



Public Document Pack

# DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AGENDA

**TUESDAY 28 MAY 2019 AT 7.00 PM  
DBC COUNCIL CHAMBER - THE FORUM**

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 Oguchi
Councillor Maddern	Councillor McDowell
Councillor Riddick	Councillor Uttley
Councillor C Wyatt-Lowe (Vice-Chairman)	Councillor Woolner
Councillor Beauchamp	Councillor Symington
Councillor Durrant	

For further information, please contact Corporate and Democratic Support or 01442 228209

## AGENDA

7. **ADDENDUM** (Pages 2 - 22)

# Agenda Item 7



**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> May 2019 at 7.00 PM**

## ADDENDUM SHEET

\*\*\*\*\*

### Item 5a

**4/03026/18/MFA - DEVELOPMENT OF SITE TO PROVIDE 84 DWELLINGS WITH ACCESS FROM DURRANTS LANE AND PROVISION OF AMENITY SPACE, LANDSCAPING AND OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS INCLUDING DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE**

**LAND AT JUNCTION OF DURRANTS LANE &, SHOOTERSWAY, BERKHAMSTED (Pages 25 - 95)**

#### Recommendation:

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Item 5b

**4/02204/18/MFA - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS. CONSTRUCTION OF EXTRA CARE SCHEME COMPRISING 41 NO. APARTMENTS WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND PARKING**

**OLD SILK MILL, BROOK STREET, TRING, HP235EF (Pages 96 - 184)**

#### Additional Consultation Response

Tring Town Council - The latest version of this application was considered by the Town Council on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> May. The Council continues to recommend refusal of this application on highway safety grounds – the amendments do not address this fundamental problem of the scale of the development in the location. A copy of the Council's previous recommendation is attached.

It is worth noting the pavement on the Silk Mill side of Brook St is less than 1m wide where there are lamp posts. Crossing to the other side of Brook Street has similar problems and the road will have to be crossed again going toward the Town as the path does not extend all the way that side. The timing of the traffic survey – end of July when two years at Tring School are on study leave and at midday – invalidates

the conclusions. Brook St is a major thoroughfare taking traffic to the A41 – the general growth in traffic, highlighted in Herts County Council’s Local Transport Plan, has been compounded by developments along the road, notably the 34 flats at the Maude & Irving site, and the change from industrial use to retail in the Silk Mill.

To support the Council’s view on highway safety, in the last week I have received two independent letters of concern from residents about the safety of Brook St for all users – car drivers: these letters were not related to the planning application. It is also a topic that is raised at our ‘Meet Your Council’ quarterly events.

A 22 week project to replace the gas main in Tring High Street starts next Tuesday. Whilst this is arguably on a different scale to the development proposed, the diversion of traffic along Brook St will be indicative of the need to avoid any increase in traffic in Brook St. Interestingly the gas contractor, having seen the situation in Brook St, is lobbying Herts County Council with us for special measures to be taken.

(22/05/19)

### Amended Consultation Response

Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:

Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) as Highway Authority wishes to recommend permitting the planning application, subject to conditions.

#### Conditions

##### Condition 1: Construction Traffic Management Plan

No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall include details of:

- a. Construction vehicle numbers, type, routing;
- b. Traffic management requirements;
- c. Construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking);
- d. Siting and details of wheel washing facilities;
- e. Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway;
- f. Timing of construction activities to avoid school pick up/drop off times;
- g. Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities;
- h. Post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and temporary access to the public highway.

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way

## Condition 2: Servicing and Delivery Plan

Prior to commencement of the development, the applicant shall submit a Servicing and Delivery Plan. This plan is to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Servicing and Delivery Plan shall contain the delivery and servicing requirements (refuse collection has been agreed) for the proposed use, a scheme for coordinating deliveries and servicing for the proposed development, areas within the development site that will be used for loading and manoeuvring of delivery and servicing vehicles, and access to / from the site for delivery and servicing vehicles.

Reason: In the interest of maintaining highway efficiency and safety.

