



Public Document Pack

# DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AGENDA

**THURSDAY 8 JULY 2021 AT 7.00 PM  
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 C Wyatt-Lowe (Vice-  
Chairman)  
Councillor Beauchamp  
Councillor Durrant  
Councillor Hobson  
Councillor Maddern  
Councillor McDowell

Councillor Oguchi  
Councillor Uttley  
Councillor Woolner  
Councillor Douris  
Councillor Williams  
Councillor Hollinghurst

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

## **AGENDA**

- 7. ADDENDUM** (Pages 2 - 38)

# Agenda Item 7

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ADDENDUM SHEET

8th July 2021

\*\*\*\*\*

### Item 5a

**21/01517/RES Reserved matters application with details of Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale comprising of 276 dwellings and associated works relating to application 4/02539/16/MOA (Outline planning application to include up to 600 dwellings (c3), land for primary school (d1), land for local centre uses (a1,a3,a4,a5,d1,d2), land for up to 7,500 square metres of employment uses (b1,b2,b8), landscaping, open space and play areas, associated infrastructure, drainage and ancillary works, new roundabout access off three cherry trees lane, new priority junction off three cherry trees lane, new vehicular access to spencer's park phase 1 and an emergency access to the employment land off cherry tree lane. Detailed approval is sought for access arrangement only, with all other matters reserved)**

### **Spencer's Park Phase 2 Land Between Three Cherry Trees Lane And Cherry Tree Lane Hemel Hempstead**

#### Corrections to report

1. Paras. 2.1, 4.1 & 10.1 - The reference to outline permission ref. 4/01749/16/OUT is erroneous. These should refer to ref: 4/02539/16/MOA granted 30<sup>th</sup> April 2019
2. Para 9.47 – Now 378 trees following amended landscape details.
3. Paras 9.166 – 9.172 – It should be noted that this section on the tilted balance isn't technically applicable for a reserved matters application since the principle of development for residential has already been considered and accepted under the outline approval. However, the commentary serves to underline that the positives from this scheme are considered to more than outweigh the negatives.
4. Para 11 to read: That approval of Reserved Matters be **GRANTED**

#### Deleted Conditions

Conditions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14

#### New / Additional Condition

1. Notwithstanding the details submitted, the details hereby permitted do not extend to the following matters:

- Solar panel siting and appearance
- Electric vehicle charging layout and infrastructure
- Cycle storage arrangements
- Proposals to dissuade vehicle parking along the shared driveways of the Green Spine
- Crime prevention measures
- Tree planting proposals
- Details to mitigate overlooking
- Details of the design and appearance of the balustrades serving the Gateway apartments

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and because insufficient or unsatisfactory information has been submitted pursuant to Condition 1 of the outline permission 4/02539/16/MOA to demonstrate an acceptable layout, appearance and landscaping of the site.

Amended Conditions

2. The Reserved Matters hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:

CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0001  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0002  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0100 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0110 B  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0111 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0112 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0113 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0120 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0121 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0122 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0123 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0124 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0125 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0126 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0127 A

CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0130  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0131  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0132 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0133 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0135  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0136  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0137 A  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0138 A

CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0200 C  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0201 B  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0202 B  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0203 C  
 CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0204 B

CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0210 B

CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0300 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0301 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0301\_1 A  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0302 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0303 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0304 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0305C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0306 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0310 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0311 A  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0311\_1 A  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0312 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0313 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0314 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0315 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0320 D  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0321 D  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0322 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0323 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0324 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0325 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0326 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0330 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0331 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0332 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0333 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0334 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0335 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0336  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0337  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0338  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0340C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0341C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0341\_1 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0342 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0343 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0344 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0350 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0351 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0352 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0353 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0354 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0355 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0360 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0361 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0362 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0363 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0364 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0365 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0370 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0371 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0372 V  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0373 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0374 C

CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0375 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0400 D  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0401 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0402 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0403 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0404 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0404\_1  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0405 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0406 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0410 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0411 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0412 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0413 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0414 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0415 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0416 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0500 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0501 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0502 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0510 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0511 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0512 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0513 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0514 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0515 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0516 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0517 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0518 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0519 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0520 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0521 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0522 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0523 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0530 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0531 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0532 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0540 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0541 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0542 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0550 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0551 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0552 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0553 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0554 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0560 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0561 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0562 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0563 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0564 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0600 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0601 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0610 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0611 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0612 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0620 B

CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0621 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0700 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0701 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0702 B  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0710 C  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_0711 C

CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_CGI\_0005  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_CGI\_0010  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_CGI\_0011  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_CGI\_0012  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_CGI\_0013  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_CGI\_0014  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_CGI\_0015  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_CGI\_0016  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_CGI\_0017  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_CGI\_0018  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_CGI\_0019

CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_CGI\_0080  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_CGI\_0081

CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_1000  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_1001  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_1002  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_1003  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-A\_DR\_1010 A

CPL\_SPH\_SC\_100 11

O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8001-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8002-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8003-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8020-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8021-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8022-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8023-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8024-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8025-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8026-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8027-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8028-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8029-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8030-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8031-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8036-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8037-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8041-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8042-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8043-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8044-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8045-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8046-PL1  
O00011-BCE-S02-XX-DR-C-8047-PL1

CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_0900 G  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_0901 E  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_0902 F  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_0920 G  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_0921 G  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_0922 G  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_0923 G  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_0930 E  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_0931 E  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_0932 E  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_0933 G  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_0950  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_0951  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_1700  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_1701  
CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_DR\_1702 A

Soft Landscape Schedule – CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_SC-2910  
Hard Landscape Outline Specification - CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_SP-1700  
Maintenance Strategy and Schedule - CPL-SPH\_HTA-L\_S3\_SC\_1701  
Plot Schedule - CPL-SPH\_HTA\_A\_SC

131121F/AT/B01 K  
131121F/AT/C01 L  
131121F/AT/D01 L  
131121F/AT/E02 F  
131121F/AT/G01 E  
131121F/AT/G02 C  
131121F/AT/G03 C  
131121F/AT/G04 B

19025-AWA-ZZ-00-DR-ES-9607-P06  
19025-AWA-ZZ-00-DR-ES-9608-P06  
19025-AWA-ZZ-00-DR-ES-9609-P05  
19025-AWA-ZZ-00-DR-ES-9610-P02-UKPN  
78-32-PRELIM-200831-CD-LI-C

Tree Protection Plan, Drg. No. LO10821-001 Rev A, contained in Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement LO10821 Report No. 001 prepared by Wardell Armstrong

Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement LO10821 Report No. 001 prepared by Wardell Armstrong

Building unit specification details provided in Section 5 and Tables 8 and 9 the Noise Assessment Report submitted by Wardell Armstrong ref LO18021 dated April 2021

Drawing LO10821- 104 in Appendix C of Noise Assessment Report submitted by Wardell Armstrong ref LO18021 dated April 2021

Noise Assessment Report submitted by Wardell Armstrong ref LO18021 dated April 2021

Sustainable Development Checklist and Energy Statement

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

3. All plots as listed below with obscured glazing identified on the drawings hereby approved (and identified in summary on Drg. No. HTA-A\_DR\_0110 received 30/06/21) shall have obscured glazing installed prior to the occupation of the dwellings and shall thereafter be permanently retained.

