



Public Document Pack

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AGENDA

**THURSDAY 13 JUNE 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

8. **ADDENDUM** (Pages 2 - 16)

Agenda Item 8



DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
Thursday 13th June 2019 at 7.00 PM

ADDENDUM SHEET

Item 5a

4/01866/18/FUL DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF FIVE 4 BEDROOM DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND ACCESS.

57 SOUTH PARK GARDENS, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1HZ

Recommendation:

As per the published report

Item 5b

4/02286/18/MFA CONSTRUCTION OF 268 FLATS AND 1404.5 SQUARE METRES OF OFFICE SPACE SPLIT ACROSS SIX BLOCKS, WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND AMENITY SPACE

PLOTS 2 & 3 KIER PARK, MAYLANDS AVENUE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 4FQ

Correction to report:

Paragraph 9.120 *Height* - It is acknowledged that the height of the development would exceed that of adjacent properties however, the policy guidance for this area seeks a landmark development in this location. It is further considered that a 12 storey high building (maximum 37 metres high) in this location would **not** be out of character, or harmful to the visual amenity of the area.

Indicative Affordable Housing location:



Amended Arboricultural Report Ref: 18024 6th June 2019

Added paragraph and associated plans for proposed tree works:

There are a small number of edge-trees located on the council-owned woodland to the west of the site; these include two poplars with stem diameters close to 70 cm. It has been agreed with the council, as owner of the trees, that, as part of the development, these edge trees will be removed. The individual trees to be removed will be agreed and marked on site with the council tree officer prior to any tree works taking place. The plan below shows the location of the two poplar trees that have been identified for removal so far.

Currently, branches of the woodland belt to the west of the site grow over the boundary fence into the site; as part of the development activity, these branches will be pruned back to the western boundary fence, taking the relevant British Standard 3998 into account.

With regards to the vegetation nearby the six proposed car parking spaces north of the existing electricity sub-station, this will be pruned back to give approximately a 3 metre horizontal buffer between the boundary fence and branches, reducing the likelihood of leaf and branch litter to fall onto parked cars and of issues such as honeydew that can affect cars. The plan below shows the affected vegetation with a red line highlighted with two arrows.

Recommendation:

As per the published report

Amended condition wording to condition 2 (approved plans) to update Arboricultural Report and condition 6 (landscaping) to remove request for protective tree fencing.

Item 5c

4/03260/18/FUL EXTENSION AND ALTERATION TO EXISTING BUILDING INCLUDING THE INSERTION OF TWO ROOF DORMERS AND FENESTRATION. CHANGE OF USE TO A 1-BED DWELLING. (AMENDED SCHEME).

FORMER TELEPHONE REPEATER STATION, DUDSWELL LANE, DUDSWELL

Hertfordshire County Council Further Response

As maybe aware, each planning application is assessed on its own merits. The Highways recommendation is therefore made on case by case basis. The Inspector's appeal decision you refer, was related to the construction of 2 pairs of semi-detached, two-storey houses (4 units in total with a provision of 8 parking spaces, arranged in bays fronting the head of the proposed cul-de-sac. Whereas, the Former Telephone Repeater Station is of a Change of Use from of an existing building to a 1-bed dwelling. This proposal included the use of the existing access from Dudswell Lane. This was put in place at the time of the original development. Both development cases are therefore entirely different in terms of the scale, location, access and highways implications.

I have also noted paragraphs 11 and 12 of the Inspector's report on 5 Tring Road on safety. Bearing in mind the relatively low level of accidents locally and the highway layout being complicated (Paragraph 9 of the report) , the Inspector concluded that a Road Safety Audit of the access arrangements should have been completed as part of the proposal. From my site visit, I fully acknowledge that the existing established VXO on Dudswell Lane serving the site is not at an ideal location bearing in mind close proximity of the Tring Road (A4251) junction. I consider a safer option could have been to formulate a new access to the site from the side access road, which currently serves the local sports club/nursery, rather than utilising the existing VXO. Such a proposal could have eliminated any reversing of vehicles close to the Tring Road junction. This however, does not form part of the details submitted, and therefore cannot be considered. In terms of Road Safety Audit, this is normally undertaken for new access proposals.