## Condition 3: Ramp Gradient

The gradient of the ramps to access footpath no 41 shall not exceed 1:12.

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory access and in the interests of highway safety and amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

## Section 106 Agreement

HCC seek improvements for the nearest bus stops at a cost of £8,000 per stop, a total of £16,000. The improvements would include the provision of easy access kerbing at each stop.

## HIGHWAY INFORMATIVES:

HCC recommends inclusion of the following Advisory Notes (ANs) to ensure that any works as part of this development are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highways Act 1980 and other relevant processes.

AN1) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website: <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/development-management/highways-development-management.aspx>

AN2) Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website: <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business->

and-developer-information/development-management/highways-development-management.aspx

AN3) 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/business-and-developer-information/development-management/highways-development-management.aspx>

AN4) Construction standards for works within the highway: The applicant is advised that in order to comply with this permission it will be necessary for the developer of the site to enter into an agreement with Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority under Section 38 and Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the satisfactory completion of the access and associated road improvements. The construction of such works must be undertaken to the satisfaction and specification of the Highway Authority, and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. Further information is available via the website noted below:

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/development-management/highways-development-management.aspx>

#### Section 278 or 184 Agreement

The applicant will be required to enter into a Section 278, or 184, agreement to agree any alternations or improvements to the public highway. This includes any changes to the existing access arrangements.

#### Description of the Proposal

The proposals are for the demolition of all existing buildings and the construction of 41 extra care home units, with associated access, car and cycle parking and landscaping, as detailed within the Design and Access Statement.

According to the Design Statement (DS) the proposed development would comprise a mixture of 13 one bedroom units and 28 two bedroom units. The Transport Statement (TS); however, refers to 40 units only. There is no completed application form on the DBC website to resolve this anomaly. However, the different unit mixes would both result in 54 bedrooms.

#### Site Description

The application site is located west of Brook Street (B488), Tring. The site is currently occupied by a pair of dwellings and an industrial unit measuring 89sqm (B2 land use). An informal car park is also located at the south of the site which caters

for the industrial unit and any additional visitors/ deliveries to the site. To the east of the site is Brook Street, to the south is The Old Silk Mill, with residential properties to the west and amenity/ recreation space to the north. The site has a vehicular access from Brook Street, adjacent to the property of 21/22 Brook Street. Brook Street is a Class B secondary distributor road and is subject to a 30mph speed limit.

The site is located approximately 935m north of the centre of Tring, where there are a variety of facilities and amenities including GP surgeries and pharmacies.

## History

Pre-application advice was sought in 2015 for 50 new residential dwellings (Ref: 4/02873/15/PRE). Several comments were provided by HCC as highway authority on the proposed access and parking arrangements which were not deemed to be acceptable to HCC in its current form.

A second application was submitted for four residential dwellings on this site in 2017 (Ref. 4/01977/17/FUL) which was recommended for approval by HCC as highway authority.

A third application was submitted in 2017 for construction of 10 residential dwellings which was recommended for refusal by HCC Highways for an excessive number of properties served from a private drive.

## Analysis

### Policy Review

The applicant has provided a Transport Statement (TS) and a Design Statement (DS) but has not provided a policy review of local, regional or national documents. HCC notes that the consideration of the following documents is advised to highlight that they have been considered when developing the proposal:

- National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018);
- Dacorum Core Strategy 2006-2031 (September 2013);
- Dacorum Local Plan 2001-2011 (Saved Policies September 2013); and
- Tring, Northchurch and Berkhamsted Urban Transport Plan

### Transport Statement

A Transport Statement (TS) was provided as part of the planning application package for consideration by HCC. This is in line with requirements set out in Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide, 3rd Edition (Roads in Herts).

### Trip generation

A trip generation profile for the existing site use and proposed site use were provided in the TS.

The TRICS online database was interrogated to obtain trip rates for the trip generation profiles for the existing and proposed land uses. This approach is considered acceptable for the purposes of this application.