Plots 2-11, Plots 13-22, Plots 24-29, Plot 34, Plots 38-43, Plots 49-52, Plot 54, Plots 57, and 58, Plot 63, Plot 65-68, Plots 70-73, Plot 78 and 80, Plots 82-90, Plot 91, Plots 95-105, Plots 107, 110 and 112, Plot 113, 115-119, Plots 124-130, Flat Block 3, Plot 143  
Plots 168 and 170, Plots 172-175, Plot 177, Plots 180-182, Plots 184-195, Plot 197, Plots 234, 237, 239 and 243

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenities of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings in accordance with Policy CS12 (c) of the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 127 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

### Informatives

The Local Planning Authority would advise the applicant that the following details will need to be submitted to fully satisfy the reserved matters required under Conditions 1 and 7 of the outline permission 4/02539/16/MOA and as noted under Condition 2 above:

#### Solar panel siting and appearance

plans and details of the solar panels, including typical cross sections to show their proposed installation in relation to the roofs of the dwellings / flat blocks hereby permitted, together with a roof plan to show their proposed final positioning on each dwelling / flat block, together with details of the roof tiles proposed.

#### Electric vehicle charging layout and infrastructure

Plans and details of the EV (electric vehicle) charging infrastructure to be installed, including a plan(s) showing the siting and distribution of above ground EV infrastructure.

#### Cycle storage arrangements

An amended layout plan (and other plans as necessary) relating to the cycle storage arrangements for Plots 55, 56, 81, 169 and 196.

#### Proposals to dissuade vehicle parking along the shared driveways of the Green Spine

Plans and details (including cross section drawings) of the proposals to dissuade vehicles from parking on the verges and gardens either side of the shared driveways alongside the Green Spine in relations to Plots 17-23, 49-53, 96-104, 185-192 and 193-197.

#### Crime prevention measures

Details of the crime prevention measures to be incorporated into the development in order to meet Secured by Design part 2 certification.

#### Tree planting proposals



Plans, details and specifications of additional tree planting to be provided adjacent to or within the rear gardens of Plots 69, 106 and 193.

Details to mitigate overlooking

Plans and details of measures to help mitigate the impact of mutual overlooking in respect of Plots 4, 5 and 34, Plots 180 and 190, Plots 181, 182 and 188, Plots 234, 235 and 236 and 176, and Plots, 237, 238, 239 and 174 / 175.

Details of the design and appearance of the balustrades serving the Gateway apartments

Details of the design of the balcony balustrades of the apartments facing Three Cherry Trees Lane to ensure that they are screened against road traffic and industrial noise to achieve LAeq16hr (07:00-23:00) not exceeding 55dB(A) or at least the lowest level practicable. This may be achieved by use of solid balustrades or alternative design.

Building Glazing and Ventilation

The building glazing and ventilation scheme hereby permitted shall be installed in strict accordance with the building unit specification details provided in Section 5 and Tables 8 and 9 the Noise Assessment Report submitted by Wardell Armstrong ref LO18021 dated April 2021.

Recommendation

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5b**

**4/00024/19/MFA Construction of 15 new two-storey dwellings, (including two and three bed dwellings).new access off tring road, parking, landscaping and all associated works.**

**Land Off Tring Road Wilstone HP23 4PD**

**Representations:**

55 Tring Road

My previous comments and objections applies equally to the latest amended plans and information.

1 Grange Road

Having seen the revised plans for the 15 houses I can see no reason to change my original objections as given below. The latest plans 13 April 2021 are a slight improvement over the previous plans 31 Mar 2021 but do not fundamentally change my objections.

PLANNING APPLICATION NO 4/00024/19/MFA.

Proposed construction of 15 houses off Tring Road, Wilstone, by Rectory Homes Ltd.

We write in connection with the above planning application. We have examined the plans and supporting documentation and are very familiar with the site having lived adjacent to it for 56 years. We wish to object strongly to the development of these houses in this location.

We suggest that if permission were granted it would set a precedent in the village for the conversion of arable land to housing. Secondly it would lead to or encourage further development along Tring Road and in the fields to the south of the site. Already a local discussion supported by the Parish council is planned. In the supporting documentation Rectory Homes make much of sustainability for their site and suggest the land is of little ecological importance. We would suggest that arable land trumps housing development on both of these counts.

By their own omission, Rectory Homes do not intend to provide housing to meet local needs, although they claim to meet a wider need from within Dacorum Borough.

Rectory Homes suggest that the village is well served by bus and rail routes and offers some limited services. We would suggest that the type of buyer that these properties are aimed at would find it very hard to survive in our village without a car. The layout of centre of Wilstone has changed little since the 19<sup>th</sup> century and is unusual in that it has no pavements. In reality, there are very few safe walking and cycling routes leading out of the Village. The exceptions are the canal tow path and some public foot paths. However these are only really usable in the drier months. Parts of the local canal towpath are classed as public footpaths which may prohibit cycling? You would not want to walk as suggested by the developer to Tring or Aston Clinton with child in a buggy along the Lower Icknield Way or from Wilstone to Gubblecote. These are all very dangerous and busy routes with no pavements.

Wilstone has a continuous problem with sewerage. The pumping station in Sandbrook lane has failed on several occasions, requiring a stream of tankers to and from the Village until the problem is fixed. Thames Water has never been able to solve the strong smell of raw sewerage which frequently pervades parts of the village. Adding more houses to the already overloaded system will not improve matters.

Parts of the village centre have had floods in recent years largely caused by the failure of land owners or authorities to clear drainage ditches and roadside drains. The proposed site aims to utilise a storage system with pumped metered discharge to a drainage ditch to the north of the site at maximum rate of 9000 litres/hour. Unless the drainage ditch is regularly maintained there will be an increased risk of downstream flooding probably in lower areas of the village recreation ground.

We specifically object to the positioning of units 14 and 15 in relation to 1 Grange Road. It is proposed to place the side elevation of the three bedroom house; unit 15, within about 4 metres of our boundary fence. The side of the house will extend completely across the width of our garden and beyond. We feel this would overwhelm our small garden and will make us feel totally hemmed in because of the close proximity and height (9 metres) of the proposed house. Also the unit 15 has a small first floor side window which will overlook our property. The site road also extends to within 4-5 metres of our boundary and we can anticipate noise and disturbance from cars and children playing. At night cars lights may cause disturbance to our rear bedroom. We believe that this issue could be resolved by repositioning the two units in such a way to satisfy all parties.

90 Tring Road

This application is contrary to policies CS1, CS2, CS7, CS10, and CS20 of the core strategy.

This proposed development borders our bungalow at 90 Tring Road. Our bungalow is single story. Both the bedrooms are situated to the front facing Tring Road. Our bathroom, kitchen and family room where we spend most of our time is facing the field where the development is proposed.

Wilstone has a good mix of all age groups. The village has no school. The children use the school bus to travel to both primary and secondary school which are both oversubscribed. There are a number of children travelling by taxi due to no places available on the school bus. In 2020 Tring secondary school had 600 applicants for year 7 with only 240 place available. Due to further development in Tring there will be further pressure for school places.

This local shop is the hub of our community. A large number of volunteers help run the shop along with many local teenagers as part of their D of E award scheme.

Wilstone has had its fair share of new housing:

1. Planning application: 4/01533/12/MFA – Dixon’s Wharf, Dixon’s Gap, Wilstone. Change of use from B1 (business) to C3 (dwelling house) and construction of 21 dwellings. Granted permission 08/11/12 a previously developed location within the designated rural area”.

