, fairly closely packed together, what potential buyers, the town of Tring and the future population of the UK actually need or want? It seems to me that the development is still dense, and out of keeping with most of the surrounding area, and that the high density is primarily dictated by the developers' wish to squeeze into the site as many houses as they can, rather than considering actual needs or wants.

2a. It would still seem better to build one new house rather than two facing onto Longfield Road. Most households nowadays (in this area anyway) have two cars (or more). Three houses to be built shortly slightly further east in Longfield Road will replace one bungalow, so that's six extra cars to be accommodated soon. The parking situation in Longfield Road is out-of-hand already, whether single off-street parking spaces are included for new houses or not. One new house with two off-street parking spaces, accessed by a single one-car width driveway, seems best.

2b. Is the parking provision in the whole development sufficient? And, if the parking does run at capacity, will all the houses be able to be safely and quickly reached by the emergency services, should the need arise?

3. I gather that the site will include about 11 units of 'social housing'. Does this merely mean that the first person to buy a particular house gets it at a reduced price, but can then sell it on at the market price? In any new development of this sort, I feel it is important that the houses should be under the control of a Housing Association (or the like), so that the houses can remain affordable for the foreseeable future. It seems short-sighted not to ensure this somehow, and not to make sure that the developers are legally bound to it.

35 Cobbetts Ride

We write to offer our additional views as residents of Cobbetts Ride on the proposed Mountleigh Development Holdings Ltd -Tring Heights development on the site of the former Francis House preparatory school , Aylesbury Road, Tring and alterations to the proposed application.

The development subject to planning agreement if it goes ahead will we feel will still directly impact our and our neighbours property which will back onto the development as we currently look out onto the tennis court / orchard area of the former preparatory school. Whilst the plans for the development have been altered / amended yet again to counter objections from local residents we still feel there are some additional changes that should be made to the development before any agreement to proceed is granted due to remaining impacts on our properties and outlook.

The remaining impacts which in our opinion still need additional thought are as follows:

1. We are happier that the four dwellings that were originally planned for the tennis court area has been reduced to two and we wish it to be clarified that this change now allows for the original target of ensuring that 23.5 metres of separation is achieved between the nearest tennis court area property H23.3B and our property The Hollies, 35 Cobbetts Ride, Tring, HP23 4BZ. Your revised plan currently shows 22 metres separation. The ideal scenario is that the tennis courts are turned over to public use by local residents or sports space. The ideal scenario for the tennis court plot is two bungalows – affordable or for the elderly or sold as retirement properties this we feel would be acceptable to the Cobbetts Ride, Abstacle Hill and Cherry Gardens residents. See attached drawings we are also curious as to the superimposed outline images of the properties in Cobbetts Ride namely 37,35,33,31 which it look as if the architect has used to get around the privacy issue concerning number 35 by using incorrect property profiles. The drawings as attached appear to show incorrect outlines overlaid across H23.3B.

2. We are also still concerned that we will still be overlooked by what appears from your amended drawings and plans that a dormer window on the South East side of the roof space on property H23.3B will face the rear of The Hollies, 35 Cobbetts Ride, Tring and will look directly into our garden, dining room, living room and two bedrooms and thus we feel this will still encroach on our current level of privacy and the occupants of the new property should it be built and this we feel is unacceptable. We are at a loss to understand your reasoning for placement of this dormer window on what is showing as two bedrooms each having either a rear plot facing window or front facing window. This we feel needs reviewing further.

3. We think from observation of sunlight / shadow in the early afternoon that that the next row of what appears to be seven proposed dwellings and which will be built on the main plot (former playing / sports field) will significantly reduce the sunlight and cause shadowing to the back gardens of 31,33,35 and 37 Cobbetts Ride due to the main plot being significantly higher by 1.5 – 2.25 metres and the lie of the land that 37,35,33 and 31 are built on and which is significantly lower than the tennis court plot and the current playing / sports field plot. We appreciate that you may have done sunlight / shadow modelling but we would suggest that more attention is paid to this element and perhaps modelling different seasons , months of the year to ensure that sunlight is not significantly eroded to the mentioned properties and thus making the rear gardens of the current dwellings in Cobbetts Ride that will be adjacent to the proposed development to be in shadow for a significant part of the spring / summer months or suggest some form of compensation. We would welcome you to observe / experience / record the current levels of shadowing and sunlight levels from the rear gardens of 31,33 35 and 37 Cobbetts ride at varying times during the mornings and

afternoons spring / summer of 2016. I would expect the current levels of sunlight / shadowing to be maintained and not eroded further by the development. The developments that we feel will still cause loss of natural light and shadowing in the afternoon hours are H21.3B through to plot H16.2B. We feel that these properties built on the higher part of the development plot should be affordable properties in the form of bungalows or bungalows for the elderly. The reduced height would we feel then become acceptable to the residents of 37, 35, 33 and 30 Cobbetts Ride. The ideal scenario for the plot is for these properties to be built as bungalows this we feel would be acceptable to the Cobbetts Ride, Abstacle Hill and Cherry Garden residents. We feel that if this is not addressed then we feel this may warrant a case under "Right to Light" as we feel the current views and light enjoyed within our property and neighbouring properties may be effected by reduced natural light and reduced sunlight within our properties and rear gardens

4. Having reviewed the proposed plans in more detail we are still astounded at the number of trees that the developers are proposing to fell including mature trees / the remains of the convent orchard that separates the tennis courts from the residents of Abstacle Hill. We feel very strongly along with other nearby residents that the development should allow for and accommodate the current trees on the plot within the scheme as a feature rather than felling them to squeeze in additional properties and parking. The residents along Cobbetts Ride directly in front of our properties have declared that they suffer ingress of water from plots higher up and behind their properties. This water probably originates from the convent plot and drains down through the chalk into Cobbetts Ride. By felling as many trees as planned this will surely have a negative impact and allow more water to soak away from the convent plots and down into Cobbetts Ride. By leaving as many trees as possible on the development will soak up some of this water and reduce the impact to Cobbetts Ride residents who already suffer. They also absorb noise and act as a sound absorbing barrier. We feel the developers have not really thought this through or bothered to really assess the impact of felling as many trees as they can in the hope of achieving more profit from the development. – Make the Developer Keep the Trees or minimise the felling of trees which are slowly disappearing within Tring and is causing Tring to lose its sleepy country market town feel !

5. Will the developers consider replacing the boundary fence running along the rear of 37,35,33 and 30 Cobbetts Ride with a newer improved quality and more substantial fence line and which could also be increased in height by another 24" to 36"

6. We feel that the proposed development would also reduce the value of the properties 37,35,33 and 31 Cobbetts Ride due to the change of outlook, increased vehicular noise levels and the potential decrease of light and privacy currently enjoyed by the residents occupying 37,35,33 and 31 Cobbetts Ride.

7. We feel that parking spaces have also not been adequately allowed for as you propose one parking spot per dwelling which ultimately means on road parking for additional vehicles. We currently suffered difficult access to our properties due the poorly thought through later developments in Cobbetts Ride which again were built with provision for single vehicle parking. This has resulted in the occupants with more than one vehicle per family parking on the road and this has prevented vehicular access to the properties 37,35,33 and 31 by emergency vehicles due to the road narrowing and cars being parked on the road either side of the latter end of Cobbetts Ride. We feel that the limited parking would result in on road parking and as per the latter end of Cobbetts Ride which we feel has not adequately been thought through or monitored and reviewed would prevent access by emergency vehicles.

8. We will be keen to hear the developers responses / additional observation / communication with the residents of 37,35,33 and 31 Cobbetts Ride and to hear the developers thoughts on any further proposed changes that could be made to the proposed Tring Heights development to offset some of the negative impacts this development may have on the residents of Cobbetts Ride and Cherry Gardens as well as impacts to residents of Longfield Road.

We would also still like to understand how you intend to allocate the affordable housing to Tring residents only and as some of the development is intended and what provisions / investments are to be made for the increased need for access to GP surgeries and schooling for families that may occupy this development especially with potential further developments to the west of Tring. I would also be interested in the types of families these affordable homes would be offered to – Working families or very low income / supported families ? as we feel this may also have a detrimental effect on the value of our properties in Cobbetts ride but positive to the landowners who will I expect make significant profit from this development at the residents of No's 37,35,33 and 31's expense.

Our current thoughts are that this site should be retained for school facilities to accommodate the proposed future West Tring housing developments.

We welcome change and the opportunity of affordable housing for Tring residents but not an additional overloading of current schools, GP surgeries and current lack of social and community facilities and increased traffic on Western Road.

In summary the developer and architect have endeavoured to overcome some of our original concerns but many still remain as per our original objections and we feel there are still changes to be made as the developer is still trying to squeeze as much into the space to maximise return without due consideration of the impact to the surrounding properties

7 Cherry Gardens

We recognise some changes have been made to the original plans but feel these minimal changes do not offer a solution to the previously stated problems.

It remains a grossly overcrowded site and 2½/3 storey houses are still included.

The lack of garages on the plans which can be used by homeowners for the purpose of storage as well as parking, will no doubt mean we will have a row of garden sheds along our garden boundary. This will produce a most unpleasant outlook.

The boundary at present is covered by a mixed hedge jointly maintained by us and the school – will this be replaced?

The area between the eastern boundary of our garden and the tennis courts, is steep and wildly overgrown. It does not appear to be part of the new gardens. Who will be responsible for this? Will this area be properly fenced, cleared and landscaped?

Who will be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed amenity areas?

We hope that DBC will respect the character of the local area and encourage more sympathetic plans that will properly enhance the local area.