#### Existing traffic

For the existing site, the TRICS database was analysed to find comparable sites with comparable trip rates. For the existing site, the 'Residential/ Houses Private Owned' and 'Employment/ Industrial Use' categories were used to obtain trip rates which is acceptable. The applicant also applied the following TRICS parameters to obtain their trip rates for the existing land use:

- Vehicles;
- England Sites, excluding Greater London;
- 6 to 20 units / 300 to 900sqm;
- Monday to Friday; and
- Suburban Area, Edge of Town, Neighborhood Area, Residential Zone and Village.

The parameters used are considered acceptable. The resultant trip rates and associated trip generation based on 2 units for residential and 89sqm for industrial operations are as follows:

- AM Peak:
  - Trip Rate: 0.136 arrivals and 0.408 departures (residential units)
  - No. Trips: 0 arrivals and 1 departure resulting in 1 two-way trip (residential units)
  - Trip Rate: 0.620 arrivals and 0.155 departures (industrial unit)
  - No. Trips: 1 arrival and 0 departures resulting in 1 two-way trip (industrial unit)
  - Total No Trips: 1 arrival and 1 departure
- PM Peak:
  - Trip Rate: 0.350 arrivals and 0.136 departures (residential units)
  - No. Trips: 1 arrival and 0 departures resulting in 1 two-way trip (residential units)
  - Trip Rate: 0.000 arrivals and 0.930 departures (industrial unit)
  - No. Trips: 0 arrivals and 1 departure resulting in 1 two-way trip (industrial unit)
  - Total No Trips: 1 arrival and 1 departure

#### Proposed Use

The category of 'Residential/ Retirement Flats' was utilised for the purposes of obtaining trip rates for the proposed development. This is a robust and therefore acceptable approach based on the comparison with the 'Health / Care Home' trip rates analysed. The following parameters were used in the interrogation of TRICS for obtaining the trip rates in the TA:

- Vehicles;
- England Sites, excluding Greater London;
- 28-80 units;
- Monday to Friday; and,
- Suburban Area, Edge of Town, Neighborhood Area and Residential Zone.

These are considered acceptable for the purposes of this proposed development. The resultant trip rates per unit, and associated trip generation based on 40 units, are as follows:

- AM Peak:
  - Trip Rate: 0.117 arrivals and 0.075 departures
  - No. Trips: 5 arrivals and 3 departures resulting in 8 two-way trips
- PM Peak:
  - Trip Rate: 0.077 arrivals and 0.096 departures
  - No. Trips: 3 arrivals and 4 departures resulting in 7 two-way trips

#### Net impact

The TS has provided a net trip generation profile which is not considered to be acceptable because it includes an assumption that half of the overspill car park arrives and departs during peak hours without any survey data or factual data to support this. The net trip generation should be compared to the existing site rather than the 'potential'. Therefore, the net trip generation profile should be as follows:

- AM Peak: 4 arrivals and 2 departures resulting in a total of 6 two-way trips
- PM Peak: 2 arrivals and 3 departures resulting in a total of 5 two-way trips

It is unlikely that the addition of 6 and 5 two-way vehicle trips in the AM and PM peak hours, respectively, would have a severe impact on the local highway network.

#### Highway safety

The applicant obtained Personal Injury Collision (PIC) data for the five-year period between 01/01/2013 to 31/12/2017 on Brook Street from HCC. The results indicated that across the study area eight collisions took place, all but two were slight in nature. The serious incidents occurred at different locations, two years apart and therefore HCC does not anticipate that any existing highway safety issues would be exacerbated by the development proposals.

#### Proposed Mitigation

The following mitigation is proposed as part of the development proposals:

- Improvements to the site access to provide sufficient visibility splays; and
- 1.8m footway on the access road for pedestrians.

The proposed mitigation is acceptable at a minimum and mitigation on the wider network would be sought due to the nature of the proposed development. Improvements on the wider network may include improvements to the footways, crossing facilities for ease of access to bus stops in the vicinity of the site, etc.