2. Planning application: 4/02833/16/MFA – Victory House, Wilstone Bridge, Tring Road Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 8. Granted permission 16/03/17. Planning officer’s report to committee highlighted the brownfield status of the site and to grant permission would “improve the appearance of a previously developed, derelict site”.

3. Planning application: 4/01331/17/FUL – 17 Tring Road, Wilstone Demolition of house and garage and construction of 3 x 3 bedroom dwellings Granted permission 14/09/17. Planning officer report to committee

4. Application 4/02469/18/FUL demolition of agricultural barn and replace single dwelling. Granted Jan 2020

5. Application 19/03229/FUL demolition of garage and construction of a single dwelling. Granted Jan 2020

6. Application 4/01803/18/FUL Construction of 3 bed dwelling on garden land behind Tring Road.

7. Current application 21/00854/FUL Demolish storage yard and construct 6 new homes outside village boundary. With planning officer

8. Current application 20/003864/FUL land off 36-44 Tring Road build 6 new homes on behalf of Dacorum Council. With planning officer

### Traffic through village

The Glanville transport report on file dated 2019 trip rates only apply to estimated households in the village.

Trip rates household privately owned:

8-9am - inbound 0.085 outbound 0.447 two-way 0.532  
17.00 -18.00 - inbound 0.404 outbound 0.170 two-way 0.574  
Daily 7am- 19.00pm - inbound 2.313 outbound 2.283 two-way 4.596

Trip rates traffic generation 15 houses:

8-9am - inbound 1 outbound 7 two-way 8  
17-18.00pm - inbound 6 outbound 3 two-way 9

7am-19.00pm - inbound 35 outbound 34 two-way 69

Tring Rural Parish Council carried out their own survey on village traffic also in 2019 which greatly differs from from Tring Trial Villages Survey.

Tring Rural Parish Council in 2019 shows that between 7-10am 408 vehicles passed through the village averaging 1 every 26.4 seconds of which 167 (40.9%) exceeded the speed limit with the highest recorded speed 55-60mph.

Between 3-6pm 448 vehicles passed through the village at a rate of 1 every 24 seconds of which 171 (38.2%) were speeding with the highest recorded speeds in 40-45mph.

1852 vehicles were recorded in a 24 hour period.

Wingrave Road which Tring meets at the T junction over the canal bridge between 7am-7pm a total of 3805 vehicles passed. During a 24 hour period 4426 vehicles passed.

#### Loss of light & overshadowing

Our property is a single story bungalow, the proposed property beside us is a two story building which is not in keeping with this side of the road. Our neighbour on the junction of Grange Road number 86 Tring Road is a bungalow and all our neighbours opposite are bungalows. Grange Road is made up of houses and some flats which are at least 100ft away from our properties. This two story building will overshadow the front of our property and not in keeping with this end of the road.

#### Overlooking/loss of privacy

Property number 15 shows an upstairs window which will overlook our garden causing loss of privacy. Our bungalow will be surrounded by traffic noise and pollution. We will have traffic to the front on Tring Road, as we are on the corner plot, traffic on Grange Road, with the plan for the new 15 homes there will be 19 parking places on a new road which will be a few feet away from our living area. My husband who is retired is asthmatic and this pollution would effect his health. I know each parking area will have an electric charging point but doubt households will have electric cars

#### Adequacy of parking turning

Our bungalow is situated on the corner of Tring Road and Grange Road. This is a very busy junction with large delivery vehicles using this junction as a turnaround because of the restrictions on the canal bridge which is listed and has a 10T weight restriction. This junction is also used for the school bus to reverse into and turn at this junction four times a day, along with residents within Tring Road using it as a turning point.

Grange Road is a very busy road with insufficient parking for residents. Most of the day and evening all parking spaces are used. This road is used by residents and the many ramblers and fishermen who also park right beside our bungalow all year round to go on walks through the field and fish on the canal. Wilstone has many ramblers which come through our village and also it is a route for many children hiking as part of the Duke of Edinburgh award scheme.

#### Noise & Disturbance

Our bungalow will be surrounded by traffic noise and pollution. We will have traffic to the front on Tring Road, as we are on the corner plot, traffic on Grange Road, with the plan for the new 15 homes there will be 19 parking places on a new road which will be a few feet away from our living

area. My husband is asthmatic and this pollution will affect his health. I know each parking area will have an electric charging point but doubt households will have electric cars.

Rectory report also states the following:

4.6 Access, Movement & Road Hierarchy Vehicular access to the site is proposed from Tring Road via a new priority 'T' junction in the north-west corner of the site. The access road will be 5m in width throughout the development, with the exception of a carriageway narrowing with rumble strips either side on the first straight section, to provide a form of traffic calming. It is intended to extend the 30mph speed limit past the site access by way of a TRO contribution, which would assist in reducing vehicle speeds in the vicinity of the proposed access. A 2m wide footway is proposed to run along the southern side of the internal access road, exiting the site in the south-west corner and subsequently connecting to the existing footway network at the Tring Road / Grange Road, thus providing a pedestrian connection to the rest of the village.

Not only would we have the possibility of thirty more cars, but in addition noise from rumble strips near our home, causing additional noise. I would strongly object to rumble strips.

#### Traffic/ junction

Living at the junction of Tring Road and Grange Road I know first-hand how dangerous this junction along with Tring Road is.

Mostly we reverse out of our driveway due to its layout and be on high alert. Traffic from both directions travel at speed and especially from around the bend by the entrance by the gate to the proposed land. The peak time volumes can have bursts of continuous traffic. The speed limits are in the main not observed by cut through traffic. Last summer cars travelling in separate directions damaged each side of their cars as the the view at this bend is obscure until you are near to the bend (by the entrance to the field)

The local farmer has had to use alternative access by Rosebarn Lane to gain access to fields when he had no access due to application 20/01754/MFA for 28 which was rejected. This road is very narrow at the top end and resulted in access to the allotment very difficult to access by foot as muddy.

#### Visual Intrusion

Currently the proposed land is arable agricultural land which is outside the village boundary, which the local farmer rents from the owners. Crops are grown annually in this field and the surrounding fields, which is used for animal feed.

This development will change the character of the village from Tring Road, as currently you can visually see the countryside across the fields along with the church steeple in Marsworth. The village will seem more built up until you go over the canal bridge.

#### Wildlife

This field currently has so much wildlife visiting. We have around several bird feeders on this hedge border with numerous varieties of birds visiting including the woodpecker family who visit every year. There is also visiting pheasants routinely to our garden. Muntjac are also found in this field along with the surrounding fields who in the evening can be found along the hedgerows.

#### Sewage & surface water

Since October 2020 we have had two episodes of severe flooding in the village. The council put a kerb stone by the canal bridge (reported to HCC with photos) which has resulted in water runoff from the proposed land has overflowed the gully under the hedge on Tring Road and has pooled under our hedge at the front of our property which resulted in a very large pond. Which covered the whole length of verge. The village has been badly flooded especially the Village hall car park and surrounding areas and along Tring Road. (Photo's sent to planning officer)

It is proposed to provide a new gravity foul water drainage system to serve the proposed residential development and to connect to the existing public sewer within Tring Road

The sewage system in the village has over the years had numerous problems. There are days especially in the summer where you can't walk down the lower end of Sandbrook Lane due to the smell at the pumping station. This should be well documented.

There are areas in the flood report which I am concerned about with reference to the water table and surface water.