As mentioned below, my recommendation is entirely based upon the fact there is an existing VXO provision, and that the site already benefits from a planning permission for office/storage space (Ref: 4/00537/18/FUL). The trips generated from the existing permission as an office/storage space would be higher than the 1-bed dwelling during the day. The safety implications of generating limited vehicular movements from the 1-bed dwelling is therefore likely to be far less than the existing permitted

use. Accordingly all the factors including safety were taken into account when I reviewed our formal comments.

Recommendation:

As per the published report

Item 5d

**4/02781/18/MFA DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING AND
CONSTRUCTION OF 21 ONE-BED FLATS**

**MILBOR ENGINEERING HEMEL HEMPSTEAD LTD, BELSWAINS LANE, HEMEL
HEMPSTEAD, HP3 9XE**

5 Swan Mead

Objection

I strongly object as there is no more space to park cars just look at Red Lion Lane is now one way traffic also the traffic congestion is out of control. Emergency vehicles can not get through. The whole area is being overbuilt and with the parking and traffic volumes is an accident waiting to happen.

7 Basildon Court

Objection

I strongly object to this planning application and have written to the planning officer and committee in addition to this. I note than on a number of occasions throughout the report, issues such as impact of the new development on noise and parking are 'considered to be minor' - what is this based on?! The opinion of someone who doesnt live there and never will?! The report is hugely biased. My objections are based on the following:

Wildlife

There is an abundance of wildlife in the area, including protected species such as Kingfishers, badgers, bats and dormice, who are afforded the highest degree of legal protection under Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Kingfishers are also classified in the UK as Amber under the Birds of Conservation Concern 4: the Red List for Birds (2015). To illustrate the hugely negative impact that further development is likely to have on kingfishers, for example;

The RSPB advise that 'human disturbance of nesting birds is a serious problem, since the broods fail if something upsets the feeding routine. If human presence close to a nest prevents these shy birds from entering the nest for too long, the chicks may weaken enough (either from cold or hunger) to stop calling. This makes the parents wrongly assume that they are well fed and will not feed them. As a result, the chicks will perish.

Heavy machinery that grades the banks and drains the land destroys many nests each year on lowland rivers.'

Clearly there is no getting away from the fact that should this development go ahead, there will be heavy machinery used, and the levels of human disturbance will increase. As a public authority in England, and in spite of their financial motivations, the council has a duty to have regard to conserving biodiversity as part of any policy or decision making. I have yet to see any real evidence of this - having a tree and one bat survey done by the developer themselves does NOT count. We await the results of the three wildlife surveys that the report says will have to be conducted before the development can go ahead, but I would be interested to know who exactly is conducting these surveys? Are they independent of the developer?

Furthermore, it goes without saying that the increase in traffic and human activity from the new development is only going to be another risk to endangered wildlife such as Badgers and Kingfishers (who are most likely to die in a traffic accident) not to mention the increase in pollution to the area which has serious ramifications for both humans and animals alike.

Surely there is other land in Hemel Hempstead which could be used for this new development to stop destruction of more natural habitats for endangered species. Given that every property will have its own parking space in addition to visitor parking, these residents will likely have transport and so do not need to be in such close proximity to the station.

Access to Basildon Court

When we first moved to Basildon Court two years ago, access to Belswains Lane was fairly difficult at rush hour with solid traffic from Kings Langley/Apsley all the way back to Hemel. Two years down the line and the traffic in the area has got significantly worse - on the very rare occasions that we use a car, we have been known to sit in over one hour of traffic just trying to get from Sainsbury's in Apsley back to the development, a distance of approximately one mile. The pollution and danger to pedestrians that this amount of traffic poses cannot, and should not, be ignored, particularly when the development is in such close proximity to two schools.

Furthermore, the access to the development for emergency vehicles is becoming impossible. In solid traffic, it is simply not possible for an ambulance, police car or fire engine to get down the road - there just isn't anywhere for the traffic to move to. I have no doubt that this will one day prove fatal to whoever is in need of help purely because the ambulance/police/fire service just couldn't get through the traffic to help them. Emergency vehicles in rush hour in central London face less of a battle to pass through traffic than those trying to get through Belswains lane.