Due to the narrowness of the existing footways along Brook Street leading into the town centre, there was concern that should two wheelchair and/or scooters travelling to/from the site meet at any point along the route, there would be no room to pass safely. Therefore, the applicant has since provided amended drawing, 18-02-P-11C,

which provides an illustration of a proposed ramp to access the existing footpath no. 41 at the rear of the property. The ramp would provide direct access to this path. The proposals are considered acceptable in principle; however, they would be subject to detailed design review and the ramp's gradient should not exceed 1:12.

#### Highway layout

#### Vehicle site access

Vehicular access to the site would continue to be via the existing dropped kerb; however, a more formal arrangement of the site access road would be provided, which would accord to HCC design guidance. The design drawing provided in Appendix H of the TS has been reviewed and it is considered that the proposed access arrangement is acceptable in principle but would be subject to review as part of any future Section 278 Agreement.

The visibility splays for the site have been designed in accordance with appropriate guidance set out in Manual for Streets.

#### Pedestrian access

Pedestrian access would continue to be proposed from Brook Street as per the existing arrangement with a 1.8m footway on the proposed access road for pedestrians.

#### Swept Path Assessment

The applicant had not provided car swept path assessment drawings for the proposed site as part of the original application submission. The swept path assessments are considered acceptable.

#### Refuse and Servicing Arrangements

The applicant has not provided refuse swept path assessment drawings for the proposed site, although has described that refuse collections would be undertaken via the vehicle entering the site in order to access the bin store area situated along the northwestern boundary. Without swept path analysis HCC was unable to understand how this could be undertaken. Additional information was requested to support that the refuse collection arrangements are safe and suitable for the purposes of this development. Additional information has since been provided to HCC and is considered acceptable.

#### Future maintenance of the access road

Due to the nature of the site, it would not be considered that HCC would adopt the internal access network and maintenance would therefore not be the responsibility of HCC.

#### Parking

#### Car parking provisions and layout

It is stated in the TS that the applicant would provide 40 off-street car parking spaces that would be accessed from Brook Street. The TS has not confirmed how many bays would be for disabled users or how many bays would be for electric vehicle spaces at the development.

Dacorum Borough Council Car Parking Standards require 20% active and 20% passive electric charging bays for all schemes with sites larger than 10 dwellings.

Dacorum Borough Council Car Parking Standards require 0.75 spaces per unit for sheltered accommodation that is warden controlled and 0.25 spaces per unit for visitors. Therefore, Dacorum's car parking standards require a maximum of 40 car parking spaces. The proposed development car parking provision is in line with these standards. The proposed car parking is considered acceptable to HCC; however, it is ultimately the responsibility of the LPA to determine the suitability of the car parking provision.

#### Disabled parking provisions

Dacorum Borough Council Car Parking Standards require that for residential use, 1 disabled space is provided for every dwelling built to mobility to standard, and for car parks associated with new employment premises, 5% of the total car park capacity should be blue badge to accommodate both employees and visitors. The TS does not state how many of the spaces at the proposed development would be designated disabled spaces. It is ultimately the decision of DBC to determine the suitability of disabled parking provision.

#### Cycle parking provisions

Dacorum Borough Council Car Parking Standards for residential use state that for warden control sheltered accommodation, 1 short-term space per 3 units plus 1 long-term space per 5 units is required. No reference has been made to cycle parking in the development submission. HCC's Local Transport Plan (LTP) 4 places an emphasis on supporting development where sustainable transport is supported. On this basis, the applicant should provide cycle parking in line with the requirements set out by DBC. However, it is ultimately the decision of DBC to determine the suitability of cycle parking provision.

#### Accessibility

##### Public transport

##### Bus

The public transport infrastructure surrounding the site provides easy access to and from a range of locations.

The closest bus stops are the 'Shugars Green' ones which are located 80m north of the site along Brook Street. The stop on the western side of the highway provides a seated shelter which is signposted with timetable information, and the stop on the

eastern side provides a flag-and-stop pole, with signposted timetable information. Both stops are served by the 50, 61 and 164 services.

A summary of the bus services available on Brook Street/ Shugars Green is included within Table 3 of the TS.