A digger came on site Sept/October 2018 and found water at approx. one metre. This was carried out after the driest hottest summer probably on record.

In the winter months to the upper end of the field near the canal the surface water can be high.

#### Glanville Report:

5.0 Flood Risk Assessment 5.1 the NPPF encourages a sequential, risk-based approach to determine the suitability of land for development. This document advises that the development of sites within Flood Zone 1 should be given preference where available. 5.2 Table 2 of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) to the NPPF categorises different types of development into five flood risk vulnerability classifications: • Essential Infrastructure; • Highly Vulnerable; • More Vulnerable; • Less Vulnerable; and • Water Compatible Development.

5.3 The NPPF classifies the proposed residential use of the site as being 'More Vulnerable'.

Also noted by Rectory Homes

6.13 The surface water pump station will be designed by specialists to achieve a maximum pump rate of 2.5l/s. The pump chamber will be fitted with a high level alarm and telemetry. In the unlikely event of pump failure, the pump station unit will provide approximately 33m<sup>3</sup> of additional emergency storage, calculated based on the guidelines in Sewers for Adoption. This emergency storage is independent of the attenuation storage provided in the surface water drainage strategy.

Wilstone has frequent power cuts all year round mostly due to overhead power cables requiring a lot of maintenance, especially in stormy weather. If I recall we had six between Jan-Feb 2018 and to this current date. What is in place should there be a power cut? UK Power Network I'm sure can provide the frequency of power cuts. How noisy will this surface water pump be?

#### Maintenance for drainage

6.22 All of the proposed SuDS and drainage networks within each plot will be the responsibility of the future owners. The surface water pumping station will be the responsibility of a private management company, if it is not formally adopted by the local sewer authority.

Table 1 shows the maintenance schedule to manage the drainage features within the development.

Table 1: SuDS Maintenance Schedule Drainage Feature Inspection and Maintenance Frequency  
Permeable pavements brushing surface to remove detrimental materials such as debris, dirt and sediment.

Annually Stabilize / mow adjacent verges, and remove weeds from surface. Occasional (as required) Ensure paving dewaterers after rain and between storms as required Rehabilitate super-structure.

Occasional (every 10-15 years) Cellular storage tank\* Ensure inlets and pre-treatment structures are clear and free of debris.

Annually Flow control structure (Hydro brake or similar)\* Inspect and remove any sediment / debris. Annually Inspect flows controls and repair as necessary.

Occasional (as required) hard standing areas Sweep regularly to prevent silt being washed off the surface. Frequently Gulley's Inspect and remove any sediment / debris. Annually

Maintenance will be the responsibility of the home owner, but there is no guarantee that this will be carried out. Who will monitor this?

### Concerns

Onsite investigations have established that a high water table exists on the site being as high as 1.1m below ground level in places. Consequently, this makes it difficult to achieve a 1m unsaturated zone required with an infiltration drainage solution, without significant design modifications such as raising finished floor levels across the site.

## **Representation from 2019**

### 10 Chapel Fields

I wish to object strongly to the above proposed development.

This is not a brownfield site, but within the green belt and is greenfield arable land. This application is contrary to the County/District council planning policy and is neither affordable housing nor linked to buyers with a strong local connection, but simply to be sold on the open market.

Wilstone already has many developments such as Grange Road, Tring Road which is a new row of three houses, Lukes Lane in Gubblecote and the new development on Wilstone Bridge. There is also a proposed development at 12 Tring Road. Many of these and existing properties remain unsold although on the market for a considerable time.

There is clearly not a need for extra housing in Wilstone. Therefore I request that this proposal be rejected completely

### 11 Grange Road

I object strongly to the application.

Tring Road is a 'rat run' at peak times and it would be dangerous to have another access road between the bend of the road and the canal bridge. It would mean at least 30 cars turning in and out of the road, not to mention delivery vehicles.

There is no footpath on this part of Tring Road. As a dog walker it is already dangerous as cars travel too fast. Mothers with push chairs, walkers, cyclists and horse riders already use this stretch of road.

I am also concerned with the impact on ecology. I often hear owls late at night and early morning coming from the area.

### 24 Grange Road

A lack of sales of similar properties in the village that were/are in the market demonstrated a lack of need for this type of housing in the village at present and in the medium term. Given the lack of need, I believe the habitats in the field should remain as well as the allotments which are such a asset to the village and community.

### 58 Tring Road

Further to my earlier comments regarding the above planning application, it is now clear that the proposed development will not be a Rural Exception Scheme (RES) in the traditional sense, which offers affordable homes for local people in perpetuity, but an Entry Level Exception Site (ELES - NPPF 2018), aimed at meeting 'affordable' housing need across the Borough.

I have read the report from Litchfield's and I struggle to understand their views on the Local Context - Wilstone, contained in the Executive Summary. Namely:

- "...That the population has aged significantly over the last 15 years..... it is likely that without further development, the village will see population decline and rapid ageing in the future..."

Many rural settlements have an increasing elderly population. Our community consider Wilstone a well-balanced and inclusive settlement, which comprises elderly residents but equally, middle-aged couples, young families and single people. The school buses from Wilstone to Long Marston and Tring School bear witness to our vibrant society. Litchfield's report shows that 35% of our population are indeed over 65 but that 41% of households are in younger age brackets and have dependent or non-dependent children.

- "Attracting (First Time Buyer) households is also likely to support the local shop and pub as well as schools and facilities in other nearby villages and towns".

Our thriving community shop is a leading example of successful and balanced communal involvement, set up, managed and run by volunteers, staffed by working and retired members of the community and many younger teenage members too.

The Half Moon pub, is very well patronised, supported enthusiastically by locals and visitors. We also have many and varied facilities here including our local church services, village hall, Allotment Gardens, shop and pub.

- "Supply of First-time Buyer Housing. Figure 5.1 Dwelling Stock."

Litchfield's report clearly shows that our community already has a balanced supply of housing sizes in the settlement, advising 35% detached homes and 66% of smaller semi-detached, terraced and apartments.

- Evidence from CDA for Herts Housing Needs Survey 2018



"Information available from Dacorum Borough Council indicates that there are 49 social housing units (general needs) provided within the parish of Tring Rural as follows:

4 x 1 bed flats  
5 x 2 bed houses  
38 x 3 bed properties  
2 x 4 bed homes

Additionally, there are nine sheltered housing units in Tring Rural;

5 x one bed bungalows  
2 x 2 bed flats  
1 x 2 bed house  
1 x 2 bed bungalow"

This clearly demonstrates a healthy local supply of affordable rented homes. Dacorum BC also have a Local Lettings Policy that prioritises allocation to rural applicants with a local connection:

Dacorum Housing Allocations Policy - Updated January 2019

#### "5.2 Village Lettings

When shortlisting for village properties, applicants with a local connection (see 2.2) to a specific village (known as village connection) will be considered above applicants without a village connection. Villages for which additional priority will be given for a local connection are:

Aldbury, Bovington, Chipperfield, Flaunden, Flamsted, Great Gaddesden, Gaddesden Row, Kings Langley, Little Gaddesden, Long Marston, Markyate, Northchurch, Potten End, Wilstone and Wigginton."