In the event that a resident should have an emergency themselves and need to get out of the development, an overflow of cars parking in the car parks for both Basildon Court and Lion Court has resulted in cars parking on any piece of space available, which usually results in another resident being blocked in/doorways being blocked.

We frequently see emergency vehicles attending both Lion Court and the wider Nash Mills development and there is absolutely nowhere for them to park should, heaven forbid, they need to bring anyone out on a trolley. This lack of space is not only a huge inconvenience to residents of Basildon and Lion Court, but is also, crucially, delaying emergency service access to people who need them. It doesn't take a genius to work out that putting more traffic and an additional 29 spaces onto such a tiny plot of land is only going to make this issue worse.

Waste disposal

Flytipping in the vicinity of Lion Court and Basildon Court is already a major issue, and has resulted in the service charges for both developments being increased which is grossly unfair, especially given that this has been raised with the housing association on numerous occasions but was totally ignored. Putting more people in such a small area is only going to exacerbate the problem, which apparently the housing association remedy by increasing our service charges! If the council are already unable to deal with the waste problem at Basildon Court/Lion Court, the new development is only going to make it worse. I, for one, will be refusing to pay an increase in service charges should the fly tipping worsen as a result of the new development.

Noise

It goes without saying that 21 new flats in the small patch of land proposed is going to significantly increase noise pollution in the area, and potentially may result in an increase of anti-social behaviour. This not only has potentially grave ramifications for endangered wildlife in the area who are disturbed by human noise, but will also impact heavily upon the day-to-day lives of current residents, many of whom work in the public sector and so work night shifts, resting in the daytime. Currently the development is peaceful and with the odd exception of anti-social behaviour, it

remains quiet. An additional 21 - 42 people is going to impact this hugely and for worse, not to mention the building and demolition noise from the outset. People chose to live in Basildon Court/Lion Court because it is peaceful and because we didn't want to feel that we were living in a noisy and crowded area - 21 new flats and 29 new parking spaces will ruin this.

I would urge the planning committee to consider the residents in the area who do not work in the usual 9-5 jobs, and to whom weeks and weeks of noise and disruption will have an enormous and detrimental effect. Furthermore, I would urge the committee to consider the effect that the building works will have on local endangered wildlife.

Privacy

A 4 storey block overlooking Basildon and Lion Court is going to be hugely invasive. Basildon and Lion Court are already in very close proximity to each other and a number of our properties are overshadowed by each other. Constructing yet more properties on the only side that Basildon Court is not overshadowed eradicates the final bit of privacy that some residents have.

Health Concerns

I have yet to see anything in writing which details the plans and considerations in place for this. I am concerned about the effects of demolishing such an old building in close proximity to both Basildon Court and Lion Court and I think the developer/planning committee need to show that they have considered what the effects of demolishing Milbor Engineering building might be on residents. Has the building been surveyed for asbestos for example?

Furthermore, how will the demolition be managed when there are so many people in such close proximity? The Health and Safety England website advises that 'Gas, electricity, water and telecommunications services need to be isolated or disconnected before demolition work begins' - can the planning committee show that the risks and huge upheaval to residents of disconnecting all of these services - particularly to anyone with young children or with health concerns - have been considered thoroughly and mitigation put in place?

To illustrate my concerns - recently, there were people spray painting a car in the garage at Milbor Engineering and the paint smell strongly lingered in Basildon Court for a whole day - whatever is released into the air from the demolition of the existing building will be ingested by all residents of Basildon Court and Lion Court who are in extremely close proximity. I would expect that the council/developers would be responsible for any health issues that arise subsequent to this as a result of the demolition being effected.

Summary from Agent

Application for the creation of 21no new apartments / dwellings – 4/02781/18/MFA
The application following a pre application submission 4/01290/18 in May 2018 for 28 units.

