



Public Document Pack

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AGENDA

THURSDAY 15 OCTOBER 2020 AT 6.30 PM
MICROSOFT TEAMS - MICROSOFT TEAMS

This meeting of the Development Management Committee will be held remotely via the Microsoft Teams application.

Should any members of the public wish to join this meeting, please contact the Assistant Director (Corporate & Contracted Services) at member.support@dacorum.gov.uk by 5pm on Wednesday 14th October

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 C Wyatt-Lowe (Vice-Chairman)	Councillor Riddick
Councillor Beauchamp	Councillor R Sutton
Councillor Durrant	Councillor Uttley
Councillor Hobson	Councillor Woolner
Councillor Maddern	Councillor Tindall
Councillor McDowell	

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

AGENDA

1. MINUTES

To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting (these are circulated separately)

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any declarations of interest

A member with a disclosable pecuniary interest or a personal interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered -

- (i) must disclose the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent and, if the interest is a disclosable pecuniary interest, or a personal interest which is also prejudicial
- (ii) may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter (and must withdraw to the public seating area) unless they have been granted a dispensation.

A member who discloses at a meeting a disclosable pecuniary interest which is not registered in the Members' Register of Interests, or is not the subject of a pending notification, must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the disclosure.

Disclosable pecuniary interests, personal and prejudicial interests are defined in Part 2 of the Code of Conduct For Members

[If a member is in any doubt as to whether they have an interest which should be declared they should seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer before the start of the meeting]

It is requested that Members declare their interest at the beginning of the relevant agenda item and it will be noted by the Committee Clerk for inclusion in the minutes.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

An opportunity for members of the public to make statements or ask questions in accordance with the rules as to public participation.

Time per speaker	Total Time Available	How to let us know	When we need to
3 minutes	Where more than 1 person wishes to speak on a planning application, the shared time is increased from 3 minutes to 5 minutes.	In writing or by phone	5pm the day before meeting.

You need to inform the council in advance if you wish to speak by contacting Member Support on Tel: 01442 228209 or by email: Member.support@dacorum.gov.uk

The Development Management Committee will finish at 10.30pm and any unheard applications will be deferred to the next meeting.

There are limits on how much of each meeting can be taken up with people having their say and how long each person can speak for. The permitted times are specified in the table above and are allocated for each of the following on a 'first come, first served basis':

- Town/Parish Council and Neighbourhood Associations;
- Objectors to an application;
- Supporters of the application.

Every person must, when invited to do so, address their statement or question to the Chairman of the Committee.

Every person must after making a statement or asking a question take their seat to listen to the reply or if they wish join the public for the rest of the meeting or leave the meeting.

The questioner may not ask the same or a similar question within a six month period except for the following circumstances:

- (a) deferred planning applications which have foregone a significant or material change since originally being considered
- (b) resubmitted planning applications which have foregone a significant or material change
- (c) any issues which are resubmitted to Committee in view of further facts or information to be considered.

At a meeting of the Development Management Committee, a person, or their representative, may speak on a particular planning application, provided that it is on the agenda to be considered at the meeting.

Please note: If an application is recommended for approval, only objectors can invoke public speaking and then supporters will have the right to reply. Applicants can only invoke speaking rights where the application recommended for refusal.

5. INDEX TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS

- (a) 20/01235/MFA - ARTIFICIAL GAMES PITCH/ MULTI USE GAMES AREA WITH FENCING AND FLOODLIGHTING - Berkhamsted Hockey Club Tring Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RF (Pages 5 - 187)
- (b) 20/01866/FUL - DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING DWELLING AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF FIVE DWELLINGS - 16 Park Road, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire (Pages 188 - 247)
- (c) 20/01667/FUL - DEMOLITION OF 4 SINGLE STORY BARNs CURRENTLY USED AS DWELLING. ERECTION OF A LOW CARBON 1.5 STOREY 4 BED FAMILY HOME, ANNEX AND GARAGE. -Greenings Farm Stocks Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RX (Pages 248 - 270)
- (d) 4/02109/19/FUL - SITE FENCING AND HARDSTANDING (RETROSPECTIVE) Land Off Pipers Hill/ Church Meadow Pipers Hill Great Gaddesden (Pages 271 - 319)
- (e) 20/02050/FHA - REAR EXTENSION, HIP TO GABLE ROOF EXTENSION WITH NEW DORMER. NEW 2 STOREY SIDE EXTENSION. REPLACEMENT WINDOWS - 10 Bunkers Lane Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8AX (Pages 320 - 334)
- (f) 20/02549/FHA - TWO STOREY SIDE/REAR EXTENSION WITH A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND FRONT PORCH (AMENDED SCHEME) 24 Finch Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3LH (Pages 335 - 344)