The above summary illustrates the variety of bus routes available, including local town services and inter-urban routes and all routes would give access to Aylesbury.

## Rail

Tring Railway Station is the closest station to the proposed development site, which is located approximately 2.8km to the east of the proposed development. Tring Railway Station lies on the West Coast Line, which runs from London to Scotland via Birmingham and Manchester. It is served by the London Midland Train Operating Company. It is noted that the station is accessible via car, foot, bicycle or bus.

A summary of the rail services available from Tring station are included within Table 4 of the TS.

## Walking and Cycling

A summary of the benefits of suitable walking and cycling infrastructure has been provided within the TS.

It is noted that there are a variety of local facilities within an 800m walking distance of the site. The TS does not describe the local pedestrian footways and if they are considered to be sufficient. However, it is noted that footways are available on both sides of Brook Street leading to the town centre. Whilst there are footways, they are in poor condition and are narrow. There is potential for improvements to be built by the developer under a S278 agreement with the highway authority or funded via Section 106 contributions.

A review of local cycle routes demonstrated that although there are no National Cycle Routes within close proximity of the site (2km), there are several local routes on road which provide access to Tring Station and beyond.

HCC notes that the site appears reasonably well situated in terms of access to the facilities within Tring.

## Travel Plan

Due to the scale of the development, a Travel Plan would not be required.

## Construction

A Construction Traffic Management Plan would be required to ensure construction vehicles would not have a detrimental impact on the vicinity of the site and a condition would be required to provide adequate parking for construction vehicles on-site to prevent on-street conflict and impacts to the highway safety. A Construction Traffic Management Plan would be required for all phases of the

construction, including excavation and construction of all elements of the development. Due to the congestion surrounding the proposed development site, it would be expected that an assessment of the impacts of construction traffic on the operation and safety of the local highway network is considered.

#### Contributions

HCC seek improvements for the nearest bus stops at a cost of £8,000 per stop, a total of £16,000. The improvements would include the provision of easy access kerbing at each stop.

#### Conclusion

HCC as highway authority has reviewed the application submission and wishes to recommend approval of the planning application, subject to conditions.

(22/05/19)

#### Additional neighbour representations

140 Kingsley Walk - I am writing with regards to the above planning application again to strongly object to the proposal.

41 extra care flats with 45 car parking spaces. On an already congested and comprised road in Tring. It is also a school crossing and due to the cottages opposite and where they park there is only access for single lane traffic.

Currently with the traffic and comprised road access the emergency services struggle to navigate the road and this will be further comprised with the proposal of these flats.

There is a likelihood that the residents of the proposal will require mobility aids/ scooters they will struggle with the narrow pavements, busy blind spot of traffic should they wish to cross. The local shop is accessed by steep slopes which incorporate steps. The residents will be stranded in this complex.

The traffic survey was taken during the day in July when students were in school and year 11 and sixth formers had already left for the summer. So is not an accurate reading.

The proposal is not in keeping with its surroundings, it is an over-development and should it be approved a serious accident is highly likely to occur on this already dangerous and unmanned crossing.

(22/05/19)

126 & 134 Kingsley Walk - Unfortunately I am unable to attend the 28 May 2019 Dacorum Planning Committee meeting, for the above application; I have strong concerns over a number of objection points and would like to high light; primarily

road safety and access to the development, and the impact of the development on the safety of the users of Brook Street, and the potential residents of the development, many of whom will have impaired mobility. I believe the 'Response Letter to the Planning application from Hertfordshire County Council (T and CP GDP Order 2015)' is very general, lacking vital detail, omitting important assessment information on traffic flow/ congestion/pedestrian usage, the school crossing patrol sited at the access point to the development and Brook Street as an arterial highway into and out of Tring. The report fails to fairly and adequately assess Brook Street and its complex highways' issues, potentially hazardous conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. My previous objections still stand, the amended plans have not addressed any of these issues.