Further comments

We recognise some changes have been made to the original plans but feel these are minimal and do not offer a solution to the previously stated problems.

As owners of 7 Cherry Gardens we feel we are the most affected by this proposed development and it affects us on two boundaries. Our house is a bungalow with a narrow garden and we will be overshadowed by houses H16 – H21 three of which are the so called 2½ storey dwellings. Our outlook will be totally obscured by these and our privacy compromised.

The rear boundary at present is a mixed hedge. Will the developers consider replacing this with a new fence line of more substance or will all the new householders be given responsibility for the hedge maintenance?

We feel the whole site is overcrowded and the number of car parking places allowed does not reflect present day car ownership. The lack of garages which can be used by homeowners for storage will no doubt mean we will have a row of six sheds along our rear boundary which will produce a most unpleasant outlook. I mention sheds because I note that crime prevention advisor Michael Clare recommends rear garden sheds for cycle storage.

He also draws attention to rear garden access alleyways and advises they should be fitted with lockable gates so that offenders cannot get easy access to the rear of properties from where most burglaries occur. He also recommends these gates should be in line with the front of the building line to remove the large recess area between the dwellings which can be exploited for Anti-Social Behaviour.

With this in mind I ask about the area between the side boundary of 7 Cherry Gardens and the cul-de-sac / parking area in front of H22, highlighted on the attached plan. A large part of this appears to be no-man's land. At the present time it is wildly overgrown and I feel unless it is tamed, landscaped and re-fenced it will also be an area which could also be exploited for Anti-Social Behaviour.

Who will take responsibility for this area and the other proposed amenity areas?

I thank you for your time and hope that careful consideration will be given to nature of this development and its impact on the surrounding residents.

26 Longfield Road

I was hoping to discuss with you the proposed two houses facing Longfield Road. Having spoken to the developer this was originally one house in the draft submission. It was changed to two houses because of your presubmission advice regarding possible overlooking to my property (26 Longfield Road)

I understand your concerns about overlooking but in practice squeezing two houses in with only one parking space per house is going to cause parking contention. We would be affected far more by the parking issues than by any extra overlooking from an appropriately designed single dwelling, even if larger.

My concern is the developer seems unwilling to revert this back to one dwelling given your presubmission advice. As this was based on your assessment of the perceived affect on our property, could I ask you to reconsider this advice and make it clear to the developer that a single dwelling facing Longfield Road would be less of an issue for us and other Longfield Residents, than the two proposed.

Unknown address

1. According to Government regulations, this development would require alternative infrastructure to replace the school which has been on the site. What is happening about this?

2. Most of the houses in the revised housing proposals are still too high, and the development is still too dense.

3. The two houses proposed on the old access, fronting Longfield Road, are overpowering and out of keeping with the area, and would increase the parking problems in Longfield Road. Please ask for this to be amended to one house which is not so tall.

4. As mentioned previously, please stipulate that it is made physically impossible for cars to park on the grass surrounds of the trees, or on the amenity area.

Comments received from local residents in relation to original scheme:

46 Longfield Road - received 18 January 2016

The plots that would look into my house are H3, H16 and H17. I would like to get a condition for obscured glass on all the windows (ground floor, first floor and second floor) on the NW flanks, the side of each of the properties.

31 Cobbetts Ride - received 19 January 2016

Comments specific to 31 Cobbetts Ride

Whilst I acknowledge that since the public consultation the applicant has made some adjustments to the plot layout directly adjacent to my home, I remain concerned over the overlooking aspect of proposed plot H27 which is extremely close to my boundary and is in an elevated position. As my house (No.31) is the closest of the existing Cobbetts Ride properties to the proposed new homes, I would have expected the Architect to show sections / sight lines from plot H27 and which show the relationship with my habitable room windows. I did request that they show this. I attach two photos taken of planning application drawings and which indicate some type of external framed structure in front of plot H26. This would appear to be some 3m high approximately. There is no notation of what this is. It appears to be over some kind of tiered access ramp!! Please can this be clarified.

Plot H27 and Plot H26 are both drawn with two roof velux lights. However these are 2 bed dwellings and have only attic storage. Please can this be clarified.

I assume that Plot H27 and H26 first floor flank bathroom windows will have obscure glass.

The planning application does not appear to include Detailed Landscaping Proposals. I am particularly keen to see the applicants plans for screening of boundaries with mature trees where there is potential for overlooking of the Cobbetts Ride properties 29 to 37 incl.

General Comments on Application

1. I would comment that the justification stated for Change of Use from school/sports facilities to housing is unconvincing and I question that this is in the best long term interests of the town of Tring.
2. With a mix of 37 dwellings and a propensity of town houses the density of building on this specific site appears extremely high.
3. Of particular concern is the lack of detail for a safe and adequate access drive from Aylesbury Road and which is suitable to serve 37 new houses. Are there detailed plans for how the existing entrance road and driveway will be improved working within the existing constraints and TPO's etc? The present driveway is narrow and has no pedestrian footpath. In previous winter snow and ice the existing school driveway has been impassable and has led to parking issues on the Aylesbury Road.
4. The provision of only 74 total parking spaces on a development of 37 family homes, on a single access site of this nature would inevitably lead to street parking issues. This could impact on safe and quick access for emergency / refuse vehicles etc."

Further comments 20 January 2016

My comment is with reference to the Planning Statement prepared by Strutt & Parker. In paras 3.5 and 5.6 there remains a question over which units will make up the affordable housing element. The language used is that..... 'At present, units 10-23 have been identified as the affordable homes'. I fail to see how a full (detailed) application can be considered without an established and fixed strategy in place for the siting of affordable homes on the site. I would request that any ambiguity is removed, so that the public is in a position to comment on detailed proposals for housing mix and tenure.

31 Longfield Road - received 20 January 2016

Objection

I am opposed to the development in its present form. It consists of too many buildings. Also the buildings back onto Longfield Road and will mean that the residents living there will no longer have any privacy. I believe that the houses which back Longfield Road should be single story bungalows.

I am also very concerned about the two houses which are to be built with entrances to Longfield Road. My main concern is parking. The houses will be adjacent to the scout hall which has many cars parking close by when people go to events in the scout hall. The two new houses will only have one garage each and since most households have two cars it will mean more cars parked on the road.

20 Longfield Road - received 21 January 2016

1) Houses on Longfield Road: The two houses proposed for Longfield Road between No. 26 and the Scout Hut appear to have only one parking space each which means there will be the likelihood of two extra cars now parking on the road. Parking is already difficult and this will cause further problems adding to an already congested street.

2) Parking on site: Providing only one parking space per two bedroom houses is insufficient. Most households will have two cars and therefore one car will have to be parked elsewhere. With only nine visitor slots (which should be used for visitors only) people will then seek alternative places to park either causing problems within the site or surrounding roads. The representatives for Mountleigh Development Holdings have said they will look at this issue.

3) Construction: With a proposed timetable of 18 months to two years to complete, we have concerns about the on-going problems with building traffic and noise. Disruption to residents needs to be at a minimum.

4) Trees: Some of the beech trees on the western border have a preservation order on them, but it appears they are rotten and due to be felled. These trees form a backdrop to many gardens and the view will be drastically altered if these go. I understand the tree surgeon was employed by Mountleigh Development Holdings. Will an independent review take place?

9 Cherry Gardens - received 20 January 2016

Objection

I wish to comment on the above planning application.

Firstly, I disagree that the proposed building is sympathetic with the current housing nearby. The proposed development consists of two and a half storey houses in an area surrounded on two sides by bungalows. Obviously, this means that the occupants of the new houses can look directly in/ down on to the established bungalows.

Secondly, the flank wall of the new housing has a bathroom window that affords a direct view in to my bedroom. I spoke at length to the architect about this and he advised that in the second round of drafts this window could be removed. I think it unfair that I will be overlooked in such a manner.

Thirdly, there is already considerable traffic parked in the surrounding roads, allocating only one parking space per two bedroom dwelling is inadequate.

I only received notification of the planning application meeting yesterday, less than a week before it takes place. Is such short notice in the hope that no-one will turn up and object?

I am a nurse working shifts and there is no way I can rearrange my rota at such short notice.

Please note my objections and have them voiced at the meeting.

40 Longfield Road - received 22 January 2016

Objection

I object on the grounds that the proposed buildings are too tall and should only be standard 2 storey properties. After carefully plotting dimensions for the properties from the plans, I have created computer generated interpretations of how the buildings will impact on the rear of our property and they will clearly have a detrimental effect to both our privacy and the amount of light in our garden. Furthermore, the plans seem to indicate that at least one tall tree is to be planted in line with the rear of our garden which again will seriously effect the amount of light we receive. These images are available on request.

44 Longfield Road - 22 January 2016

My garden backs on to the proposed development called Tring Heights and I wish to express some concerns and observations.

Garden fence bordering my land – I request that it be replaced or renovated to the same height and not lower.

Trees – Indications on the plans are that many of the mature trees are to be felled and fewer planted as replacements.

The mature trees, when in leaf, perform the valuable function of noise absorption from the A 41. I request that more be planted to achieve this.

Privacy – I am concerned that the end house and garden of the row on the plan, H.3, will overlook our garden and there will be some loss of privacy.

4 Park Road Tring - 26 January 2016

Objection

Although it is a suitable site for the construction of some houses, I object to this application on the grounds of over-development. The development would be too dense.

As some of the neighbouring houses in Longfield Road are bungalows, it is not feasible to have high dwellings looking down into their rooms.