Current (February 2019) Local Open Market housing potentially suitable for First Time Buyers

6 x 2 bed units - Lendon Grove (possibly affordable shared ownership) currently unoccupied  
3 x 3 bed units - Willow Bank Cottages, Wilstone  
2 x 2 bed units - Long Row, Wilstone  
1 x 3 bed unit - Tring Road, Wilstone

Tring Rural Parish Council and Community Development Agency for Herts recently conducted a Housing Needs Survey (HNS) in the parish, with a view to establishing whether there was a need for affordable homes, available in perpetuity and provided for people with a strong, provable local connection. The survey did establish such a need but as can be seen above, we already have suitable properties available, including Social Rent, Open Market rent, Shared Ownership (Lendon Grove) and Open Market for sale. The Survey was not conducted to support provision of 'other' needs.

Dacorum Borough Council has robust policies in place to preserve their distinct rural settlements and part of their social objectives are to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment, supporting effective use of land and improve biodiversity.

The Core Strategy (Adopted 2013), also lists Wilstone as an Area of Development Restraint:

- "being one of the least sustainable areas of the borough, where significant environmental constraints apply. These include areas of high landscape quality, such as the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and the countryside between settlements. This needs to be protected to ensure its rural character is retained and settlements keep their separate identities.

POLICY CS20: Rural Sites for Affordable Homes

"Small-scale schemes for local affordable homes will be promoted in and adjoining selected small villages in the countryside (see Policies CS6 and CS7), and exceptionally elsewhere with the support of the local Parish Council. Development will only be permitted if:

- (a) it meets an identified local need for affordable housing;
- (b) the housing is for people who have a strong local connection with the village or parish through work, residence or family; and
- (c) the scheme is of a scale and design that respects the character, setting and form of the village and surrounding countryside. Any site on the edge of a village must represent a logical extension to it."

We are fortunate and privileged to live in Wilstone, situated in The Boarscroft Vale, and to ensure the healthy balance continues, we are always willing to embrace appropriate, modest, well-planned development and to welcome new members to the community. As can be seen, we already have a good supply of social rented units and affordable properties suitable for first time buyers. Development of this site is not justified by local circumstances. I do not consider that the proposed development is appropriate in Wilstone, it does not meet a proven 'local' need and does not have general community support for the proposed ELES development.

It should also be noted that the Parish Council and Community Shop committee are currently looking into ways to provide permanent shop facilities. This may include a Community Right to Build Order (Localism Act 2011) and this in turn could, if needed, address any shortfall of appropriate small-scale housing development for the community in the near future.

Recommendation

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5c**

**21/00854/FUL      Demolish existing storage yard, change of use to residential and construction of 6 dwellings.**

**Development Site Southeast Of Loch View Wilstone Bridge Tring Road Wilstone Hertfordshire HP23 4PQ**

Recommendation

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5d**

**21/00365/FUL Raising of roof, Change of roof pitch, Conversion of barn to residential use and changes to fenestration. Repositioning of tree planting screen.**

**Barn A Birch Lane Flaunden Hertfordshire HP3 0PT**

Recommendation

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5e**

**20/02125/RES Submission of reserved matters on appearance, Landscaping, Layout and scale attached to planning permission 4/00783/17/OUT - Construction of two chalet bungalows with associated access , parking and amenity Space.**

**Land For Development Love Lane Kings Langley Hertfordshire**

Recommendation

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5f**

**21/01261/FUL Demolition of Garage/Outbuildings and the construction of a detached bungalow and carport (amended scheme).**

**93-95 High Street Markyate St Albans Hertfordshire AL3 8JG**

Additional neighbour representations have been received as follows:

- Quill House, 91 High Street, Markyate St Albans, Hertfordshire AL3 8JG

Customer objects to the Planning Application

- Development too high
- Inadequate parking provision

It is astonishing that a development has now been changed to increase the height of the building quite significantly affecting adjoining properties - 89 & 95 specifically. This is now the 4th time the site has had applications put forward and each time rejected due to parking and overlooking other properties as well as all other previous objections previously submitted - please refer to your files @ previous objections

Again, not all residents who would be affected received notification of the amendment; why is this?

Had the original plan for the bungalow as originally submitted proceeded without the latest amendment then the residents would have had very few objections to the development.

I am of the view that opinions of current residents are not fully taken into account and the lack of communication with them creates a feeling of underhandedness and unprofessionalism - surely those residents affected by any development should have their voice heard and their views taken into consideration

It would be interesting to hear on what basis amendments to the application has been put forward

- 87A High Street, Markyate, St Albans, Hertfordshire AL3 8JG

Customer objects to the Planning Application

- Close to adjoining properties

The plans for the development at 93 have changed - the roof height is now significantly higher - providing scope for a 2nd floor extension - and will be far more visible from our properties.

The applicant has informed my neighbour at 89 High Street, that the roof height is about 1600 mm lower than the 2 level house rejected by the committee. If this is correct the new roof height is 5.4 meters. This is more than 1 metre higher than her barn roof which is 4.25 meters and which has planning permission for 2 floors. I would ask why does a 3 bed bungalow need such a high pitched roof? The conservation officer recommended it as he thought it would be more in keeping with the surrounding properties.

The revised heritage report does not address the impact on our properties (as requested at the planning committee) and the roofline is substantially higher and potentially negatively impact my and surrounding properties

- 97 High Street, Markyate, St Albans, Hertfordshire AL3 8JG

**Stance:** Customer objects to the Planning Application

**Reasons for** - Close to adjoining properties

**comment:**

- Conflict with local plan
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate parking provision
- Increase in traffic
- Increase of pollution
- Information missing from plans
- Loss of light
- Loss of parking
- Loss of privacy
- Not enough info given on application
- Out of keeping with character of area
- Strain on existing community facilities

**Comments:** Beggars belief that neighbours are consulted AND AGREED with proposed changes to the architecture (HEIGHT) and the apparently the Conservation Officer has now worked with the architect to raise the roof height by over 2 meters. I would like the Planning Committee to:

see all correspondence between these two individual including any text/WhatsApp messages!

understand/consult on why neighbours were not consulted.

understand why the heritage report fails to take into account issues raised in all previous 4 applications

seek confirmation that if this planning application proceeds that there will be a legal condition that a second story can NEVER be built.

Receive confirmation that no windows overlooking 97, 91,89 will have clear glass.

Enquire why the three existing vehicles parked on site in relation to 93-95 High Street remain ghosted (not identified in any plans)

- 89 High street

I strongly object to the amended plans submitted in June 2021 in which the roof height of the bungalow is raised significantly. I do not object to the original plans for a single level bungalow as submitted by the Applicant in March 2021

I made representations to the Development Committee Meeting in January 2021 on behalf of my neighbours when planning permission for 93-95 was refused – mainly due to the adverse impact on our adjacent heritage properties which were not mentioned in the Heritage Report or indicated on the plans.

Since refusal the Applicant has liaised with me regarding a modified scheme for a single level bungalow which was submitted for approval in March 2021. Despite the fact that the bungalow is much closer to my property than the previous 2 floor building I decided not to object to the scheme as the roof height was much lower and the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor had been removed.

I then received notification that the scheme had been changed and that neighbour responses must be in by 29 June (today). I was surprised to discover that significant changes had been made and in particular to the roof height to reflect concerns of the conservation officer that it was not in keeping with the surrounding heritage properties. The new roof height is more than a metre higher than my Barn and will be a blot on the landscape.

#### Consultation Process

I am concerned that this planning application is being rushed through before the consultation period for the amended scheme has expired. Don't our views matter? Why did the planning officer submit her report to the Committee yesterday when the neighbour consultation period doesn't expire until today? Why hasn't she included within her report the recent objections that have been uploaded to the planning portal by Nos. 97, 87 and 87A? Has Markyate Parish Council been notified of the changes and had time to put in an amended objection?

