



Public Document Pack
**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
AGENDA**

**THURSDAY 15 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 7.00 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBER**

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 Guest (Chairman)
Councillor Birnie
Councillor Clark
Councillor Conway
Councillor Maddern
Councillor Matthews
Councillor Riddick

Councillor Ritchie
Councillor Whitman
Councillor C Wyatt-Lowe (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Fisher
Councillor Tindall
Councillor P Hearn
Councillor Bateman

For further information, please contact Katie Mogan or Member Support

AGENDA

7. **ADDENDUM** (Pages 2 - 20)

Agenda Item 7



DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
Thursday 15 February 2018 at 7.00 PM

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item 5a

4/01779/17/FUL - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW AND CONSTRUCTION OF 2 NEW SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGS. CONSTRUCTION OF 7 NEW TERRACED DWELLINGS ON LAND TO THE REAR OF 50-53 CHESHAM ROAD. NEW ACCESS ROAD TO TERRACES.

50 - 53 CHESHAM ROAD, BOVINGDON, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 0EA

Additional Representation

Rowans, Hempstead Road

There has been insufficient provision made for parking. The 3 storeys are very out of keeping with the area. The additional movement in and out for cars will cause traffic congestion at peak times. The density is too high for the area.

Page 26:Ecological Implications

This should read '...some vegetation'.

Conditions

Condition 11 should include reference to Condition 10:

'All remediation or protection measures identified in the Remediation Statement referred to in Condition 10 ' .

Objection

Dear Sirs,

As I cannot attend the meeting I would like to log my objection regarding the above planning application. This is one more of a continuing number of applications by developers seeking to overdevelop plots, without any regard for the local community to its suitability.

It also fails to address any need for affordable housing as, one can only assume, these will be sold at top of the market prices for a massive return.

In particular

- . The proposed 8 new residential dwellings is an unacceptable and excessive over development of the Chesham Road site which currently holds 4 houses.
- . Construction of seven 3-storey terraced houses in the rear garden area would result in a cramped and dense development, badly impacting the privacy and amenity of neighbouring homes.
- . The 7 terraced houses themselves are excessively high, bulky in massing and completely out of character with the homes in the neighbouring Chesham Road, Apple Court and Orchard Court area.
- . The proposed development would dramatically intrude on neighbouring homes with new associated vehicle movements, driveways, headlights, exhaust fumes, service vehicle access and increased noise into what are now quiet gardens.
- . To make matters worse there appears to be no provision for visitor parking for the proposed 7 terraced houses or for the 21 trash bins the units will require. The additional vehicle access onto the already very busy Chesham Road is unacceptable and will inevitably lead to considerable increased parking on the Chesham Road.
- . As proposed the scheme is contrary to Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the adopted Dacorum Core Strategy and Appendix 3 of the Local Plan.
- . If approved this precedent would open the door to similar overdevelopment all across Bovington.

Recommendation

As per the published report subject to the amendment of Condition 10.

Item 5b

4/03167/17/MFA - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION OF 31 DWELLINGS, ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING VEHICULAR ACCESS ON TO AYLESBURY ROAD, LANDSCAPING AND INTRODUCTION OF INFORMAL PUBLIC OPEN SPACE (AMENDED SCHEME)

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

Further representations have been received in relation to this application following publication of the report and are summarised below.

Hertfordshire Highways

With respect to sustainable transport contributions sought the highway authority confirmed that in this instance (noting previous application history and contributions sought) that an objection would not be raised to this planning application if the bus stop contributions were not sought.

Trees and Woodlands

No objection. Previous comments still relevant and the following details submitted by the applicant's agent noted:

- All common areas on the site will be maintained by a residents controlled management company;
- We have adjusted the positions of the proposed trees in the open space areas as suggested that these are illustrated on the revised site plan 16/3431/30A attached;
- Tree report is as previously referenced;
- The access drive at the junction of Aylesbury Road is to be modified in accordance with details previously approved under the consented scheme – no objection to proposed pruning that enables the site entrance to be utilised more fully;
- Soft landscaping details to be reserved by condition to include species, planting size, planting specification, location and maintenance regime.