There is not enough provision for parking on the site, which will mean vehicles trying to park in Longfield Road and Western Road which are already crowded.

The volume of cars needing to exit on to Western Road from this substantial development of 37 houses, would overload Western Road where it has become impossible for two-way traffic already, because of so many parked cars.. This will be even more of a problem when LA5 is expedited along past the cemetery.

The maximum height of the houses should be two-storey.

Possibly a plan for about 20 houses would be more acceptable.

1 Longfield Road - 26 January 2016

Objection

I object to the proposal in its present (minutely revised) form.

I agree with direct neighbours' concerns about their privacy due to the height of some of the proposed houses and their window placements. All the three storey buildings should be reduced to two.

I feel strongly that the density of houses is still far too high to make a pleasant environment for its future inhabitants, and that there is a lack of provision of amenity and recreation space (the sloping bit by the main road, though nice to have, being of very limited recreational use).

I questioned at the presentation meeting last Autumn (and continue to do so) the lack of any flats, without gardens, for both elderly retired folk and young professionals.

I also would like to express my concern that 'affordable housing' may no longer mean anything when the first resident of a particular house decides to sell. Somehow, the affordability of the houses in the future needs to be controlled and maintained by the council.

It is pleasing to note that concerns about trees with preservation orders seem to have been addressed. The choice of trees close to the boundaries of the site need to be carefully considers, vis-à-vis the light reaching properties in neighbouring roads.

26 Longfield Road - received 27 January 2016

Objection

Since the closure of the school we accept that some development of the site is inevitable. There are some positive features of the proposal. In particular we support the closing of the any access route from Longfield Road which historically was very problematic.

However we object to the proposals as they stand because there are several issues that need addressing

1) Overdevelopment of the plot comprising the current access way from Longfield Road (House A&B)

We strongly oppose the proposal for two properties on this site on the following basis

We note the implication in the pre-application response in April 2015 that implies the developer initially proposed one property in this plot. Your draft response ([link here](#)) suggested two houses because of potential for overlooking with one house to the neighbouring property.

As we are the neighbouring property (the other side being a scout hut) we feel that the impact of one property, sensitively designed, would be much less than two properties; for the following reasons:

Overlooking: A single property within the same envelope would result in less overlooking at the back.

Parking: It is reasonable to assume that a two bedroom house in Tring would attract couples, with two cars. On street parking in the evenings on Longfield Road is currently at capacity, and the potential addition of four extra vehicles (and removal of one area to park) could only make this worse. This would cause problems for the Scouts when parents drop their children off. Dacorum Borough Council specify just 1.5 parking spaces per two bedroom house, but the off street parking provided on the plans are only one.

Overdevelopment of the plot and character: In comparison with the adjacent plots, two properties with very small gardens are out of character and look and feel

squeezed into the site. The specific designs are not inspiring and do not appear to match neighbouring properties.

Play Street: Longfield Road is Hertfordshire's first 'Play Street' and has a permanent order under the Play Street section of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 that allows the residents to close the street to through traffic once Sunday afternoon a month. The plot is within the main section of the street used for play. A single family home rather than two two-bed properties would derive more benefit from being in a Play Street.

2) Unacceptable overlooking from the two houses (H1&2) that will back on to us

We live in a bungalow with our main living areas on an extension to the back. There is a wide patio window. The first floor windows of these properties would provide a clear view into our main living areas and represent significant loss of privacy.

We would be significantly less impacted if the houses were further away or if they were bungalows. There is a need in Tring for bungalow accommodation for older residents, for which there is currently no provision on the site.

This block would overlook our entire garden area and look directly into the main living areas at the back of our house. There is nothing on the plans that would appear to provide any mitigating screening. This would be an unacceptable loss of privacy.

These houses would also require the destruction of the row of beech trees. Most of these are currently protected by a preservation order. The developers proposed to destroy this row of trees, on the basis of some spores of *Kretzschmaria Deutsa* being observed. They acknowledge that it is impossible to tell whether this means the trees are significantly affected by disease or not. The proposal to fell the entire lot would appear excessive and we would welcome a formal opinion from the local Tree Officer. We suggest two alternatives that would be more acceptable.

1) Retention of the beech trees and using the area as amenity and play space for the development itself. The mix of the development means that there will be families living in the development. It is not clear where the children would be able to play outside. On the plans the only amenity space is limited to the steep slope near the main road and the verges of the drive. This would appear to be inadequate or unsuitable for outdoor play. The development is cut off from parks or other outside spaces by busy major roads. The Tring Play Survey (2015) indicated that natural outside areas are highly valued as play space (more so than formal play equipment) and the area around the tree could form some really usable natural amenity space.

OR

Retention of the larger Beech trees and a one story development suitable for older residents. This could potentially fit in a similar area to H1&2, without the tree destruction and /or without the gross loss of privacy of the current proposals. It would also allow some provision in the development for older people which Tring has a need for, and which would allow downsizing and release of existing family properties elsewhere in the town.

2) Objection to proposed widening of T junction without other traffic calming measures

Road speeds on Aylesbury Road are a concern; appropriate traffic calming should be included at the junction of the access road with Aylesbury Road, rather than simply a T junction.

3.) Objection to overall density, design and character of development

The design of the development is uninspiring and has been described by the County Councillor as 'rows of barracks'. The three story nature of large parts of the development is not typical for west Tring, which is predominantly two story houses. The layout does not suggest a community – there is no central green or amenity area which could provide a focus for community interaction or outside play. Instead there are two inadequate 'amenity' areas at the edges of the development, plus the steep borders of the main access road, which in practice would have limited amenity.

The fundamental issue seems to be the cramming in of the maximum number of houses.

The design could be so much better and really offer a new community with a focus rather than another dormitory type development. Reducing the development to 25 or so houses with central amenity space would help solve these issues.

35 Cobbetts Ride - received 28 January 2016

Objection

"We write to offer our additional views as residents of Cobbetts Ride on the proposed Mountleigh Development Holdings Ltd -Tring Heights development on the site of the former Francis House preparatory school , Aylesbury Road, Tring.

The development subject to planning agreement if it goes ahead will we feel directly impact our and our neighbours property which will back onto the development as we currently look out onto the tennis court / orchard area of the former preparatory school. Whilst the plans for the development have been altered to counter objections

from local residents we still feel there are some additional changes that should be made to the development before any agreement to proceed is granted due to remaining impacts on our properties and outlook.

We were also disappointed to note that whilst looking through the planning applications / notes at the Tring Council offices the complete objections from local residents appears to not have been taken into consideration and made public. It appears that the developers / planning office have just cut and pasted the less objectionable negative comments into the planning applications rather than the complete residents objections ? We are guessing this is to make the development look more favourable or the negative comments more balanced vs the few favourable comments. This from our perspective seems to be very underhand and a smoke and mirrors tactic on the behalf of the developers.

The remaining impacts which in our opinion still need additional thought are as follows:

1. We are happier that the four dwellings that were originally planned for the tennis court area has been reduced to three and we wish it to be clarified that this change now allows for the original target of ensuring that 23.5 metres of separation is achieved between the nearest tennis court area property H26.2B and our property The Hollies, 35 Cobbetts Ride, Tring, HP23 4BZ. Your plan currently show 21 metres separation. The ideal scenario is that the tennis courts are turned over to public use by local residents or sports space. The ideal scenario for the tennis court plot is three bungalows – affordable or for the elderly or sold as retirement properties this we feel would be acceptable to the Cobbetts Ride, Abstacle Hill and Cherry Gardens residents.

2. We are also still concerned that we will still be overlooked by what appears from your preliminary drawings and plans that a dormer window on the South East side of the roof space on property H26 / 2B will face the rear of The Hollies, 35 Cobbetts Ride, Tring and will look directly into our garden, dining room, living room and two bedrooms and thus we feel this will encroach on our current level of privacy. We are at a loss to understand your reasoning for placement of this dormer window in what is shown as a roof storage space and not intended for occupation or habitable space or is it that you wish to market the properties as having potential for further habitable space within the roof area ?

Please also clarify if the South East facing bathroom window on H26.2B will only have limited top glazing opening capacity for ventilation and will be opaque as we feel it is inappropriate to look from our property into our neighbours bathrooms. Again ideal scenario for the tennis court plot is three bungalows – affordable or for the elderly or sold as retirement properties this we feel would be acceptable to the

Cobbetts Ride, Abstacle Hill and Cherry Gardens residents or it could remain as some sort of sports space for local residents.

3. We think from observation of sunlight / shadow in the early afternoon that that the next row of what appears to be seven proposed dwellings and which will be built on the main plot (former playing / sports field) will significantly reduce the sunlight and cause shadowing to the back gardens of 31,33,35 and 37 Cobbetts Ride due to the main plot being significantly higher by 1.5 – 2.25 metres and the lie of the land that 37,35,33 and 31 are built on and which is significantly lower than the tennis court plot and the current playing / sports field plot. We appreciate that you may have done sunlight / shadow modelling but we would suggest that more attention is paid to this element and perhaps modelling different seasons , months of the year to ensure that sunlight is not significantly eroded to the mentioned properties and thus making the rear gardens of the current dwellings in Cobbetts Ride that will be adjacent to the proposed development to be in shadow for a significant part of the spring / summer months or suggest some form of compensation. We would welcome you to observe / experience / record the current levels of shadowing and sunlight levels from the rear gardens of 31,33 35 and 37 Cobbetts ride at varying times during the mornings and afternoons spring / summer of 2016. I would expect the current levels of sunlight / shadowing to be maintained and not eroded further by the development. The developments that we feel will still cause loss of natural light and shadowing in the afternoon hours are H19.2B , H20.3B, H21.3B, H22.3B, H23.2B. We feel that these properties built on the higher part of the development plot should be affordable properties in the form of bungalows or bungalows for the elderly. The reduced height would we feel then become acceptable to the residents of 37, 35, 33 and 30 Cobbetts Ride. The ideal scenario for the plot is for these properties to be built as bungalows this we feel would be acceptable to the Cobbetts Ride, Abstacle Hill and Cherry Garden residents.