The consultation process has been woefully inadequate. Neighbours who put in objections previously and/or attended the last Committee hearing have not been consulted including 87, 87A and No.50 Roman Way. The planning officer's report suggests that 16 neighbours were consulted and only 1 objected. This is grossly misleading as the wrong people appear to have been consulted AND the consultation period had not yet expired. Who are the 16 neighbours that have been consulted?

#### Heritage Report Inadequate

Once again the planning officer has overlooked the fact that the Heritage report makes no reference to the impact of the development on Nos 87, 87A and 89 – all Grade 2 listed properties. PARA 9.9 of the planning officer's report states 'The application is supported by a revised heritage statement which sets out the significance of the surrounding heritage assets and a full impact assessment has therefore been undertaken by the Councils Conservation officer. IT DOESN'T. This was the point I made and was accepted at the last committee meeting when consent was refused. The committee members were concerned that the 3 listed buildings adjacent to the development were not mentioned in the report and their proximity was not indicated on the plans. The current Heritage report not only makes NO reference to the listed buildings 87, 87A and 89 but also has not been updated to reflect the revised plans. The NPPF (PARA 189) makes clear that in determining applications the lpa should require applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected including any contribution made by their setting. As this has not been done the Committee should defer making a decision or refuse the application.

The Conservation Officer should not have overlooked this very important omission, particularly as the plans were changed to reflect his concerns.

The building will not be subservient to the Grade 2 listed building no 89 – the roof will be more than a meter higher and it is nonsense to describe the dwelling as being one storey in height.

#### Errors in Report

Paragraph 9.17 of the Planning Officer's Report wrongly refers to my Barn as being number 97 – it is number 89. She states 'the previous application was refused partly due to the harm caused were those conversion works to be implemented'. The work started many years ago as stated at the last Committee Meeting.

Paragraph 9.18 of the report is wrong in stating once again that the building is set over 23 metres away from the main rear walls of existing dwellings – the car port is less than 1 metre from the adjoining wall to my Barn and the bungalow will be less than 4 metres – this was raised at the last planning meeting and in written objections.

## Conclusion

The application should be refused/deferred because:-

- i) the consultation period has been rushed
- ii) the neighbour consultation exercise has been inadequate
- iii) there are significant errors in the planning officer's report
- iv) the Heritage Report fails to address the impact on 87, 87A and 89 as required by The NPPF (PARA 189)

Conservation officer's comments 93 Conservation & Design (DBC) Comment Date: Thu 17 Jun 2021 Original Plans; New dwelling to rear. The site is within the Markyate conservation area and there are a number of nearby listed buildings e.g. 93 and 97 High St Markyate. The proposal would impact on the setting of these designated heritage assets. A previous scheme which had an appropriate design was recently refused. The proposal is a revised scheme for a new dwelling to the rear of buildings to the High Street. Unlike the previous proposals this is a single storey bungalow with a low pitched roof. The building is not in keeping with the character of the conservation area. This is due to the proposed width of the property and low pitch of the roof of the building. It therefore fails to respect and respond the character of the traditional buildings within the conservation area and therefore it would be detrimental to the character of the conservation area. It would also detract from the setting of the adjacent listed buildings. This would cause harm to the designated heritage assets. The harm caused would be less than substantial and at a low to moderate level. There would not appear to be any public benefits of the proposal and therefore following the balancing exercise as set out in the framework it would appear contrary to both policy and guidance. Recommendation We would object and recommend refusal due to the detrimental impact on the designated heritage assets. Amended Plans; New dwelling to rear. The site is within the Markyate conservation area and there are a number of nearby listed buildings e.g. 93 and 97 High St Markyate. The proposal would impact on the setting of these designated heritage assets. A previous scheme which had an appropriate design was recently refused. The proposal is a revised scheme for a new dwelling to



1. Site plan. Window of 89 Barn to the left in blue

15:55 ✓✓







4. View from bedroom window 89 showing barn and to the right the corrugated roof covered in Ivy which will be removed - will be replaced by car port with pitched roof to provide privacy to 89



5. Rear of barn and garden - bungalow will be to the left of picture at same level as bin but set back a few metres. New roof will tower over garden restricting light

16:03 ✓✓







5 and 6. Plans showing location of windows. Conversion to front of barn started many years ago.

16:04 ✓✓

Agent response to recent objections (in red) and comparison plan.

89 High Street Markyate St Albans Hertfordshire AL3 8JG (Objects)

**Comment submitted date: Wed 30 Jun 2021**

I strongly object to the amended plans submitted in June 2021 in which the roof height of the bungalow is raised significantly. **In part by 1.4m - see attached** I do not object to the original plans for a single level bungalow as submitted by the Applicant in March 2021 \*

I made representations to the Development Committee Meeting in January 2021 on behalf of my neighbours when planning permission for 93-95 was refused - mainly due to the adverse impact on our adjacent heritage properties which were not mentioned in the Heritage Report or indicated on the plans. **Your views were very much listened to around how the development might have impacted your property. In fact the layout/fenestration of the new bungalow was designed specifically to accommodate you !**

Since refusal the Applicant has liaised with me regarding a modified scheme for a single level bungalow which was submitted for approval in March 2021. Despite the fact that the bungalow is much closer to my property than the previous 2 floor building I decided not to object to the scheme as the roof height was much lower and the 2nd floor had been removed. **The new building is just 375mm closer to the boundary - 2547mm before and now 2172mm**

I then received notification that the scheme had been changed and that neighbour responses must be in by 29 June (today). I was surprised to discover that significant changes had been made and in particular to the roof height to reflect concerns of the conservation officer that it was not in keeping with the surrounding heritage properties. The new roof height is more than a metre higher than my Barn and will be a blot on the landscape. **I was contacted by the owner of 89 on the 22nd June and corresponded immediately with her that day, to explain the differences in heights**

#### Consultation Process

I am concerned that this planning application is being rushed through before the consultation period for the amended scheme has expired. Don't our views matter? Why did the planning officer submit her report to the Committee yesterday when the neighbour consultation period doesn't expire until today? Why hasn't she included within her report the recent objections that have been uploaded to the planning portal by Nos. 97, 87 and 87A? Has Markyate Parish Council been notified of the changes and had time to put in an amended objection?

The consultation process has been woefully inadequate. Neighbours who put in objections previously and/or attended the last Committee hearing have not been consulted including 87, 87A and No.50 Roman Way. The planning officer's report suggests that 16 neighbours were consulted and only 1 objected. This is grossly misleading as the wrong people appear to have been consulted AND the consultation period had not yet expired. Who are the 16 neighbours that have been consulted?

#### Heritage Report Inadequate

Once again the planning officer has overlooked the fact that the Heritage report makes no reference to the impact of the development on Nos 87, 87A and 89 - all Grade 2 listed properties. PARA 9.9 of the planning officer's report states 'The application is supported by a revised heritage statement which sets out the significance of the surrounding heritage assets and a full impact assessment has therefore been undertaken by the Councils Conservation officer. IT DOESN'T. This was the point I made and was accepted at the last committee meeting when consent was refused. The committee members were concerned that the 3 listed buildings adjacent to the development were not mentioned in the report and their proximity was not indicated on the plans. The current Heritage report not only makes NO reference to the listed buildings 87, 87A and 89 but also has not been updated to reflect the revised plans. The NPPF (PARA 189) makes clear that in determining applications the lpa should require applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected including any contribution made by their setting. As this has not been done the Committee should defer making a decision or refuse the application.