- **Dacorum Core Strategy - CS12 a: Provide a safe and satisfactory means of access for all users.**

**The Statement provided within the amended application refers to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), July 2018**, referring to paragraph 109, 'development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an **unacceptable impact on highways safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe**. Within this context, Paragraph 110 advises that developments should give priority to pedestrians and cycle movements, address the need of disabilities or reduced mobility, and minimise the scope of conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

- The applicant, **Hounsfeld Limited commissioned M-EC Traffic Report, August 2018** fails to mention conflicts of road use at the site entrance to the apartments, omitting completely that the access point is situated on the site of the school crossing patrol point, at the point where the road narrows due to parking on the Tring bound lane to single file for a distance of approximately 100 metres and that the crossing point is used by many throughout the day, including the elderly people living at Shugars Green opposite the site entrance. Visibility for pedestrians at this point is very poor and restricted crossing from Shugars Green, as there are parked cars obscuring the view. There is only a passing comment of the parking, which creates a single lane along the entire length of the proposed apartments and the Silk Mill Industrial Estate.

**The M-EC Traffic Report collected their survey data 17-23 July 2018, with a site visit 20 July 2018 at an unspecified time. It must be noted that Tring schools year 11 and Upper Sixth pupils had already left school and road use would have a shown a reflection of this. No surveys of pedestrians crossing usage were taken.**

- The development's Traffic Statement published TRIP calculation rates, (Table 7) which did not incorporate numbers of visitors, delivery vehicles, refuse vehicles and carers to the site. Table 7 draws comparisons between (theoretical) half occupancy numbers of previous vehicle TRIPs with the proposed apartments, concluding during peak hours of 0800-0900hrs and

1700-1800hrs, 28 trips were made in each of these times in previous use and 8 trips would be made between 0800-0900hrs and 7 trips between 1700-1800hr by the apartments. As residents who overlook the car park, vehicle numbers were on average most days between 3 and 5 vehicles which generally were parked, without being moved all day, arriving between 0700-0800hrs in the morning. (We have never witnessed the car park at half parking occupancy) Therefore the Table 7 stated 'Net change (+/-) between the half occupancy and extra care apartments of -20 trips (0800-0900hrs) and -21trips (1700-1800hrs is inaccurate.

**\*'Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) Highways Report, worryingly refers to the developer's commissioned Transport Statement, quoting figures from the Traffic Statement's figures, which are not a true reflection of Brook Street's typical pedestrian and vehicle usage and the conflicts between the two, using computer assimilated TRIP calculations. The Traffic Statement, refers in passing to the busy school crossing patrol point, sited on the development's access point to Brook Street and directly opposite Shugars Green, and barely mentions the single carriageway of at times approximately 100 metres in length, stretching the whole length of the Silk Mill Industrial Estate.**

- Section 5.7 in the Statement, 'The site can be easily accessed by foot or cycle ...' excluded from the statement, is the ease of access of mobility scooters and wheelchairs, which no doubt some of the apartments' potential residents will use, especially as the architect has made provision for their parking and storage within the plans and designed wide pathways to accommodate their usage on site. The pavement directly outside the development along Brook Street is particularly narrow with lamp posts and drainage pipes on the sides of Silk Mill Industrial Estate, narrowing the pavement and causing obstacles for wheelchairs and Class 2 scooters. Class 3 scooters intended for road use would have to navigate the single lane, (due to parking along Brook Street), which would cause further congestion, travelling a maximum of 8 miles an hour, not to mention safety, as the road is very busy and narrow. The pavement outside the cottages on the opposite side of Brook Street is wider on the Tring bound direction, but then becomes narrower, before completely disappearing which would mean pedestrians would have to cross the busy road to walk on a pavement – there is no drop kerb for a wheel chair user or mobility scooter to cross.