5. Having reviewed the proposed plans in more detail we have been astounded at the number of trees that the developers are proposing to fell including mature trees / the remains of the convent orchard that separates the tennis courts from the residents of Abstacle Hill. We feel very strongly along with other nearby residents that the development should allow for and accommodate the current trees on the plot within the scheme as a feature rather than felling them to squeeze in additional properties and parking. The residents along Cobbetts Ride directly in front of our properties have declared that they suffer ingress of water from plots higher up and behind their properties. This water probably originates from the convent plot and drains down through the chalk into Cobbetts Ride. By felling as many trees as planned this will surely have a negative impact and allow more water to soak away from the convent plots and down into Cobbetts Ride. By leaving as many trees as possible on the development will soak up some of this water and reduce the impact to Cobbetts Ride residents who already suffer. They also absorb noise and act as a sound absorbing barrier. We feel the developers have not really thought this through

or bothered to really assess the impact of felling as many trees as they can in the hope of achieving more profit from the development. – Make the Developer Keep the Trees or minimise the felling of trees which are slowly disappearing within Tring and is causing Tring to lose its sleepy country market town feel!

6. Will the developers consider replacing the boundary fence running along the rear of 37,35,33 and 30 Cobbetts Ride with a newer more substantial fence line and which could also be increased in height by another 24” to 36”

7. We feel that the proposed development would also reduce the value of the properties 37,35,33 and 31 Cobbetts Ride due to the change of outlook, increased vehicular noise levels and the potential decrease of light and privacy currently enjoyed by the residents occupying 37,35,33 and 31 Cobbetts Ride.

8. We feel that parking spaces have also not been adequately allowed for as you propose one parking spot per dwelling which ultimately means on road parking for additional vehicles. We currently suffered difficult access to our properties due the poorly thought through later developments in Cobbetts Ride which again were built with provision for single vehicle parking. This has resulted in the occupants with more than one vehicle per family parking on the road and this has prevented vehicular access to the properties 37,35,33 and 31 by emergency vehicles due to the road narrowing and cars being parked on the road either side of the latter end of Cobbetts Ride. We feel that the limited parking would result in on road parking and as per the latter end of Cobbetts Ride which we feel has not adequately been thought through or monitored and reviewed would prevent access by emergency vehicles.

We will be keen to hear the developers responses / additional observation / communication with the residents of 37,35,33 and 31 Cobbetts Ride and to hear the developers thoughts on any further proposed changes that could be made to the proposed Tring Heights development to offset some of the negative impacts this development may have on the residents of Cobbetts Ride and Cherry Gardens as well as impacts to residents of Longfield Road.

We would also still like to understand how you intend to allocate the affordable housing to Tring residents only and as some of the development is intended and what provisions / investments are to be made for the increased need for access to GP surgeries and schooling for families that may occupy this development especially with potential further developments to the west of Tring. I would also be interested in the types of families these affordable homes would be offered to – Working families or very low income / supported families? as we feel this may also have a detrimental effect on the value of our properties in Cobbetts ride but positive to the landowners who will I expect make significant profit from this development at the residents of No's 37,35,33 and 31's expense.

Our current thoughts are that this site should be retained for school facilities to accommodate the proposed future West Tring housing developments.

We welcome change and the opportunity of affordable housing for Tring residents but not an additional overloading of current schools, GP surgeries and current lack of social and community facilities and increased traffic on Western Road.

Further comments 2 February 2016

We write to offer our additional concerns for our neighbours as residents of Cobbetts Ride on the proposed Mountleigh Development Holdings Ltd -Tring Heights development on the site of the former Francis House preparatory school , Aylesbury Road, Tring.

The development subject to planning agreement if it goes ahead will we feel directly impact our and our neighbours property which will back onto the development as our property and many others in Cobbetts Ride have been built at a considerably lower height than the current school site and proposed development.

Our concerns are that the proposed building of properties on the old St Francis school land will impact our properties that site below the plot level due to rain water run-off. We noticed that the development proposal by Mountleigh Development Holdings Ltd necessities the removal of many well established trees and the orchard area next to the tennis courts and large areas of hard standings and roads for vehicle parking.

The residents along Cobbetts Ride directly in front of our properties have declared that they suffer ingress of water from plots higher up and behind their properties. This water probably originates from the convent plot and drains down through the chalk into Cobbetts Ride. By felling as many trees as planned this will surely have a negative impact and allow more water to soak away from the convent plots and down into Cobbetts Ride. By leaving as many trees as possible on the development will soak up some of this water and reduce the impact to Cobbetts Ride residents who already suffer.

We feel the removal of many established trees, the orchard and the development of this site with housing will cause considerably more water run off than current which will flow away from the St Francis land via the plots on Cobbetts Ride and cause more problems with water damage.

Currently within our plot 35 Cobbetts Ride which is built into a chalk and earth bank in front of but below the tennis court area are suffering from ingress of water as a

result of rain water run-off from the undeveloped plot and will need to undertake a survey to determine the cause

We would propose that additional thought / research be taken into account by Dacorum planning department and Mountleigh Development Holdings Ltd to better understand the impact of the tree felling plan and rain water run-off from the development site and its impact on certain plots in Cobbetts Ride."

1A Longfield Road - received 28 January 2016

Objection

I strongly oppose this development of 37 houses in Longfield Rd, on the following grounds:

1. Parking.

This area is already heavily congested with parked cars, causing a safety problem especially if emergency vehicles need access. Most houses have 2 cars & the lack of on-site parking being made available is woefully inadequate.

2. Trees

The destruction of mature trees on the site is of great concern, changing the character & natural beauty of the area. This negatively impacts on the wildlife.

2 Abstacle Hill - received 29 January 2016

Objection

i would like to object to the development in its present form for a number of reasons. Although I am not a direct neighbor the height of the proposed houses is such that it will take a large amount out of my skyline. where it is known that the houses in Cobbetts ride bordering this development will be overshadowed, my own back door and patio door is another 10 feet lower than the level of these houses. The elevation of the land taking in Abstacle hill is sloping over two planes,NW-SE as well as W-E. This will take out another chunk of sky from the block backing onto the bungalows in Abstacle hill, blocking out the light,sky and evening un from my solar panels. The type of houses and the number of houses are not in keeping with the surrounding area. I would seem a better use of the land would be a set of two bed bungalows. This may encourage older people in larger houses to downsize giving a boost to the area overall.

I am also very concerned about the run off of rainwater. As I live on the lower part of Abstacle hill during heavy downpours the water from Cherry gardens and above my property pours down the hill in a torrent. The ground on the development plot will be covered in a vast amount of concrete and paving etc so heavy rainwater will not soak into the ground as at present but will flow off down the hill to the rear of the houses in Cobbetts ride and Abstacle hill. It is stated that the developer is liable to ensure the flow away is sufficient but where to? Will any flood risk assessment take account of this flow or any down onto Western road in the vicinity of St Josephs care home. At a recent council meeting it was mentioned that there is a spring on this area which flows into a culvert in Cobbetts ride and on to Goldfield road, Friars walk to the silk mill. Excess flow or surface water could well upset the balance and flow of this culvert causing flooding elsewhere in the town.

The traffic entry and exit from the Aylesbury road will cause even more problems to Western road than the considerable trouble now. This section of a main road into the town has become an accident waiting to happen with emergency vehicles held up in what is a virtually one carriageway road.

Daisy Cottage, 38 Longfield Road - 31 January 2016

Objection

Daisy Cottage is situated adjacent to the Scout Hut. Its southern boundary and part of its western boundary adjoin the site. The three-storey block comprising Houses H1 & H2 is situated just 3m from the junction of these two boundaries. Both proposed houses and the side of House H2 overlook Daisy Cottage and its garden, not to mention a number of neighbours.

Having studied the submitted application drawings and supporting information, we write to confirm our objection to the proposed development. If all avenues to retain Educational Use have been exhausted (please confirm that this is the case), then we would not object to the general principle of residential development on the site.

In our view, the Application is contrary to Dacorum Planning Policy and would result in harm to the character of the area and cause a significant loss of amenity to our dwelling through a loss of private residential amenity due to overlooking. Our objections are set out below for the Council's consideration alongside Policies CS11 (Quality of Neighbourhood Design), CS12 (Quality of Site Design), CS13 (Quality of the Public Realm), of the adopted Core Strategy.

Policy CS11 states that development should respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and respect its general character. The proposals have a density of 34 dwellings per hectare (excluding the amenity areas) whereas the density of the surrounding streets varies between 20 and 23

dwellings per hectare – this ratio is therefore around 60% higher resulting in it being the densest open housing development anywhere in Tring. This would suggest that a development of around 20 dwellings would be more appropriate and in keeping with the Character Area Appraisal for TCA 2 (Miswell Lane) which clearly states that development should be “maintained in the low range compatible with the existing character.” It is therefore apparent that the proposals do not comply with Policy CS11 in that they fail to respect the density of the surrounding areas.