Hertfordshire Lead Local Flood Authority

No objection if the applicant is proposing the same drainage arrangements for the site as per the previous application for 40 units.

If the Flood Risk Assessment / drainage proposals are exactly the same from the application for 40 units, the conditions will remain the same for this application and happy for you to use our previous conditions.

The applicant's agent has confirmed in writing that the FRA and drainage proposals for the current scheme are the same as the application for 40 units. As such, the conditions imposed relating to drainage set out in the published committee report are relevant and appropriate.

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5c

4/03153/17/FUL - CONSTRUCTION OF TWO NEW SEMI-DETACHED THREE-BEDROOM DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED ACCESS.

LAND TO THE REAR OF 21, 23 & 25 GROVE ROAD, TRING, HP23 5HA

Additional Plan



Tree Protection Fence (TPF) Specification
 Before the commencement of any work on-site (other than tree work), TPF is to be erected to protect the trees being retained in the position shown with a well line on the plan.
 Durable, all-weather signs (as below) are to be attached to the fencing. These shall be printed out, laminated and attached to every third fence panel.

**TREE PROTECTION FENCING
 KEEP OUT**
 This fencing must not be removed or altered in any way.
 There is to be no access, or material storage within the fenced area.

Once erected, the protective fencing is to be regarded as permanent. There is to be no access by pedestrians into the area protected by the TPF and no work carried out within the TPF zone (including the storage of materials, any form of excavation, or changes to levels). The protective fencing is to be maintained in good order so that it is fit for purpose throughout the construction process. The fencing will not be altered in any way, or previously mentioned.
 TPF is to be constructed of 2.1m height windbreak (flexible) panels, set out. The panels are to be fixed to a scaffold framework with ties or with ratchet straps. The scaffolding shall comprise a vertical end horizontal framework, used for and to resist impact, with vertical tubes spaced at a maximum of 1.5m or at intervals yet panel width, and driven into the ground 0.5m. It is not sufficient to drive the panels in rubber or concrete footings alone. TPF to be raised temporarily to position shown by broken blue line on the plan during construction of parking bays.



Photograph showing example of TPF erected to the correct specification

GENERAL PRECAUTIONS
 Storage of materials: No material or spoil are to be stored within the area protected by the TPF. Rows of trees are to be within 30 metres of the above, otherwise to be noted.
 Above ground damage to trees: Care must be taken to identify trees and operation of machinery to avoid above ground damage to trees. BS5837 (2012) Section 4.2.4.1 states 'Provision of an operator should take sufficient care to avoid trees, not knock and plant with beams, pile and counterweight (including drilling rigs) to avoid trees they can operate without causing any contact with retained trees. Such contact can result in serious damage to trees and might make their safe retention impossible. Carelessness, any removal or removal of plants is prohibited. It should be conducted under the supervision of a botanist, to ensure that adequate clearance of trees is established at all times. As an indication provision should be undertaken where necessary to maintain this clearance.'

20 New Mill Terrace, Tring

Objection

The proposed building works will overlook my property, and when previous works were carried out on Grove Road there were already concerns in regards to appropriate drainage of water down to New Mill Terrace, and I am concerned these new buildings could cause further problems. The number of new builds being squeezed into a small place in addition to building works that are already in progress seems preposterous, and leads me to doubt the accuracy of the plans submitted for the land.

I'm sure you are more than aware of the parking issues in Tring, and the Grove/New Mill area is already choked to capacity.

For all of these reasons I object to the planned building works and I hope my concerns are not taken lightly - drainage, parking and overcrowding all for financial gain doesn't seem to fit with the ethic of Tring town.

1 Sinfield Place, Tring

Privacy

Currently we have complete privacy for our main habited room at the rear of our property from all angles. We are extremely concerned with the ability to look directly in to this area from the unobstructed views from the rear bedroom of plot 9.

Due to our slightly elevated position we would also be able to see unrestricted into both their main living room and bedroom from our rear 2nd floor bedroom window. The distance being only just over 19 meters from the corner of our property to the corner of plot 9 is making this a huge invasion of privacy.