**Figure 1. Brook Street pavement widths at narrowest points – section Development**

**4/02204/18/MFA to Silk Mill Industrial Estate entrance**



- The footpath which would be used to access the Co-op is a steep slope and stepped path from the development which would mean residents with mobility issues would not be able to access, leaving limited options; walking a longer distance along busy narrow pavements to access Tring town centre, catching unreliable buses, or becoming stranded, and unable to live independently. Section 5, page 9 refers to the NPPF 'deals with sufficient supply of homes and the governments continued commitment to boosting the supply of homes, including homes to meet the needs of groups with specific housing requirements.' It is our belief that the site will inadequately provide access for it's intended extra care residents, offering limited access to Tring, stranding it's residents, and unacceptably compromising Brook Street users safety. Brook Street does not have the highways infrastructure to support this development. If this development were to be built it would be a question of time before a very serious road traffic incident would occur.

Figure 2. Footpath access Development 4/02204/18/MFA to the Co-op



supermarket

The proposed development plans have provided 45 car parking spaces. Cars will require access in and out of Brook Street daily. **Road safety is at risk.** Traffic through Brook Street can be very heavy, as it is an important route towards the B488 and B489. The point of site access from Brook Street is where a busy school crossing is located and just as the road narrows due to parking on the Tring bound lane in front of the terraced houses numbering 50 upwards. This road is particularly congested at school start and finish times and during rush hour. Children wishing to cross the road outside of school start and finish times will have to negotiate this very busy crossing alone, as will elderly residents of Shugars Green (opposite site entrance) and the new residents of the development.

There will be poor visibility at the point of access from Brook Street at an already congested bottleneck section of the road. It must also be noted that Tring Fire Station and paramedic response is located on Brook Street near to the site which

may compromise their emergency response. It must also be noted that large vehicles such as refuse collection vehicles, and delivery vehicles will need to gain access to the site, all increasing the site T.R.I.P. numbers. The 'extra care scheme' will require staff and residents will no doubt receive visitors, who will require parking, of which there is already inadequate numbers of parking areas/spaces along Brook Street.

During the construction there will be site traffic: large construction vehicles, construction delivery vehicles and site worker traffic to be accommodated along the already narrow Brook Street.

Our objection comments (November 2018) regarding the **Dacorum Core Strategy CS12f and g** – out of character (large scale three storey development), over development and **The Charter Appraisal Tring Design Objectives - 1. Conserve the historic core, 5. Maintain low rise characteristic of the town**, still stand.

We would be grateful of your consideration regarding these concerns.

(22/05/19)

65 Longfield Road – This application represents a gross overdevelopment of the site which does not have any significant residential history. It would result in the loss of two characterful properties designed by William Huckvale for the Rothschild estate but the applicant fails even to consider this issue. The proposed design is overly pretentious and amounts to a feeble pastiche of the Silk Mill. The footway where it passes the mill buildings is narrow and intimidating. Traffic leaving the site would have to contend with the unpredictable two-way working that occurs there, and to join this road by cycle at this point would be lethal. Traffic along Brook Street would have to take into account joining traffic just where the two-way working often starts.

(21/05/19)

140 Kingsley Walk – Photos as attached to representation dated 2/04/18 within main report.



(2/04/18)

Recommendation:

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5c**

**4/01863/18/FUL - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY EXTENSION AS A SEPARATE DWELLING.**

**1 AUSTINS MEAD, BOVINGDON, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP30JX (Pages 185 - 204)**

Recommendation:

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5d**

**4/02980/18/FHA - NEW REAR DORMER AND ALTERATIONS TO TERRACE**

**7 GAVESTON DRIVE, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1JF (Pages 205 - 211)**

Recommendation:

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5e**

**4/00177/19/FUL - CONSTRUCTION OF 1 X ONE-BEDROOM DWELLING TO THE SIDE OF 8 PARKFIELD. (AMENDED SCHEME)**

**ADJACENT TO 8 PARKFIELD, MARKYATE, ST ALBANS, AL3 8RD (Pages 212 - 227)**

No.15 Parkfield email about parking problem:

I am a resident of No 15 Parkfield, Markyate, and we have spoken on the phone once before regarding the planning application for No 8 Parkfield.