The size of typical rear gardens surrounding the site range from 200 m² to 350 m², whereas the majority of the rear gardens of the proposed dwellings are very small ranging from 72 m² to 120 m². In this regard, the proposals do not respect the character of the surrounding area. The pre-application advice also called for gardens front and rear – there are no front gardens.

Policy CS12 part (c) states that development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties. The proposed development would result in a significant visual intrusion to our property, in particular by proposed houses H1 and H2, which are immediately adjacent to our rear boundary. No separation has been allowed for by the architects of these new dwellings and our property, the only separation being the garden which is used extensively for 9 months of the year. The proposed siting of houses H1 and H2 will cause an intolerable loss of privacy to our property, especially the garden, and as such we strongly object to the proposals. Due to this visual intrusion and loss of privacy, the proposals are contrary to Policy CS12 part (c). H1 & H2 are three storeys high (actually 10m high) and will also create an unpleasant enclosing effect on our house and rear garden. We have attached before and after photographs, which show the extent of the engulfing, overlooking and loss of amenity. NB Existing adjoining properties in Longfield Road are generally 6m – 7m high.

Proposed House H2 is also set only 10m away from our external home office building. This building is fully insulated, heated, lit and used throughout the year and will lose sunlight in the winter months.

Part (d) of policy CS12 states that the development should retain important trees or replace them with suitable species if their loss is justified. There are a number of TPOs on site, and we understand that it was recommended to the developer to retain these. However, the plans show the removal of several of these trees (T1, T2, T3, T4, T7 and T8 in the Arboricultural Report, as well as many trees which are protected by a group TPO). Thereby the proposals are contrary to Policy CS12 part (d).

Policy CS12 part (g) (reiterated in the pre-application advice) states that the development should respect adjoining properties in terms of: i) layout; ii) security; iii)

site coverage; iv) scale; v) height; vi) bulk; vii) materials; and viii) landscaping and amenity space.

The scale of the development is also too dense for its location, as discussed above, as well as being too high. We understand that it was recommended to the developer in pre-application advice that the dwellings should not exceed two storeys in height. However, the developer has apparently disregarded this advice, which has resulted in proposals which are far too bulky and obtrusive for their location. As such, in our opinion, the proposals are contrary to Policy CS12 part (g). If proposed houses H1 & H2 are to remain, these should be changed to bungalows. Added benefit is that the mix is improved and the development will be more inclusive for all generations.

Policy CS13 states that new development will be expected to contribute to the quality of the public realm by promoting pedestrian friendly spaces and including appropriate lighting, among other things. Apart from the path leading into the site from Aylesbury Road, there are no pedestrian walkways within the site. There are also no details submitted as to how routes through the site will be lit. This will have to be undertaken sensitively to minimise any light pollution to existing properties. As such, the proposals are contrary to Policy CS13.

The Developer should be requested to provide additional drawing to demonstrate the relationship of the proposal to the surround buildings and streets or add this information to the submitted drawings - in particular the three images on drawing PL26 could be expanded/extended to take in the surroundings and show the outlines of the existing properties as seen between the new blocks of houses.

We understand that the Developer had originally only proposed infilling of the gap in Longfield Road with a single detached house. It is a very narrow plot - about the width of the neighbouring bungalow and of our plot and of several others nearby. Two parking spaces for two houses is insufficient and will create further problems in Longfield Road. Shouldn't the Developer revert to the original proposition to avoid overwhelming the single-storey properties on either side?

Previous planning applications have been turned down in the vicinity because of overlooking issues and others been allowed only on the basis that modifications are incorporated to prevent overlooking. We trust the same rigorous attention will be applied to this application. In this respect, we draw particular attention to the following applications:

4/00670/11/FUL, 4/00163/12/FUL & 4/00128/12/FUL – No 82 Longfield Road + No82a

4/01429/11/FHA and 4/01579/01/FHA - Daisy Cottage, 38 Longfield Road

4/02021/03/FUL – Scout Hut (between Daisy Cottage and No 26)

4/01112/09/FHA – No 26 Longfield Road

4/00832/12/FUL – No 24 Longfield Road

4/02257/07/FHA, 4/00832/12/FUL & 4/02459/15/FHA - No 22 Longfield Road

All the above, had issues of overlooking and compatibility with neighbours and effect on amenity which will also be relevant to the current application.

Attached are various images which the Architect has not chosen to include and which demonstrate the unacceptable impact that their proposal will have on the neighbouring properties.

In summary, we contend that this Application is contrary to policy and will result in a loss of residential amenity to our property and have a negative impact on the character of this part of Tring.

A wonderful opportunity to create an attractive and desirable place to live on this important site will be lost if this Application is approved.

Many think Tring deserves something better and that it complies with Dacorum's policies on respecting the character of local area in terms of massing, density, respecting privacy and providing decent homes with decent gardens.

29 Cobbetts Ride - 31 January 2016

As you will see from the plans we have a long boundary adjoining the proposed development which currently has a single storey School building , a Sports Hall and a Chapel with virtually no windows overlooking our house.

The proposals are to replace these structures with 9 two and three storey houses which will then have approximately 18 windows overlooking us, quite an alarming change, we would hope that these could be single storey dwellings or sunk into the ground to lessen the impact as was the case when No's 31 to 37 Cobbetts Ride were constructed, at the very least we would like to see some form of proposed /enforceable in perpetuity, landscaping/tree planting scheme to minimise the overlooking and potential noise from the 9 gardens that will adjoin us.

The whole scheme seems to be a vast over development of the site and coupled with the proposed site further along Aylesbury Road the local infrastructure will start to burst at the seams unless it is improved as a condition of granting planning permission for such schemes.

Another concern however is the amount of car parking spaces and the access.

It is mind boggling to allow just 74 spaces for 37 family homes, 2 each including visitors spaces ? most families now have at least 3 cars so where are they going to park in a development with only 1 access ?

With regard to the access which is no more than a driveway barely wide enough for two cars to pass with no pedestrian access.

When the School was still in use I believe the Highways Agency and the Police advised that a one way system was put in place with cars entering the Longfield Road entrance and exiting at the Aylesbury Road entrance to alleviate congestion due to the driveway being too narrow for passing cars combined with pedestrians, with the proposal closing the Longfield Road entrance the problem at the Aylesbury Road entrance will now be magnified especially when the driveway becomes impassable due to snow or ice as has happened on numerous occasions, with the potential for 74 cars to be parked on the Aylesbury Road.

We have been informed by the developers that the driveway cannot/will not be widened because of the impact on tree roots, with an assurance that the trees will remain in place we would be interested to see how this problem can be solved, we would suggest less houses with more parking spaces.

58 Longfield Road - received 1 February 2016

Whatever form the development eventually takes, we would make the following points.

ECOLOGICAL CONCERNS

The arboricultural and bat surveys look adequate.

Please ensure that the conditions re the bats, as detailed in the survey and specified by the Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust, are complied with fully.

In relation to the trees, one major concern is to ensure that the Root Protection Area of the retained trees is respected.

This would mean that the road for the houses in block C should be at least 7+ metres from the trees on the boundary, shown as group G5, or I think Trees T 96 – 99 in the Arboricultural report. We cannot tell from the plans that we have seen what the distance is in the plans as they stand at the moment. It is also vital that it is made physically impossible for cars and/or motorbikes to be parked on the grass areas around these trees.

With reference to the Beech trees T1-T8 in the Sylva numbering, we appreciate that T1 and T2 should be felled and replaced, due to the fungal decay, but the others should be retained, as recommended in the Arboricultural report.

So much wildlife is losing its habitat with this development, that the retention of as many trees and as much grassland as possible should be a priority.

ENVIRONMENT - LIGHTING

Presumably the street lighting will be such that the light is directed downwards, not adding to night-time light pollution.

How will the specified conditions to maintain the dark corridor for the bats be upheld? There must also be rigorous regulation of any external lighting that residents may wish to install.

OBJECTIONS TO THE CURRENT PROPOSALS

DENSITY

The proposed density of housing is out of keeping with Tring as a whole and especially with reference to the relevant Character Area. It would also make life miserable for the residents of the site. The development principles for the Character Area TCA1 state that the density should be compatible with the existing density range (less than 15 dwellings/ha). So the current proposed 37 dwellings is massively excessive.

HEIGHTS

No wonder the development has been called "Tring Heights". The proposed houses are very tall, out of keeping with the area, and exceed the development principles for the Character Area TCA1, which state that the height of housing should not exceed two storeys.

Also they are not laid out sympathetically with regard to the topography of the site. The effect of these high buildings on the residents around the boundary would be overpowering and depressing.

PARKING

The parking provision may meet Dacorum's standard but this standard urgently needs to be revised. If not increased on the Francis House site, there are likely to be significant problems, with conflict between neighbours on the site and in the surrounding areas, and potentially unsafe parking on the Aylesbury road. Also, as indicated above, there would be parking on areas designated as "green", unless this is made physically impossible.

DESIGN

There do not appear to be any pavements within the site, let alone ones wide enough to take double children's buggies. Walking on the road, with cars, delivery vans, etc., is not a safe or pleasant option.

Minute front gardens, and small back gardens is again not in keeping the character of the area.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

We appreciate that houses are needed, but with the development proposals in the pipeline for Tring there is a need for more school provision. It is therefore a great pity that the Francis House site could not be used for a school. We understood that there was a group willing to take over the school, but this offer was refused. We are told that there is latent provision in the existing schools, without taking away play space or sports space. If this is the case, "latent" must be interpreted as "well hidden".