We would like to add the missing use of trees as screening which was a major part of the planning application for the original 6 houses to help insure privacy is missing from the new application. Highlighting the fact there is not enough room for these houses as adding any type of screening would be so close to us it would then result in a loss of sunlight & daylight contradicting their social context section of Design & Access Statement saying we will not currently be affected.

Also any issues with an impact on privacy on habitable rooms on the granted planning application where answered with frosting to the new rooms protecting the existing occupants. Why has this not been applied to this application?

The fact that loss of privacy is not mentioned in the Design & access Statement when referring to 1 Sinfield Place we believe it has deliberately been avoided as it is a fact that cannot be disputed.

Please see the photos taken from inside our property, centre of the widows facing at a measured 45 degree angle showing the rear garden of 21 Grove Road.

Rear view



Rear Bedroom Window



Noise

Looking at the plans we would like to draw attention to the problem of noise coming from the rear of the new properties. By the nature of the garden being lower than ours with the three original houses sitting above the new build, squeezing in two, two 1/2 storey properties, incasing them with 1.8 meter fences and the screening of the trees from the houses of New Mill terrace will create a bowl for these houses to sit in.

Any sound created from these new houses will natural bounce and reverberate around this bowl heading towards the rear of our property which sits higher.

The position of the new houses with the sun traveling round from the North East means the patio created for these new houses will spend a lot of the day in the shade, forcing the new owners to the end of the gardens to capture the sun.

This already happens with the neighbours of New Mill Terrace heading to the rear of their gardens to capture the afternoon and evening sun.

With the creation of the these two houses it would give us three neighbours to the left side of our house, three to the rear & a single neighbour to our right. Giving us a

total of 7 properties surrounding our garden which only measures approximately 15 meters by 7 meters.

I am self employed and can work unsociable hours and my partner also, who works for the NHS as an EMT with the ambulance service. We are regularly attempting to sleep in the daytimes following nightshifts when other families are making the most of the weekends and holidays, unfortunately every day can be a working day for us. There would be a significant noise increase if 5 households are increased to 7 in a very small area especially in the summer months when windows unavoidably need to be opened.

Plans

We believe that on the plan showing the new development from above important measurements & details showing the actual impact the build will have on our property have been deliberately left off.

It only shows a fraction of our property before fading away, it doesn't show any of our rear garden or any dimensions.

The distance from corner of our home to the corner of plot 9 of the properties are not shown. Yet the longer more acceptable distance to New Mill terrace is highlighted.

The short distance from plot 9 to our boundary is also not included.

These should all be included to show the impact before a decision is reached.

Design, Access Statement & Appeal Decision

Within in these documents we would like to highlight a few major concerns.

The sections in Black are taken from either the design, access statement or appeal decision documents, our concerns are written in Red.

The application site falls within Character Area TCA13, New Mill West area of Tring, where the Area Based Policies for Development in Residential Areas in the SPG document apply. In this area, the Development Principles acknowledge that there is scope for variation and innovation in design and for small to moderate sized dwellings not exceeding two storeys in height. Density in the medium range of 30 to 35 dwellings per hectare is acceptable.

The site area, excluding the shared access road, is 566 m² and the development has a density of 36 dwellings per hectare, only marginally exceeding

These houses will make a total of 9 houses across 2 1/2 floors after TCA13 states they should not exceed 2 stories. In the new access statement they refer to the extra houses as only 2 stories with a bedroom and bathroom in the loft space but in the appeal decision the same style of house is referred to as 2 1/2 storeys. The extra houses are OVER the maximum range of 35 dwellings per hectare.

Policy NP1 states that the Council will take a positive approach to the consideration of development proposals, reflecting the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development. It states that the Council will work proactively with applicants to find solutions for development proposals that help to improve the economic social and environmental conditions in the area.

Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure development is guided to appropriate areas within settlements. The site is within a residential area of Tring where Policy CS4 encourages appropriate residential development.

We believe this will not improve economic social and environmental conditions and this is not a appropriate development.

The evidence to back this can be confirmed by the number of houses that are affected by these developments either up for sale, sold or to let.