I have read through the documents that are contained in your email. My main concern is with regards to the impact of parking therefore I would like you to consider the following:-

I have 2 letters, one from the Borough and one from the police (See documents attached) sent over the last couple of years regarding the parking issues in Parkfield. There is no doubt an existing problem with parking in Parkfield and this new development will add to this issue. On the balance of probabilities there is going to be extra demand for parking despite the provision of 3 car spaces. No 8 has to provide for 2 cars and one works van at the present and the new build will no doubt demand for 2 cars and not one. That is 2 more vehicles competing for parking including their visitors and deliveries.

If the police and Borough consider that there is a struggle for parking then I fail to see how planning can override this?

The parking at the new build is tight, in fact 0.5m insufficient between the two sites. Will this accommodate access for disabled users?

There is no mention on the removal of the mature Privet hedge to the front of No 8. This will have be removed to provide access for 2 car parking spaces. It is part of the front boundary for No8 and it seems to have been forgotten.

Date: 24/09/2018  
Your Ref:  
Our Ref: Unauthorised Parking  
Contact: John-Luke Edey  
Email: John.Edey@dacorum.gov.uk  
Directline: 01442 228 441



Civic Centre  
Marlowes  
Hemel Hempstead  
Hertfordshire  
HP1 1HH

Telephone: 01442 228000  
www.dacorum.gov.uk  
DX 8804 Hemel Hempstead  
D/deaf callers, Text Relay:  
18001 + 01442 228000

Residents of  
Parkfield  
Markyate  
Herts

Dear Residents

**RE:UNAUTHORISED PARKING**

I have been advised that there have been parking issues on Parkfield.

Aspects to consider:

- There are **NO** allocated spaces: parking is based on a first arrive, first park basis.
- You must not "reserve" parking spaces by leaving cones or any other items
- **You must** park within the assigned lines and only take up one car parking space.
- **You must** park considerately and allow room between the vehicle in the next space for them to open their driver doors.

Your co operation in alerting all fellow neighbours would be greatly appreciated.

If you do need to discuss this further, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Yours sincerely

  
John-Luke Edey  
Housing Officer - Tenancy



HERTFORDSHIRE

CONSTABULARY

### **Parking issues on Parkfield**

Dear Resident,

As I'm sure you are all aware, the village of Markyate was never designed and developed to accommodate the large amount of vehicles that people own nowadays. This often causes issues and can understandably be very frustrating when looking for somewhere to park.

In a few cases, some residents have chosen to park in places which are not ideal and can affect other road users and pedestrians. One of these places I refer to is the council owned spaces put in at the bottom of Parkfield. These spaces are not allocated and can be used by anybody. Furthermore, if any vehicle is seen to be parked across the end of these bays blocking or obstructing other vehicles from leaving, this will be deemed as an 'unnecessary obstruction' and will get a fine or be removed.

I will emphasise that these occurrences are rare and as a whole, most residents are respectful and considerate. If you do have any issues, please feel free to contact me via 101 or give us a wave as I'm passing by.

Regards,

**PCSO 6357 Rowen Sheppard**

Markyate, Flamstead and Gaddesden Row  
Hemel North Rural, West & Central  
Safer Neighbourhood Team

### Recommendation:

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5f**

**4/00182/19/FHA - SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION**

**1 CHANTRY VIEW, CHAPEL CROFT, CHIPPERFIELD, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 9EH  
(Pages 228 - 236)**

Additional Consultation Responses

Environmental Health (Noise & Air Quality): No objections on noise or air quality grounds.

23/05/2019

Environmental Health (Contaminated Land): I am aware of the previous planning history of this application site, including the previous recommendation for the inclusion of a discovery condition on any permission that might be granted. However, considering the restricted size of the extension, its location and having established that land contamination conditions 9 and 10, placed on the 2017 permission to develop the 4 houses comprising Chantry View, were discharged in 2018 I am able to recommend that there is no requirement for a land contamination planning condition. Instead the following informative would be more than sufficient in this instance:

Informative:

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority with all works temporarily suspended because, the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.

21/05/2019

Case Officer's response: A contaminated land informative has already been included, therefore it is not necessary to add the above informative note to the decision notice, should planning permission be granted.

Recommendation:

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*