This full application was submitted in November 2018 and has been negotiated and amended accordingly. The proposal has:

- Reduced the number of units by 7 units - from 28 units to 21units
- Removed most of the top floor accommodation. The 2 units left on the top floor can only be seen from the front elevation.
- Lion Court opposite is a four-storey building.
- The new building has been moved 2.5m further away from the rear (SE) boundary than the existing building.
- The new building has been reduced in height by over 2.5m, with the rear parapet being only 1.4m higher than the existing building albeit 2.5m further away.
- The front of the houses on Kingfisher Dive are over 30m away from the rear of this proposal.
- Therefore, the new building is 2.5m further away from the SE boundary and 1.4m higher than the existing.

Starting point / Current use

The current site has a B2 use for “General Industry” which is unrestricted, Milbor Engineering has operated from this site for decades, they have been slowly winding up the business and their use over the last few years has been light.

A new B2 use on this site is likely to be far more intensive and as the area has changed significantly over the last decade from industrial to residential, this industrial site is now isolated and surrounded by residential uses on all sides and therefore there is scope for conflict between the two uses.

The site is a “Previously Developed Land” site which is suitable for redevelopment, a residential reuse of this site would be far more palatable to the surrounding area than a new B2 use.

What the proposal delivers

The proposal delivers **21 new starter dwellings / apartments**, these are one bed units to accommodate the market demand for starter units and commuter units.

The proposal delivers **29 parking spaces, exceeding** the required parking spaces which includes an allowance for visitor spaces.

This proposal is a **significant improvement both aesthetically and functionally** to the existing building and use, the proposal assimilates itself to the new architecture of the redeveloped Sappi site and the residential use that now surrounds this site.

A full Arboricultural Report was submitted with the application in November 2018, further shading analysis has also been provided and both the case officer and **Trees and Woodlands team are content.**

A full Ecological report was submitted with the application in November, 2 further emergence surveys have been carried out, with no evidence of bats recorded. **The ecologist is content.**

The proposal is for a high-quality landscaped scheme to create 21 starter dwellings that responds to the area architecturally, following the lead from the Sappi redevelopment but provides parking facilities in excess of the required standards. We have done all that we can to address all the points that have been raised positively and I hope it is clear from the summarised amendments noted above that this has been successful.

Initial proposal of 28 flats



Amended Scheme reduced by 7no flats- 21 flats



Representation from Cllr Maddern, ward councillor:

Main Areas of Concern for this Planning Application – Parking, Height and Bulk of Building and Protection of Local Historic Buildings and Trees Adjacent to the Site

Parking

Nash Mills Wharf was built between 2008 and 2015, around 500 dwellings, and so the ward, or ‘village’ of Nash Mills has grown by over 30% in a very short time. It replaced an ageing paper mill and, on the whole, has proven to be a lovely addition to our community... except for the parking issues that came with it!

This whole estate is privately owned with no availability to park other than in allocated bays; and there is a ridiculously insufficient parking provision for the number of dwellings. This has caused chaos in the local area; due to a private parking company ticketing cars parked inside the estate, vehicle owners living in

Nash Mills Wharf have no option than to park in neighbouring roads, on pavements etc, which has resulted in some very dangerous problems on Red Lion Lane, Mill Close, Nash Green, Bunkers Lane and Kingfisher Drive. These issues are a main topic of frustration and anger on social media, with residents from Nash Mills, Apsley, Kings Langley and Abbots Langley regularly tagging me in complaints about Red Lion Lane in particular.

Access to the application site is via Croxley Road, which is part of Nash Mills Wharf, so any overspill from the new development will add more pressure onto the roads mentioned above. ***It must be noted that there are already two planning applications approved adjacent to the application site that are not yet built – Nash House has 9 (mainly 2 bed) flats with only 11 spaces and 245 Belswains Lane, which is a conversion of a single dwelling into 4 flats (3 of which will be 2 beds).*** The new application site will further add to this huge pressure; with only 29 parking spaces for 21 flats, there is literally nowhere else for people to park

The parking issues have become so overwhelming that they are literally affecting some of our older residents' quality of life, in particular those living in Nash Green, which is just a few metres away from the site. I cannot emphasise enough that this application in its current form will drastically and detrimentally affect the vicinity.

Height and Bulk of the Building

This is a proposal for a 4-storey, flat roofed building, and whilst I do think it is attractive in its design, I cannot see the need to cram so many units into a tiny space. Three storeys would still appear high, but the 4th level, while it has been revised to reduce the size, is still too high for the surrounding area.