At present 2 houses that immediately back on to the building site from New Mill Terrace are up for sale, another has already been sold and new owners moved in at Christmas

1 sold and 1 for let that are affected in Grove Gardens

Owner of 31 Grove Road after selling their gardens and reducing their asking price have also sold.

After learning of this new application we at number 1 have had our house valued and discussed our options with estate agents and the same has happened at number 2 Sinfield Place.

To say in these statements & decisions that the effect of these developments will not have an impact on the existing residents by either people employed by the developers or that have no connection with the area is outrageous & can not be backed up in any physical way.

In comparison we could not show any greater way the impact this will have on us than having to move from a place we have invested 8 years of time and money in and leave Tring.

This measurable factor should not be ignored against facts that have no merit or backing

The gardens of the proposed units would be of a reasonable size and equate to many of the surrounding properties to the south of the site, providing a good standard of amenity to the future residents of the proposal. The ratio of built form to site area is some 25%, according to the appellant's figures. This would appear reasonable given the prevailing character of the area, and would provide each property with acceptable amounts of amenity space, making sure that the site would not appear cramped or overdeveloped. The landscaping set between parking spaces and the amounts of gardens proposed would ensure that hard surfaces would not dominate the site

We believe the above statement is now not correct. The fact that the original plans have already had to be amended to be able to add the 2 additional dwellings to the already granted 7 should mean that this proposal should now be looked at as one complete plan. The bottom half of the site towards 25,23, & 21 Grove Road will not allow acceptable amounts of amenity space and makes it look cramped & overdeveloped, in fact with 6 car spaces and three houses it will be the complete opposite with hard surfaces dominating the area.

Overall Concerns

Before the build got fully underway we were made aware of a potential error regarding the measurements and the plot size. Shortly after this the site was very busy period with a lot of cars and official people on site. Can we get confirmation if any errors were made?

We would like to know if the measurement of just 11.5 meters of the garden being left at the rear of number 25 is going to be independently checked. This being the absolute minimum amount they can be left with appears very tight.

The parking with a one in one out option which has also been adopted at number 27 Grove Road which originally had ample parking of 2 parking spaces on its drive and a large garage, yet after completion now only looks long enough for a car and half at best for a four bed room home is not sufficient.

The potential for residents to park on the inner road thus blocking the route for emergency vehicles or jamming the entrance from the main road causing more traffic congestion on the already busy Grove Road is a large risk.

We know the site noise during the build is something we are meant to accept but a very large generator being turned on around 7.15am, a large hardcore delivery lorry sitting outside with his engine running at 6.30am, the footpath being closed with no signs or precautions to safely assist the public, mainly parents with young children around the obstruction via the busy road & building materials being placed on the path during the busy school run times is not acceptable.

On the Appeal Decision it stated the development should not have been started before a Construction Traffic Management Plan was completed.

Within the plan it mentioned timing of construction activities to avoid school pick up & drop off.

Siting of wheel washing facilities.

Was this ever completed and can we please see a copy?

As it stands the bulk of deliveries appear to arrive from 7.30 till around lunch time and the only thing cleaning the mud from the wheels of the trucks on the road is the rain.

The recently laid public path had also been damaged as it was not protected from the site machinery



Unfortunately this is very disappointing start to what is going to be very long disruptive period

Agent's Response to Comments:

Density

The Development Principles for the New Mill West TCA13 Character Area of Tring expects new housing to fall within the medium density range of 30 to 35 dwellings per hectare (net).

As set out in the submitted Design and Access Statement, the net site area (excluding the shared access road) is 566 m² and the proposal has a density of 36 dwelling per hectare, only marginally exceeding the range “normally” acceptable.

The Area Based Policies SPG state at paragraph 2.7.5 that the descriptions given in the Character Appraisal are broad indications only and "...should not be interpreted as mathematical figures to be strictly followed." Therefore, it is clear that this guidance is intended to be used flexibly, and the density of the proposal is, therefore, acceptable and well within the 30 to 50 dwelling per hectare range set out in saved Local Plan Policy 21.

The combined site area with the 7 houses previously approved and the two now proposed is 0.295 hectares. The density of the development as a whole would be 23.7 dwellings per hectare, below the range normally found to be acceptable in the Character Area.