The Conservation Officer should not have overlooked this very important omission, particularly as the plans were changed to reflect his concerns.

The building will not be subservient to the Grade 2 listed building no 89 - the roof will be more than a meter higher and it is nonsense to describe the dwelling as being one storey in

height. **It is NOT more than a metre higher than No 89, if that is what is being suggested. It is *not* nonsense to describe this as a single storey building, since that is clearly what it is ?**

#### Errors in Report

Paragraph 9.17 of the Planning Officer's Report wrongly refers to my Barn as being number 97 - it is number 89. She states 'the previous application was refused partly due to the harm caused were those conversion works to be implemented'. **That is surely the case. The Committee expressed their concern over a window which has never been installed and discussions were had around a proposed first floor window which might have impacted the 'never installed' window in the neighbour's barn** The work started many years ago as stated at the last Committee Meeting. **- and has never been completed in more than 25 years ....**

Paragraph 9.18 of the report is wrong in stating once again that the building is set over 23 metres away from the main rear walls of existing dwellings - the car port is less than 1 metre from the adjoining wall to my Barn and the bungalow will be less than 4 metres - this was raised at the last planning meeting and in written objections. **The 23 metres refers to back to back first floor windows**

#### Conclusion

The application should be refused/deferred because:-

- i) the consultation period has been rushed
- ii) the neighbour consultation exercise has been inadequate **Immediate neighbours on both sides were fully consulted over the new bungalow prior to submission and subsequently discussed the amended roof with the owner of No 89 on the 22nd June, which was requested by the Conservation Officer. In fact there were a series of amended drawings proposed and discussed with the owner of No 89 until she was satisfied that the scheme mitigated previously expressed worries and concerns.**
- iii) there are significant errors in the planning officer's report
- iv) the Heritage Report fails to address the impact on 87, 87A and 89 as required by The NPPF (PARA 189)

*Hope Cottage 87 High Street Markyate St Albans Hertfordshire AL3 8JG (Objects)*

#### **Comment submitted date: Tue 29 Jun 2021**

There is still a lack of parking provision in the new proposal as there is no parking allocated in the plans for the current property which will then mean parking on the already heavily congested High Street affecting neighbouring properties and businesses. **No 93 is under a separate title to the application site and has been for a number of years. The application therefore need not provide any additional parking for No 93, nor indeed any other properties along the High Street. This is an erroneous argument and should be disregarded. In order however to help with the parking situation generally in the area and with an amount of space available, the applicant has generously proposed to grant a single space for the benefit of the occupants of No 93. The parking standard requirement for the new dwelling would be 2.25 spaces. We have provided 3 spaces, which is significantly in excess of the minimum requirement**

The first plans submitted for a single storey house seemed not to affect my property as this would not be visible from my Grade II listed home. However, the plans have been amended to include a much higher pitched roof which would be visible from my home and garden without giving any notice to me as a neighbour impacted by this. **I am not sure it would be any more visible at all** The higher pitched roof is completely unnecessary for a single storey home and would have a detrimental effect to the conservation area and the semi-rural surrounds of the Grade II listed homes so close to it. **Clearly this is not backed up by the LPA's appointed Conservation Officer** My concern is also around lack of privacy to my home and garden should the high pitched roof then be allowed to become a second storey or include windows. **Should an application be made by a future occupier to raise the level of the roof, clearly that would be publicised and the owner of No 87 and other neighbouring properties would have the chance to comment. We are only seeking permission for the submitted design - NOT for some possible future development which I suggest is unlikely ever to happen.**

*87A High Street Markyate St Albans Hertfordshire AL3 8JG (Objects)*

**Comment submitted date: Mon 28 Jun 2021**

The plans for the development at 93 have changed - the roof height is now significantly higher - providing scope for a 2nd floor extension - and will be far more visible from our properties. Again this is supposition without foundation. There is no intention to extend this roof to provide first floor accommodation. **There will be limited headroom within the loft void and the roof was raised only at the recommendation of the Conservation Officer**

The applicant has informed my neighbour at 89 High Street, that the roof height is about 1600 mm lower than the 2 level house rejected by the committee. If this is correct the new roof height is 5.4 meters. This is more than 1 metre higher than her barn roof which is 4.25 meters and which has planning permission for 2 floors. **This is simply not true. See attached drawing. I am not aware that the neighbour's barn actually has permission for a second floor? but certainly with an overall quoted height of only 4.25m, this wouldn't be feasible. The ridge level of the neighbour's barn is in fact higher than the proposed bungalow, even with the increased roof pitch.** I would ask why does a 3 bed bungalow need such a high pitched roof? **The Conservation Officer called for a small clay tiled roof with an increased pitch. He recommended this approach as he thought it would be more in keeping with the surrounding properties. The neighbour's barn at No 89 has a ridge height level quoted on the topographical survey of 129.33 and the new bungalow 129.315, so a fraction lower. I would ask the Committee to disregard this as an issue though, since what matter if it were slightly higher than a neighbour's barn or lower? Why not compare it to the correspondent's own home, which at the highest point I note is 133.42, or a full 4.1m higher than the proposed bungalow!**

The revised heritage report does not address the impact on our properties (as requested at the planning committee) and the roofline is substantially higher and potentially negatively impact my and surrounding properties

*Quill House 91 High Street Markyate St Albans Hertfordshire AL3 8JG (Objects)*

**Comment submitted date: Mon 28 Jun 2021**

It is astonishing that a development has now been changed to increase the height of the building quite significantly affecting adjoining properties - 89 & 95 specifically. This is now the



4th time the site has had applications put forward and each time rejected due to parking and overlooking other properties as well as all other previous objections previously submitted - please refer to your files @ previous objections **Respectfully, the correspondent may wish to re-visit the file themselves, since this is wholly inaccurate. None of the previously submitted applications have been refused citing highways issues. Indeed in concert with this one, in each other case the Highways Officer has been content with the proposals. During the course of the very first application for three cottages, the Highways Officer had expressed concern over the number of car movements proposed, in which case the application was withdrawn.**

Again, not all residents who would be affected received notification of the amendment; why is this?