59 Longfield Road - received 1 February 2016

Objection

The site looks over developed and out of character with the surrounding buildings. With the amount of housing proposed compared to the available parking, there will parking overflow issues which I suspect will spill out onto London Road creating traffic issues entering and exiting from Tring. Parking in Longfield Road is currently up to capacity, the two proposed houses will not help this situation. Please consider providing 2 parking bays per house or reduce the planning to one house which would be more appropriate considering the location.

33 Cobbetts Ride - received 1 February 2016

Objection

We have received details of the above planning application and wish to raise our objections to the proposed development for the reasons given below.

We are concerned about the overlooking aspect for the neighbouring properties in Cherry Gardens, Abstacle Hill and Cobbetts Ride, particularly as many of the proposed properties are more than two storeys in height. In the submitted Design and Access Statement it appears that the applicant is endeavouring to indicate that a greater proportion of existing local properties in the area comprise 2½ or 3 storeys than is actually the case. In this location on two sides of the tennis courts the adjacent properties are bungalows and the majority of properties the local vicinity are single or two storey homes.

The development is not in keeping with the area in that the density is much higher than the surrounding properties, which are mainly detached with some semi-

detached and not terraced. Also the gardens are much smaller if these are deemed to be family homes, consideration should be given to providing suitable civic amenities in such a large development.

As the name 'Tring Heights' suggests the former school grounds are located on an elevated position above the surrounding existing homes and building the proposed dwellings would cause overshadowing and loss of privacy to many of these neighbouring properties. Indeed the application drawings showing the elevations of units H.24-H.26 (such as drawings PL10, PL12, PL21 and PL22) show clearly that the ridge line of the proposed dwellings is significantly above the ridge lines of the existing homes in Cherry Gardens and Cobbetts Ride. The local topography does not appear to have been taken into consideration as the height differential between existing and new homes would be considerable due to the level changes in the area. For this reason we believe that any development should comprise no more than one or two storey homes.

How much natural daylight and direct sunlight will these homes lose if the proposed development were to proceed? At the consultation event it was indicated that some modelling of the shadowing effect had been undertaken but the assessment appears limited as it has not taken into account seasonal variations, as a result for half the year when the sun is lower the neighbouring properties in Cherry Gardens, Abstacle Hill and Cobbetts Ride would be likely to receive little direct sunlight.

We do not believe that homes in such an elevated position overlooking existing properties should be any more than two storeys to minimise the visual intrusion to the existing residents. We are concerned over the loss of privacy due to the close proximity of the proposed dwellings which would overlook habitable rooms of the existing nearby homes and their private gardens. What is the required minimum distance between proposed new dwellings and existing dwellings? For example the drawings appear to show that the distance between H.24 and the existing adjacent property would only be 16m and just 21m between H.26 and the nearest home. Will the proposed homes be required to have obscured glazing and non-opening windows where they overlook habitable rooms of neighbouring properties? How will privacy be protected?

The planning issue drawings (such as PL10, PL11, PL12 and PL22) appear to show some sort of structure towards the front of H.26, which could be in the region of 3m tall. No further detail or description is apparent and we request that more information is made available to enable full consideration and comment by the public.

The planing application does not appear to provide sufficient details of the hard and soft landscaping proposals. We would wish to see more information about the landscaping and in particular the proposals for the site boundaries. For example who will be responsible for maintaining the landscaping between the Amenity Area

adjacent to H.27 and the left side of H.26 alongside the boundaries to 31, 33, and 35 Cobbetts Ride? This area does not appear to fall within the front or rear gardens of the proposed properties.

The planning application is not clear about which properties are to be designated as affordable housing and we would therefore wish to receive more details regarding this aspect to enable full consideration and comments to be made regarding the proposed unit and tenure mix.

We believe there could be issues with potential surface water run off due to the increased amounts of hard landscaping on the site and as a consequence rain water running from higher ground in 'Tring Heights' down towards the lower lying surrounding properties.

The loss of the open green space and some of the trees (which we believed were protected by a Tree Preservation Order dated 22nd July 2014, ref 544) is a concern both on the grounds of exacerbating surface water run off (as mentioned above) and in terms of loss of wildlife habitat. The ecology reports submitted as part of the application refer to bats, owls and numerous other species on the site. Will the developer be required to provide bird or bat boxes etc. to mitigate the loss of such habitats?

If any of the existing trees are to be felled, they should be replaced with mature trees of similar variety. The presence of fungus on a tree is not necessarily cause for concern however, and often trees have fungi present yet continue to thrive.

The proposed parking provision of 74 parking spaces for 37 family homes would be grossly insufficient as most of the occupiers are likely to have at least two cars, so effectively no allowance has been made for parking for visitors or homes with more than two vehicles. Driving along the surrounding roads, particularly Longfield Road and Western Road, is already problematic due to the number of cars parked on both sides of the road. Will contributions be required for road safety improvements in the area? Such as the junction of Miswell Lane and Western Road (where visibility is regularly impaired by vehicles parking close to the junction) and the junction of the access road from 'Tring Heights' onto Aylesbury Road? The volume of cars exiting from the proposed development on to Aylesbury/Western Road would further increase the number of vehicles where it is already often difficult for two-way traffic to pass, because of so many parked cars. This will be further exacerbated when the LA5 site is developed as no doubt visitors will be forced to park on Aylesbury Road.

There have already been instances where emergency vehicles have been unable to drive along neighbouring roads. Will the proposed road layout on the development enable safe access by emergency / refuse vehicles when cars are parked along the roads?

In addition to encourage pedestrians (and reduce car journeys) it would seem sensible for a footpath to be included across the site to link Aylesbury Road and Longfield Road.

Given that the density of the development appears very high compared to the surrounding area, does Tring have sufficient infrastructure and facilities (including schools, dentists and GP surgeries) to support the proposed new homes?

In view of the above and the many valid points raised by others we feel the development is not in keeping with, and is inconsiderate of, the area.

25 Longfield Road - received 1 February 2016

Objection

We are concerned the two 3-storey houses that will front on to Longfield Road are proportionately too high in comparison to the adjacent buildings, such as the scout hut and bungalow that neighbours the scout hut. We question whether two houses can visually be accommodated on the proposed two house site and believe a single, two-storey house with 2-car driveway would be a better, more appropriate fit within the available space. These two houses assume one car per household, when most would concede 2-car households are today's norm. At the very least (not accounting for visiting friends and relatives) this will add two more cars to the already crowded parking situation on this part of Longfield Road, as well as adding to the increasing volume of cars at drop off and pick up when the scout hut is being utilised by Beavers, Cubs and Scouts etc.

The mature trees on the site act as screening and sound diffusion from the A41, felling these will diminish the area accordingly. Newly planted trees will take many years to be anything like as established with the same presence as the existing trees.

Further comments - 2 February 2016

I wanted to inform you that although I have no major objections to the proposed construction of the dwellings, I am concerned about the demolition of said buildings in particular the school building nearest the longfield rd entrance. The internal walls of this building are made of asbestos fibre board. I am sure the construction company will take down the walls in the appropriate manner, however I thought would bring this to your attention.

Tring Town Council – amended scheme

Tring Town Council remains opposed to the development on two counts.

1. Firstly, with regard to the principle of development on the former school site, it is felt that the application fails to satisfy Policy CS23 ["Existing social infrastructure will be protected unless appropriate alternative provision is made, or satisfactory evidence is provided to prove the facility is no longer viable. The re-use of a building for an alternative social or community service or facility is preferred"].

Hertfordshire County Councils assertion that there is sufficient latent capacity in Tring Schools to meet demand to 2031 has a caveat that it is conditional on detached playing fields being identified and secured. The provision of funds through the Community Infrastructure Levy or a Section 106 agreement, whilst welcomed, falls short of the practicalities of identifying and securing a plausible site necessary to ensure the facilities are actually provided. There is concern that whilst capacity may exist, this is in schools in the east of town – a situation that will be exacerbated by LA5.

A development of just residential houses does not qualify as ‘an alternative social or community service or facility’.

2. In terms of the development proposed there are issues, mainly of a technical nature, relating to boundary issues that still need to be address to mitigate the impact on neighbouring properties (such as overlooking/loss of privacy and/or overshadowing). The Town Council hopes that these can be resolved in a manner similar to the way in which the amendments dealt with several of the issues raised against the original application.

These issues are:

a. Replace plots H1 & H2 with a single dwelling. There was concern initially that a single dwelling would cause a loss of amenity through overlooking and this could be avoided by a pair of semi-detached houses. In practice the proposed solution makes the situation worse and had an additional dis-benefit by aggravating the parking problems in Longfield Road

b. Plots H22 & H23. Clarify the measures to be taken vis a vis Cherry Gardens to reduce overlooking, to ensure effective screening, and to manage that screening.

c. Amenity Areas. Clarify the on-going management and maintenance of these areas

d. Drainage. The potential repercussions of the development on the natural drainage need to be identified and mitigated as appropriate. Residents of Abstacle Hill report the area is prone to water streams. Building on the porous macadam tennis courts will make matters worse.

e. Ecology. The Council is concerned that a viable habitat is secured e.g. root protection areas of the retained trees are respected. Whilst the developer has met the requirements for the provision of car parking spaces, it is widely accepted that the requirements do not reflect present day car ownership. Therefore there will be

pressure within the site to park on verges, etc. A form of protection of the grass areas around trees to prevent this happening should be included in the proposal

Tring Town Council - 3 February 2016

Objection

"Tring Town Council has several reservations with regard to the proposed development of this site. As a consequence it recommends refusal of the application.