The figure quoted in the appeal decision permitting the first six houses on the site included Nos 27 and 29 Grove Road and if they are incorporated the site area is 0.357 and the density is 30.8 dph, well within the 30 to 35 dwelling per hectare density range quoted in the Development Principles. The appeal scheme was just under this range at 29.41 dwellings per hectare, but was found to be acceptable despite falling slightly below the density range in the SPG.

The objections raised on the basis of density cannot be substantiated.

Site coverage

The footprint of the proposed buildings is 139 sq m and the site area (excluding shared drive serving Plots 1 to 7) is 569 sq m. The percentage of ground covered by buildings is 24.4%, demonstrating that the development is not cramped.

The objections based on the development being cramped and being an overdevelopment of the site cannot be substantiated.

Height

The properties in Sinfield Place are 2 ½ storeys high, as are the houses granted at appeal and subsequently by Dacorum on the site. The Development Principles for the area only require development not to exceed two storeys in height. It does not preclude development within roof spaces. Therefore, the proposed development accords with the Development Principles and is in keeping with the character of the area which includes numerous houses with rooms in their roof, either as originally constructed or subsequently converted.

Affordable Housing

Affordable housing contributions do not apply to the current application for two houses and in any event the 5 house threshold in the Local Plan was superseded by the Ministerial Statement, which changed the threshold for contributions to 10 dwellings.

Parking

Two spaces per dwelling falls within the maximum parking requirement set out in Dacorum's Local Plan. Having tandem spaces is no less convenient than having a parking space in front of a garage, which is common place throughout Tring. There is plenty of space along the shared access road for visitors to park. Plots 8 & 9 are distant from Grove Road and it is unlikely that their occupants and visitors would choose to park in Grove Road when there is more convenient parking close to the properties.

27 Grove Road is not in the application site but its driveway is long enough to accommodate two cars.

Living Conditions

The rear elevations of the proposed dwellings and those at Sinfield Place are a right angles to each other. There is no separation distance for properties related to each other in this way as there is no direct overlooking. However, the distance between habitable first floor windows exceeds the 23 m distance for dwellings that are in a rear to rear or rear to front relationship. The accrual distance between the centres of bedroom windows is in excess of 25 m.

Obscure glazing is proposed to the first floor windows to the side elevations of the proposed dwellings to ensure the privacy of neighbouring properties is maintained.

Elevated timber fencing exists between the rear gardens of the proposed dwellings and 1 Sinfield Place and timber fencing is proposed to the side boundaries of the proposed properties. Far from creating a bowl, timber fencing will dampen any sound.

The proposal will result in two properties (one additional property) bounding the side of the rear garden to 1 Sinfield Place not three as alleged. Plot 8 does not share a boundary with 1 Sinfield Place.

Although it is accepted that a number of properties have been sold in the vicinity of the site no evidence exists as to why they have chosen to move but whatever the reason they have sold and the relationship of the properties to the development has been found to be acceptable by the new purchasers.

Flooding

The site is not within a Flood Zone and surface water drainage has been designed to avoid run-off with permeable surfaces and soakaways proposed. There will be no increased risk of flooding of properties in Brook Street as a result of the proposed development.

Foul sewage

The capacity of the mains sewer is a matter for Thames Water and no objection has been raised by them to the proposed development.

Trees

There is only one tree of significant size, an Ash, in the rear gardens to the New Mill properties adjacent to the site and the foundations of the proposed dwellings are beyond the crown spread of the tree, so its roots will not be affected by the foundations.

Accuracy of Plans

The proposal has been based on an accurate professionally produced topographical survey of the site.

Recommendation

As per the published report

Condition 4 removed

- 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.**

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:**

Policy CS29 Checklist

Design and Access Statement December 17

Geo-environmental Report November 2017

L06-16

2049/56C

2049/55E

2049/57C

2049/59

2258-11-01 Rev E

Typical Layout- rainwater down pipe drainage into sub-base reservoir

High level Drainage Schematic- 06/02/18

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

- 3. The bathroom windows at first floor level in the side elevations of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.**

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenities of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings and future occupants of the dwellings; in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004).