Indeed there are flats to one side of it that are a similar height, but the developer has not taken into account that on two sides the application site faces 2 storey dwellings. This will completely overwhelm the street scene from Kingfisher Drive. Until several trees were removed and pollarded recently the current building was barely noticeable. The small cottages are directly in front of the proposed site and again this huge 4-storey building will overwhelm this terrace.

Protection of Local Historic Buildings

The terrace of cottages that faces onto Belswains lane is going to be hugely impacted by this development. This part of Hemel Hempstead has a very important history and we are seeing our heritage being decimated by greedy local developer. I am gravely concerned about the building of such a large structure damaging the

integrity of the cottages, which date back to the 16th century and were built without foundations. These cottages have not been listed, and they need to be protected.

Trees

A line of Lombardy poplar trees was planted in Kingfisher Drive, along with several other lines of similar trees in The Mallards, Swan Mead, and a row of willows along the canal bank, to drain the waterlogged land when this was all part of Chiltern Hunt Plastics factory. This is the last line of poplars and there is great concern amongst the residents that these will follow the demise of the other poplars that were also removed by developers who had no regard for protecting these magnificent trees. I would request that whatever planning applications are approved at this site, these trees MUST be protected and preserved. For some bizarre reason they do not have TPOs on them but they are very important to the local area.

SUMMARY

I would absolutely encourage development on this site, as long as it is sympathetic to the locality and gives due consideration to the impact it will have on local residents who are already struggling with the thoughtless development of Nash Mills Wharf.

Recommendation:

As per the published report

Item 5e

4/03028/18/FUL CHANGE OF USE TO NURSERY AND CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE-STOREY EXTENSION

6 ALSTON ROAD, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP1 1QU

Recommendation:

As per the published report

Item 5f

4/00630/19/FUL CHANGE OF USE OF VACANT BARN TO DWELLING.

THE BARN, NETTLEDEN ROAD, FRITHSDEN, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP4 2RF

Recommendation:

As per the published report

Item 5g

4/00658/19/MFA DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION OF 15 DWELLINGS (CLASS C3) AND ONE RETAIL (CLASS A1 SHOP) UNIT AND PARISH STORE ROOM, ALTERATIONS TO VEHICLE AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESSES

GARDEN SCENE CHIPPERFIELD, CHAPEL CROFT, CHIPPERFIELD, KINGS LANGLEY, WD4 9EG

Affordable Housing

In the absence of definitive guidance within the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document or relevant case law in the Borough surrounding the 35% on-site provision requirement set out under Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy, provision of five affordable housing units (rounding down from a 5.25 requirement) is considered to be acceptable bearing in mind the small increase in making up the difference between 33% and a policy-compliant figure in this instance. In addition, the affordable rent percentage of the dwellings has also been increased to 80% (Affordable Housing SPD requires 75%) in lieu of the rounding down to 5 from 5.25.

The Council's Strategic Housing Team Strategic Housing have confirmed that they are satisfied with the level of affordable housing being provided.

It should also be noted that the site is proposed to accommodate more dwellings than initially anticipated (15 as opposed to the indicative 12 units referenced in the site allocation). As such, this represents a net gain in affordable housing provision in the borough.

Hertfordshire Ecology

Late representations have been received from Hertfordshire Ecology and are provided (in full) below:

Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Ecology on the above, for which I have the following comments:

A **Preliminary Roost Assessment** as part of a **Preliminary Ecological Appraisal** was carried out by The Ecology Partnership on the 14/6/2018. This found **negligible potential** roosting places within any of the buildings or trees on site. Based on these

findings the report recommended that no further surveys were required. I have no reason to doubt these findings

However as a precaution the following **Informative** should accompany any consent granted.

"In the event of bats or evidence of them being found, work must stop immediately and advice taken on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England."

Walk over surveys were also completed for badgers, and reptiles. No evidence of the use of the site by badgers was found. A small area of ruderal vegetation to the north of the site was assessed as having limited potential for reptiles. However the ecological consultant did not consider the potential to be high enough to warrant a specific reptile survey, but recommended a precautionary approach to cutting of the vegetation and removal of material. Consequently the **Informative** regarding should form part of any consent given.