1. The topography of the site

It is not readily apparent how the land rises steeply from the Aylesbury Road/Western Road in the south and from Miswell Lane in the east. The site effectively sits close to the ridge with commanding views down the valley and to the Chilterns A.O.N.B opposite. The land then rises gradually towards the Icknield Way to the north.

With the exception of the dwellings facing Longfield Road, the developer has proposed buildings, that whilst not strictly three storey town houses, are tall at 9.75m high to get living accommodation in the roof space.

In the site layout the developer has made every effort to comply with the normal requirement of a distance 23m from habitable windows to habitable windows to avoid overlooking, however the topography and height of the proposed buildings require this should be increased.

There are particular points where issues of overlooking/loss of privacy and/or overshadowing are of concern:

Cherry Gardens
29 & 31 Cobbetts Ride
High Drive, Aylesbury Road

2. The Ecology of the Site

The bat survey identifies the site as one where bats roost and therefore a European licence is required. The Council is concerned that a viable habitat is also secured, especially given the removal of the vast majority of (larger) trees. The removal breaks an uninterrupted 'wildlife corridor'. The Town Council would like the assertion that trees subject to TPOs are diseased to be independently verified.

The Council would like assurances that the root protection areas of the retained trees are respected. Whilst the developer has met the requirements for the provision

of car parking spaces, it is widely accepted that the requirements do not reflect present day car ownership. Therefore there will be pressure within the site to park on verges, etc. A form of protection of the grass areas around trees to prevent this happening should be included in the proposal.

The potential repercussions of the development on the natural drainage need to be identified and mitigated as appropriate. Residents of Abstacle Hill report the area is prone to water streams. Building on the porous macadam tennis courts will make matters worse.

3. Traffic

The widening of the access road is welcomed as this will prevent vehicles waiting to turn out of the site 'backing-up' on an exceptional busy principle route into the town. The Town Council is surprised that Herts County Council, the Highways Authority, have not specified widening of the road to incorporate a dedicated lane for vehicles to turn right.

The Town Council would like to emphasize how busy Western Road/Aylesbury Road is, so whilst the visibility splays are good the sheer volume of traffic will make access onto and from the development difficult. This will only get worse with the completion of 200 houses in Local Area (development) 5 which is taking place just along from the site.

4. Design

The development principles of Tring Character Areas 1 (Aylesbury Road) & 2 (Miswell Lane) have relevance. Those for TCA1 are given below:

Type: detached and semi-detached dwellings are appropriate and encouraged

Height: should not exceed two storeys

Size: moderate to large sized dwellings are appropriate. The scale and bulk on new development should be sympathetic to that of existing buildings (with the exception of the larger structures at the Convent)

Density: should be compatible with the character within the existing density range (i.e. within the very low range <15 dwellings/ha)

The development principles for TCA2 are similar except the size should be small to medium. The statement for 'Type' is telling:

Type: a variety of dwelling types are acceptable, but should relate well in terms of type, design, scale, bulk and layout of nearby adjacent development

The construction of 9.75m high dwellings is not compatible with these development principles. A reduction in the height of the buildings would go a long way to mitigate

the concerns about overlooking, etc. and being out-of-keeping with adjacent properties.

5. Protection of Existing Social Infrastructure

Policy CS23 states that "Existing social infrastructure will be protected unless appropriate alternative provision is made, or satisfactory evidence is provided to prove the facility is no longer viable. The re-use of a building for an alternative social or community service or facility is preferred".

When closure of the school was announced, it was stated that it was no longer viable. Has this been subject to scrutiny?

The Town Council is suspicious of Hertfordshire County Council (HCC)'s education representations to Dacorum Borough Council's Core Strategy and Site Allocation Document which stated that there is sufficient latent school capacity in Tring to provide for housing growth to 2031. HCC did state, however, the expansion potential of the existing schools (at both primary and secondary) is dependent on detached playing fields being identified and secured.

The Town Council welcomes the developer's stated position of being willing to provide funds to offset the loss of the playing field and tennis courts and hopes that the 'niceties' of whether it is through the Community Infrastructure Levy or a Section 106 agreement does not inhibit this."

Environmental Health - received 15 January 2016

Advises that any permission which the Planning Authority may give shall include the following conditions:

"Noise on Construction/Demolition Sites

The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Control of Pollution Act 1974 relating to the control of noise on construction and demolition sites. And the best practicable means of minimising noise will be used. Guidance is given in British Standard BS 5228: Parts 1, 2 and Part 4 (as amended) entitled 'Noise control on construction and open sites'.

Construction of hours of working – plant & machinery

In accordance with the councils adopted criteria, all noisy works associated with site demolition, site preparation and construction works shall be limited to the following hours: 0800hrs to 1800hrs on Monday to Friday 0800hrs to 1230hrs Saturday, no works are permitted at any time on Sundays or bank holidays.

Dust

Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or by carrying out other such works that may be necessary to suppress dust. Visual monitoring of dust is to be carried out continuously and Best Practical Means (BPM) should be used at all times. The applicant is advised to consider the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance, Produced in partnership by the Greater London Authority and London Councils.

Asbestos

Prior to works commencing the applicant is recommended to carry out a survey to identify the presence of any asbestos on the site, either bonded with cement or unbonded. If asbestos cement is found it should be dismantled carefully, using water to dampen down, and removed from site. If unbonded asbestos is found the Health and Safety Executive at Woodlands, Manton Lane, Manton Lane Industrial Estate, Bedford, MK41 7LW should be contacted and the asbestos shall be removed by a licensed contractor.

Bonfires

Waste materials generated as a result of the proposed demolition and/or construction operations shall be disposed of with following the proper duty of care and should not be burnt on the site. Only where there are no suitable alternative methods such as the burning of infested woods should burning be permitted."

Crime Prevention - updated 4 April 2016

Thank you for further consulting me with regard to planning application 4/00029/16/MFA at Convent Of St Francis De Sales Preparatory School, Aylesbury Road, Tring, HP23 4DL for 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. (Additional plans).

Further comments

1. Rear Garden access gates: Setting Site and Zone plan shows rear garden access gates towards the rear building line along some of the semi-detached and terraced dwellings (zones C & E). To remove this large recess area between the dwellings which can be exploited for Anti-Social Behaviour the gates should be brought forward towards the front of the building line.

Otherwise I have no further comments to my earlier ones of 20th January, which for completeness I have copied below.

Thank you for consulting me with regard to planning application 4/00029/16/MFA at the Convent Of St Francis De Sales Preparatory School, Aylesbury Road, Tring HP23 4DL for demolition of all existing buildings. construction of 37 residential dwellings (including over 35% affordable housing), alterations to the existing vehicular access onto Aylesbury Road, landscaping and the introduction of informal public open space.

Comments

1. Security – ADQ and SBD:

In October 2015, Approved Document Q (ADQ) came into force that requires under Building Regulations dwellings are built to “Prevent Unauthorised Access”. This applies to any “dwelling and any part of a building from which access can be gained to a flat within the building”. Performance requirements apply to easily accessible doors and windows that provide access in any of the following circumstances:

- a. Into a dwelling from outside
- b. Into parts of a building containing flats from outside
- c. Into a flat from the common parts of the building

Achieving the Secured by Design award meets the requirements of Approved Document Q (ADQ), and there is no charge for applying for the Secured by Design award. I would ask that this information is passed by way of informative to the applicant.

Secured by Design part 2 physical security: If this development were to be built to the physical security of Secured by Design part 2, which is the police approved minimum security standard and also achieves ADQ. This would involve:

- a. All exterior doors to have been certificated by an approved certification body to BS PAS 24:2012, or STS 201 issue 4:2012, or STS 202 BR2, or LPS 1175 SR 2, or LPS 2081 SR B.
- b. Ground level exterior windows to have been certificated by an approved certification body to BS Pas 24:2012. All glazing in the exterior doors, and ground floor (easily accessible) windows next to or within 400mm of external doors to include laminated glass as one of the panes of glass.

These standards are entry level security and meet the Secured by Design part 2 physical security standard. Building to the physical security of Secured by Design, which is the police approved minimum security standard, will reduce the potential for

burglary by 50% to 75% and achieve ADQ. I would encourage the applicants to seek Secured by Design certification to this standard when it is built.

2. Cycle storage: Will there be cycle storage in sheds in the rear gardens? If so will there be a rear garden access alleyway for some of the dwellings? If so such alleyways are to be provided, then these should be secured with a self-closing lockable gate, so that offenders cannot get easy access to the rear of the properties (which is from where most burglaries occur).

Otherwise on the basis of information available I am content with the application.

I hope the above is of use to you in your deliberations and will help the development achieve that aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

69 – re safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.

& the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

010 – re Sec 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1984 – to prevent crime & disorder.

011 – re taking proportionate security measures being a central consideration to the planning and delivery of new developments and substantive retrofits.

& Dacorum Core Strategy policies:

CS12 – re safe access, layout and security

CS13 – re pedestrian friendly, shared spaces in appropriate places

Crime Prevention - received 20 January 2016

Comments

"1. Security – ADQ and SBD:

In October 2015, Approved Document Q (ADQ) came into force that requires under Building Regulations dwellings are built to “Prevent Unauthorised Access”. This applies to any “dwelling and any part of a building from which access can be gained to a flat within the building”. Performance requirements apply to easily accessible doors and windows that provide access in any of the following circumstances:

- a. Into a dwelling from outside
- b. Into parts of a building containing flats from outside
- c. Into a flat from the common parts of the building

Achieving the Secured by Design award meets the requirements of Approved Document Q (ADQ), and there is no charge for applying for the Secured by Design award. I would ask that this information is passed by way of informative to the applicant.