- 4. If within a period of five years from the date of any planting in accordance with approved plan ref:2049/55D, 2049/59 and 2258-11-01 Rev E, any planting is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies (or becomes, in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective), further planting of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place in the next planting season.**

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity; in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

- 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within the following classes of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written approval of the local planning authority:**

Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, D, E, F, G and H

Schedule 2, Part 2, Classes A, B and C

Schedule 2, Part 3, Class L

Reason: To enable the local planning authority to retain control over the development in the interests of safeguarding the residential and visual amenity of the locality; in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Item 5d

4/02372/17/ROC REMOVAL OF CONDITION 7 (RESIDENTIAL FLAT TO BE OCCUPIED BY MEMBER OF NURSERY STAFF) ATTACHED TO PLANNING PERMISSION 4/01719/13/FUL (GROUND FLOOR NURSERY WITH SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION AND RESIDENTIAL USE OF FIRST FLOOR AS ONE

BEDROOM FLAT)STEPHENSONS COTTAGE, 306 BELSWAINS LANE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 9XE

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5e

4/02115/17/FUL CONSTRUCTION OF AGRICULTURAL BUILDING AND GREENHOUSE

LAND TO THE EAST OF DELMEREND LANE, FLAMSTEAD, ST. ALBANS

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5f

4/03264/17/FUL NEW THREE BED DWELLING

105 CHERRY ORCHARD, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP1 3NJ

Recommendation

Additional condition:

5) The development, hereby permitted, shall not commence until a drive specification has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This specification shall set out details of the materials to be used in its construction, gradient and any surface water drainage system. The access and drive shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation and shall be thereafter be retained.

Reason: In the interests of highways and pedestrian safety.

Representations:

HCC Highways

Hertfordshire County Council does not object to the proposed development, subject to the following conditions:

Condition 1

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the vehicular access shall be provided and thereafter retained at the position shown on the approved plan (Dwg. No. PL/003) in accordance with the highway specification and with appropriate arrangements for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory access into the site and avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway. The above condition is required to ensure the adequate provision of off-street parking at all times in order to minimise the impact on the safe and efficient operation of the adjoining highway.

Condition 2

The driveway length shall be at least 6 metres as measured from the highway boundary into the property.

Reason: To ensure parked vehicles do not overhang the adjoining public highway, thereby adversely affecting highway users.

Condition 3

Prior to the commencement of the development the new access servicing the development shall be completed in accordance with the approval in principal plan (drawing number L/003) and constructed to the specification of the Highway Authority and the Local Planning Authority's satisfaction.

Reason: To ensure the provision of an access appropriate for the development in the interests of highway safety.

Condition 4

Best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the development site during the construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway.

Reason: In the interest of road safety.

Highway Informatives:

AN1) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website:

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Item 5g

4/02928/17/FHA PROPOSED TWO-STOREY AND SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION, ONE REAR AND TWO SIDE ROOF WINDOWS

8 LITTLE GADDESSEN, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1PA

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5h

4/02996/17/FHA DOUBLE GARAGE WITH WOOD STORE, NEW RELOCATED GATE, LAPBOARD FENCE AND LANDSCAPING

THE GRANARY, CHEVERELLS GREEN, MARKYATE, ST ALBANS, AL3 8AA

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5i

4/02997/17/LBC DOUBLE GARAGE WITH WOOD STORE, NEW RELOCATED GATE, LAPBOARD FENCE AND LANDSCAPING

THE GRANARY, CHEVERELLS GREEN, MARKYATE, ST ALBANS, AL3 8AA

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5j

4/03269/17/FUL TWO STOREY AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSIONS AND REAR DORMER TO FORM NEW DWELLING (AMENDED SCHEME).

17 CHESTNUT DRIVE, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 2JL

Recommendation

As per the published report

Item 5k

4/02491/17/FHA FRONT, SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION. LOFT CONVERSION WITH CROWN ROOF AND FRONT GABLE EXTENSION

74 SCATTERDELLS LANE, CHIPPERFIELD, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 9EX

Recommendation

As per the published report