"Keep any areas of grass as short as possible up to, and including, the time when the works take place so that it remains / becomes unsuitable for reptiles or amphibians to cross. Clearance of existing vegetation should be undertaken progressively using hand-held tools, where appropriate, towards boundaries to allow any animals present to escape to contiguous areas of retained habitat.

Where any tall vegetation, long grass or scrub are to be cleared, this work should be carried out in two phases. The first cut should be to > 100mm to decrease the suitability of the vegetation for reptiles and encourage any reptiles present to move to retained areas of habitat.

Where potential for reptiles to be present remains, following a minimum period of seven days, a second cut to ground level should be carried out in order to render the habitat unsuitable; cleared areas should be maintained to prevent re-colonisation prior to works commencing; and potential hibernacula or refugia such as loose stones or dead wood should be removed by hand.

Stored building materials (that might act as temporary resting places) are raised off the ground e.g. on pallets or batons away from hedgerows on site. Caution should be taken when moving debris piles or building materials as any sheltering animals could be impacted on and if an amphibian (with exception of a Great crested newt) is found, then it should be moved carefully out of harm's way.

Any excavations have a ramp left to allow trapped animals to escape easily / provided with a means of escape for any animals that may have become trapped - this is particularly important if holes fill with water.

The accompanying DAS includes a proposal to remove 6 trees, which will result in the loss of potential nesting sites for birds. Nesting birds are protected under Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. The following informative should be included with any consent.

"Any vegetation should be undertaken outside the nesting bird season (March to August inclusive) to protect breeding birds, their nests, eggs and young. If this is not practicable, a search of the area should be made no more than two days in advance of vegetation clearance by a competent Ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest."

The proposal includes the planting of forty nine new trees. In order for this to fully compensate for the removed trees and to provide biodiversity gain in line with the aims of the NPPF, these should be composed of native species and species with a known benefit to wildlife. The proposal is also accompanied by a picture of integrated bat and bird boxes. Together these measures will provide biodiversity gain for the site. The number and location of bat/ bird boxes of the type shown, and the number and species of tree being planted, should be included in a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).

This should be submitted to the LPA for approval as a **Condition** of any planning consent.

Other than the above, I am not aware of any ecological constraints to the proposal.

The findings of the County Ecologist do not give rise to any concerns. The recommended informatives will be appended to any grant of planning permission.

Additional Representations

Oaklands, Croft Lane, Chipperfield:

I am writing to you regarding the above planning application, I have enclosed documents for you to examine as I have sent several documents to you at Dacorum and still have not got any correspondence back so please can you examine this and get back to me as a matter of urgency either contact me on my mobile.....or via email.....I have been in contact with land registry regarding the two pieces of land given to you by Simmonds Nursery in 1967 because the information given to land registry is incorrect so I ask if you can set a meeting with me to see where your two pieces of land should be.

I must point out that the service road is not registered and it is privately owned so why should the owners of the service road have the benefit of access on to Croft Lane when planning grant ran out in 1971, they also have been giving rights of way to other owners to access on Croft Lane since 2008 this is way before your letter dated the 14/09/18 Ref: DA/460/2018 sent to Highways in Hertford. I have read Mike Younghusbands reply to your letter and would again suggest they should be at the meeting as there are issues with his statement.

Letter from SA Law (Solicitors acting on behalf of Applicant) dated 11 June 2019

I write to confirm that the Property benefits from free and unencumbered rights of access over the accessway from Croft Lane both with and without vehicles which will enable for the carrying out of the development of the Property and use of the Property following completion of the development.

Recommendation:

As per the published report

Item 5h

4/03077/18/FHA PROPOSED CAR PORT

**KILBRACKEN, HUDNALL COMMON, LITTLE GADDESSEN, BERKHAMSTED,
HP4 1QW**

Recommendation:

As per the published report

Item 5i

**4/00891/19/FHA CONSTRUCTION OF NEW CAR PORT
WOODLAND VIEW, ROSSWAY, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3UD**

Recommendation:

As per the published report