Had the original plan for the bungalow as originally submitted proceeded without the latest amendment then the residents would have had very few objections to the development.  
**hmmm ...**

I am of the view that opinions of current residents are not fully taken into account and the lack of communication with them creates a feeling of underhandedness and unprofessionalism - surely those residents affected by any development should have their voice heard and their views taken into consideration **The immediate neighbours were fully consulted before an application was even submitted. In fact the proposal was design quite specifically for the benefit of the owner of No 89**

It would be interesting to hear on what basis amendments to the application has been put forward **The Conservation Officer requested the amendments**

*97 High Street Markyate St Albans Hertfordshire AL3 8JG (Objects)*

### **Comment submitted date: Tue 22 Jun 2021**

Beggars belief that neighbours are consulted AND AGREED with proposed changes to the architecture (HEIGHT) and the apparently the Conservation Officer has now worked with the architect to raise the roof height by over 2 meters. I would like the Planning Committee to: **The height has not been raised by over 2 metres - see attached drawing.**

see all correspondence between these two individual including any text/WhatsApp messages! **I have never corresponded directly with the Conservation Officer on this matter. I was signposted by the LPA to the comments of the CO, at which point the drawing was amended to reflect the request and re-submitted via the case officer. The CO then added a further note of agreement to the design.**

understand/consult on why neighbours were not consulted. **Neighbours were consulted**

understand why the heritage report fails to take into account issues raised in all previous 4 applications **There were three previous applications. This is the fourth. The Heritage statement was produced by a qualified company and has been accepted as appropriate by the Conservation Officer and Case Officer.**

seek confirmation that if this planning application proceeds that there will be a legal condition that a second story can NEVER be built. **This of course cannot be insisted upon. Each application is judged on its merits - not what might happen in the future.**

Receive confirmation that no windows overlooking 97, 91,89 will have clear glass. **I can**

**confirm the following - There is one ground floor window which looks back towards No 89/91 and this is already shown as being glazed with obscure glass - as agreed with the owner of No 89. There are no windows facing directly towards No 97**

Enquire why the three existing vehicles parked on site in relation to 93-95 High Street remain ghosted (not identified in any plans)

**Comment submitted date: Thu 01 Apr 2021** I have discussed this above, but for clarity have copied and pasted my comments -

**No 93 is under a separate title to the application site and has been for a number of years. The application therefore need not provide any additional parking for No 93, nor indeed any other properties along the High Street. This is an erroneous argument and should be disregarded. In order however to help with the parking situation generally in the area and with an amount of space available, the applicant has generously proposed to grant a single space for the benefit of the occupants of No 93. The parking standard requirement for the new dwelling would be 2.25 spaces. We have provided 3 spaces, which is significantly in excess of the minimum requirement**

Firstly, the building plan is satisfactory and we have no objection to this style of property being erected following our objection to the previous monstrosity. **Great news that there is finally an acknowledgement of our hard work to accommodate neighbours. Apologies to the Conservation Officer who commented that he actually preferred the design of the previously submitted two storey building ..... "monstrosity" ?**

Our remaining and consistent objection, raised with both the developer and the agent, is the deliberate attempt to mislead in relation to parking and the relationship between this development and the 3 bedroom house at Number 93.

**No 93 is under a separate title to the application site and has been for a number of years. The application therefore need not provide any additional parking for No 93, nor indeed any other properties along the High Street. This is an erroneous argument and should be disregarded. In order however to help with the parking situation generally in the area and with an amount of space available, the applicant has generously proposed to grant a single space for the benefit of the occupants of No 93. The parking standard requirement for the new dwelling would be 2.25 spaces. We have provided 3 spaces, which is significantly in excess of the minimum requirement**

For sake of clarity, this development is in land at the back of no 93. The property is held in trust for xxxxxxx xxxxxxx who is in long term care in St Albans. It is currently one property not two separate lots as described.

**Again as has been pointed out separately to the writer, this is factually incorrect and misleading. The land to the rear is held under a separate title to No 93/95 High Street. This is a private matter and need not be shared with other members of the public. Indeed I'm not sure what Planning point the correspondent is trying to make ?**

While the various attempts at development (this is the 4th) have been presented No93 has been rented. Those tenants, similar to the previous ones have three (3) vehicles that are parked in the driveway and in front of the existing barn.

**The application therefore need not provide any additional parking for No 93, nor indeed any other properties along the High Street. In order however to help with the parking situation generally in the area and with an amount of space available, the applicant has generously proposed to grant a single space for the benefit of the occupants of No 93. The parking standard requirement for the new dwelling would be 2.25 spaces. We have provided 3 spaces, which is significantly in excess of the minimum requirement**

The plan only sets aside parking for two cars in a car-port. Those cars relate only to the new development. **Perhaps a re-viewing of the plans might be helpful here. The three spaces for the new bungalow are in front of the building, with one space housed within the car port. The second car port space has been suggested to be provided for the residents of No 93. I would reiterate that we are not required to consider parking for No 93/95 at all within this application, since they have no legal rights to park there**

A very simple question to the Committee is where are the existing 3 cars going to park? **Another very simple question might be - You sir have only one dedicated parking space for your own five bedroomed house. Where do you park your other vehicles?** There is zero free space on the narrow high street where parking is only on one side. The agent is suggesting that No93 "needs no parking facilities" but is considering providing one space next to the car-port. Given the agent lives in the village he is well aware of the intense situation in relation to High Street parking. **I do not live in Markyate - perhaps you are confusing me with someone else?**

To ignore these cars is disingenuous. **The highways officer is content with the scheme**

There is plenty of space for 5 cars if the property were placed at the back of the site, leaving space for cars to turn. I will email you separately pictures of existing cars which I would ask you to submit to the committee. **The correspondent well knows, that in concert with his own small garden, the rear garden of the proposed bungalow lies with a Flood Zone where building works are prohibited. This is not therefore an option.**

**In conclusion, given the remarks where the owner of 97 applauded the new design, I couldn't help wondering if the remainder of the text was a *personal* view, or a view proffered on behalf of Markyate Matters, [a small village campaign group founded by this same correspondent], or indeed if it were the result of some disappointment that if approved, he would no longer be able to covertly burn his garden rubbish on the application site?**

*Markyate Village Hall Cavendish Road Markyate St Albans Hertfordshire AL3 8PS (Objects)*

**Comment submitted date: Tue 06 Apr 2021**

No parking, this application will make the problem worse. This is also infilling. Parking provision should be provided for the house on the High Street. **There is adequate parking for the new bungalow. That is what is being determined. There is no legally tenured parking currently provided on site for any other property, in which case, it cannot be the case that a loss of parking provision for any other house would occur. The principle for development on this site is not in question and has been agreed elsewhere in Markyate**

Comparison Plan (will be included in presentation)



Officer comments;

Most of the concerns/points raised have been addressed by the agent above but in addition the following comments are made;

- There is an error at 9.17 of the Officer report – it should be No. 89 not 97 as stated.
- Reference to the barn conversion was in relation to the rear facing windows/doors which are yet to be inserted (see photos of rear barn in neighbour comments above)
- The 23m separation distance quoted is a direct back to back distance between the properties of the High Street/Roman Way and the proposed dwelling, there are no policy requirements for an oblique separation distance. In addition there are existing structures (existing barn and rear wings) behind the rear windows of many of the high street properties.
- There is no direct correspondence between the Conservation Officer and the Agent, all correspondence was via email between the Case Officer Robert Freeman and the agent.

Recommendation

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5g**

**21/00142/FUL      Demolition of existing detached dwelling. Construction of 2 semi detached dwellings.**

**Woodley 37 Chesham Road Bovington Hertfordshire HP3 0EE**

Recommendation

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5h**

**21/01335/FUL      Construction of two new semi-detached cottages and new boundary wall.**

**64 High Street Markyate St Albans Hertfordshire AL3 8HZ**

Recommendation

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5i**

**21/01336/LBC      Construction of two new semi-detached cottages and new boundary wall.**

**64 High Street Markyate St Albans Hertfordshire AL3 8HZ**

Recommendation

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5j**

**21/00956/FHA      Proposed open porch, attached garage with new driveway, two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.**

**3 Bulstrode Close Chipperfield Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 9LT**

Recommendation

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Item 5k**

**21/01337/FHA      A single storey side return and rear extension to the existing house, including interior reconfiguration and addition of two roof lights (amended scheme).**

**36 Victoria Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2JT**

Recommendation

As per the published report.

\*\*\*\*\*