Secured by Design part 2 physical security: If this development were to be built to the physical security of Secured by Design part 2, which is the police approved minimum security standard and also achieves ADQ. This would involve:

A. All exterior doors to have been certificated by an approved certification body to BS PAS 24:2012, or STS 201 issue 4:2012, or STS 202 BR2, or LPS 1175 SR 2, or LPS 2081 SR B.

B. Ground level exterior windows to have been certificated by an approved certification body to BS Pas 24:2012. All glazing in the exterior doors, and ground floor (easily accessible) windows next to or within 400mm of external doors to include laminated glass as one of the panes of glass.

C. These standards are entry level security and meet the Secured by Design part 2 physical security standard. Building to the physical security of Secured by Design, which is the police approved minimum security standard, will reduce the potential for burglary by 50% to 75% and achieve ADQ. I would encourage the applicants to seek Secured by Design certification to this standard when it is built.

2. Cycle storage: Will there be cycle storage in sheds in the rear gardens? If so will there be a rear garden access alleyway for some of the dwellings? If so such alleyways are to be provided, then these should be secured with a self-closing lockable gate, so that offenders cannot get easy access to the rear of the properties (which is from where most burglaries occur).

3. Otherwise on the basis of information available I am content with the application.

I hope the above is of use to you in your deliberations and will help the development achieve that aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

69 – re safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.

& the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

010 – re Sec 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1984 – to prevent crime & disorder.

011 – re taking proportionate security measures being a central consideration to the planning and delivery of new developments and substantive retrofits.

& Dacorum Core Strategy policies:

CS12 – re safe access, layout and security

CS13 – re pedestrian friendly, shared spaces in appropriate places"

Thames Water - received 22 January 2016

No Objection

“Waste Comments

Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0800 009 3921. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

Water Comments

On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.”

Hertfordshire Property Services - received 3 February 2016

“I refer to the above mentioned application and am writing in respect of planning obligations sought by the County Council towards fire hydrants to minimise the impact of development on Hertfordshire County Council Services for the local community.

Based on the information provided to date we would seek the provision of fire hydrant(s), as set out within HCC's Planning Obligations Toolkit. We reserve the right to seek Community Infrastructure Levy contributions towards the provision of infrastructure as outlined in your R123 List through the appropriate channels.

All dwellings must be adequately served by fire hydrants in the event of fire. The County Council as the Statutory Fire Authority has a duty to ensure firefighting facilities are provided on new developments. HCC therefore seek the provision of hydrants required to serve the proposed buildings by the developer through standard clauses set out in a Section 106 legal agreement or unilateral undertaking.

Buildings fitted with fire mains must have a suitable hydrant provided and sited within 18m of the hard-standing facility provided for the fire service pumping appliance.

The requirements for fire hydrant provision are set out with the Toolkit at paragraph 12.33 and 12.34 (page 22). In practice, the number and location of hydrants is determined at the time the water services for the development are planned in detail and the layout of the development is known, which is usually after planning permission is granted. If, at the water scheme design stage, adequate hydrants are already available no extra hydrants will be needed.

Section 106 planning obligation clauses can be provided on request.

Justification

Fire hydrant provision based on the approach set out within the Planning Obligations Guidance - Toolkit for Hertfordshire (Hertfordshire County Council's requirements) document, which was approved by Hertfordshire County Council's Cabinet Panel on 21 January 2008 and is available via the following link:
www.hertsdirect.org/planningobligationstoolkit

In respect of Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 the planning obligations sought from this proposal are:

- (i) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Recognition that contributions should be made to mitigate the impact of development are set out in planning related policy documents. The NPPF states "Local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Conditions cannot be used cover the payment of financial contributions to mitigate the impact of a development (Circular 11/95: Use of conditions in planning permission, paragraph 83).

All dwellings must be adequately served by fire hydrants in the event of fire. The County Council as the Statutory Fire Authority has a duty to ensure fire fighting facilities are provided on new developments. The requirements for fire hydrant provision are set out with the Toolkit at paragraph 12.33 and 12.34 (page 22).

- (ii) Directly related to the development;

Only those fire hydrants required to provide the necessary water supplies for fire fighting purposes to serve the proposed development are sought to be provided by the developer. The location and number of fire hydrants sought will be directly linked to the water scheme designed for this proposal.

(iii) Fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development.

Only those fire hydrants required to provide the necessary water supplies for fire fighting purposes to serve the proposed development are sought to be provided by the developer. The location and number of fire hydrants sought will be directly linked to the water scheme designed for this proposal.

I would be grateful if you would keep me informed about the progress of this application so that either instructions for a planning obligation can be given promptly if your authority is minded to grant consent or, in the event of an appeal, information can be submitted in support of the requested provision.”

Hertfordshire Archaeology - received 19 February 2016

“Please note that the following advice is based on the policies contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposed development site lies on the outskirts of historic core of Tring, a medieval village. Evidence for prehistoric, Roman and medieval occupation is known from the wider vicinity, including the junction of two Roman Roads, Akeman Street and Viatores 173b. Although we only have projected courses for these routes, there is good archaeological evidence in support of their existence. Akeman Street is projected to run along the current application sites southern boundary. It is common for structures and settlements contemporary to the roads to be located directly off from their routes.

I believe that the position and details of the proposed development are such that it should be regarded as likely to have an impact on heritage assets with archaeological interest that may require mitigation through the planning process.

I recommend, therefore, that the following provisions be made, should you be minded to grant consent:

1. a programme of archaeological evaluation by means of trial trench methodology (prior to the demolition of extant structures).
2. a contingency for the archaeological investigation of any remains encountered
3. the analysis of the results of the archaeological work and the production of a report and an archive
4. such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the archaeological interest of the site.

These may include:

- a) the preservation of any remains in situ, if warranted
- b) appropriate archaeological excavation of any remains before any development commences on site
- c) archaeological monitoring of the groundworks

I believe that these recommendations are both reasonable and necessary to provide properly for the likely archaeological implications of this development proposal. I further believe that these recommendations closely follow para. 141, etc. of the National Planning Policy Framework, relevant guidance contained in the National Planning Practice Guidance, and the recently issued Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic England, 2015).

In this case two appropriately worded conditions on any planning consent relating to these reserved matters would be sufficient to provide for the level of investigation that this proposal warrants. I suggest the following wording:

Condition A

No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme for post investigation assessment
3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

Condition B

- i) Demolition/development shall take place in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A).
- ii) Each phase of the development shall not be occupied until the site investigation has been completed and the provision made for analysis in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A). The final phase of development shall not be occupied until the site investigation has been completed and the provision made for analysis in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition

(A) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

If planning consent is granted, then this office will be able to provide details of requirements for the investigation and to provide information on accredited archaeological contractors who may be able to carry out the work.

I hope that you will be able to accommodate the above recommendations. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information or clarification.”

Trees and Woodlands - received 19 February 2016

Tree currently on site

Tree retention in various parts of the site is satisfactory and uncontentious, there are a number at the rear of Longfield Road, some around the perimeter of the old tennis court and importantly both sides of the access drive that appear to remain as present.

The pecked lines that show tree retention are a bit sketchy down the drive and confirmation is needed that trees are to be retained or more detail if any are to be lost during any changes to the road layout.

The central line of trees, mainly horse chestnut were discounted from the TPO because of their poor condition and none are shown for retention.

The area for discussion comes on the western edge of the site near some old white pre-fab type buildings. Beech trees 1 – 8 are all close by and as part of the PreApp we have stated that we wish for this group of trees (or future replacement trees) to remain in this part of the site.

Sylva Consultancy have looked at trees 1 – 8 in some detail, I have some general observations and detailed comments in respect of these trees (I will use Sylva numbering)

All 8 beech trees were harshly pruned perhaps 25 years ago, this as noted by Sylva took the form of topping. Since then the crowns have re-formed and to the uninitiated eye have the appearance of normal trees. From this level of wounding there will be decay in all the trees at the pruning points. This situation is common and management of decay caused by physical wounding routine enough. I find that the variability of response in terms of ongoing management recommendations to be greater than it should be given the relative similarity in the subject matter – e.g. T3 – recommend 60% crown reduction to T8 - remove squirrel damage and deadwood.

T1 – I also found Kretzschmaria but had to get right down to ground level with a torch to find one fragment of the fungus right out on a long surface root. While I am in no doubt about the serious nature of this fungus, I am unconvinced about the effect it has had on this tree – the crown is fully budded to its extremities as noted in the report. Its my view that the recommended 50% crown reduction is excessive to deal with the issues we can see and as the author will know not a form of pruning at that level, which lends itself to beech trees.

I saw no exudates and the 'over extended limb' presumably refers to the long limb extending westwards which is easily dealt with via an appropriate crown reduction.

T2 – I excluded this tree from the TPO and concur with the Sylva report – fell

T3 – The levels of decay resulting from the previous topping are definitely more visible on this tree but not necessarily much different to other trees that received the same treatment. Its my view that the recommended 60% crown reduction is excessive to address the issues we can see and may well not assist the long term health of the tree.

T4 - A lesser reduction is recommended and more towards what is appropriate for these trees

T5 – As for T2, I excluded this tree from the TPO

T6 – As for T4

T7 & 8 - Deadwood removal recommended.

This group of trees is in my view, far more viable than the report suggests, in general the levels of pruning are in excessive to deal with the current management issues. As with mature beech, the treatment needs to be sensitive and no more than strictly needed to achieve reasonable levels of safety.