6. QUARTERLY ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Pages 345 - 360)

ITEM NUMBER: 5a

20/01235/MFA	Artificial Games Pitch/ Multi Use Games Area with Fencing and floodlighting	
Site Address:	Berkhamsted Hockey Club Tring Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RF	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr Nicholas Burles	Mr Nick Burles
Case Officer:	Nigel Gibbs	
Parish/Ward:	Northchurch Parish Council	Northchurch
Referral to Committee:	Recommendation is contrary to view of Northchurch Parish Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be **REFUSED.**

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The site is located in the Green Belt and Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty within the countryside. This location is identified through Dacorum Core Strategy's Settlement Hierarchy as an 'Area of Development Restraint', which is a 'least sustainable area' within the Borough where significant environmental constraints are applicable. Policy CS1 of Dacorum Core Strategy (Distribution of Development) applies this approach in the assessment of new development. The policy expects that the rural character of the Borough will be conserved and that development that is compatible with the policies protecting and enhancing the Green Belt and AONB will be supported. This approach to restraint is reinforced through Core Strategy's Countryside Place Strategy Local Objectives, especially the AONB.

2.2 The proposal would provide an additional inclusive community based sports facility which the Club considers is essential for its future and that of hockey in Dacorum with many sporting benefits for the Borough. This would be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework's social objective in supporting sustainable development, in addition to economic benefits. The application is supported through Sport England's consultation response by England Hockey, The Football Foundation and The Rugby Union.

2.3 The proposal, however, is inappropriate development in the Green Belt as the fencing enclosure would be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt resulting in the encroachment of the countryside. The community benefits of the proposed sports facility are considered to represent very special circumstances.

2.4 However, these very special circumstances do not outweigh the permanent harm to the AONB due to the impact of the intensive use of the floodlighting in this countryside location through the introduction of a very substantial 'box of light' within in an established unlit night time environment/ locality. This is with reference to the expectations of the NPPF's Paragraphs 172 and 180 in addressing development in the AONB and light pollution in intrinsically dark landscapes. The intensity of use is fundamentally and materially different to the low level use of sports floodlighting for club fixtures on traditional grassed surfaces.

2.5 The principle of the proposed floodlit facility is in principle unacceptable in this location within the AONB. This is demonstrated by the Chilterns Conservation Board's objection.

The proposal would not be a sustainable development as it would not be in accordance with the NPPF's environmental objectives, which outweigh the identified social benefits.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1. Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club (BHHHC) is based at Cow Roast located to the south west of this historic small settlement's long established core of ribbon development. Cow Roast features predominantly mature housing and commercial garages respectively fronting both sides of the lit London Road (A4251) within a Scheduled Ancient Monument and countryside setting. The canal and railway are to the north east.

3.2 The settlement includes a vacant former pub/ restaurant on the A4251's south western side. This adjoins an elongated unmade unlit BOAT (Byway Open to All Traffic) which is linked to BHHHC's modernised clubhouse, car park and playing field by an associated access road. The BOAT connects Cow Roast to the wider local road network to the south east of Wigginton, with a link to the Rossway Lane- Bottom House Lane- Crawley Lane junction within the vicinity of the A41M bridge which is located to the south west of BHHHC's playing fields.

3.3 The large area of playing pitches form land to the south west of the clubhouse bounded by the BOAT to the north east and featuring a wooded south western boundary. BHHHC has confirmed that the pitch nearest to this boundary is disused. This is about 200m from the clubhouse area. The Club has also confirmed that one of the existing pitches is used by Berkhamsted Rugby Club for training with temporary/ halogen floodlights. This is during October and February each year for 2/3 nights between 19.00 and 22.00hours and has been in use with floodlighting since 2015.

3.4 The pitches are within the Green Belt, Chilterns of Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, an Area of Archaeological Significance and an Air Limits Area.

3.5 The application site is limited to an area of land associated with the aforementioned disused pitch. The remainder of BHHHC's associated land is edged in blue by the submitted location plan, including the clubhouse and car parking. Orchard Cottage adjoins the BHHHC centre.

3.6 The inclusive BHHHC site/ club is used for community based hockey, football, rugby, archery, dog training, lacrosse, dance, cricket and 'other ad hoc' sports. This is a reflection of BHHHC's transformation to a modern multi sports role within the Borough, from its hockey origins in 1903 and establishment at Lockhart Fields/ Cow Roast since 1958. The clubhouse was constructed in 1972 and following acquiring more land in 1979 and the provision of additional pitches, the Club amalgamated with HH Ladies Hockey Club in 1982.

PROPOSAL

4.1 This is for the installation of an enclosed 97.4m by 61m floodlit green surfaced artificial grass pitch (AGP) on the site of the disused pitch. It would be served by six 15.2m high galvanised lighting columns each supporting a LED luminaires. The maximum level of pitch lighting would be a 350 average lux which can be reduced to 125 lux when not used for hockey. The enclosing perimeter moss green steel open mesh fencing would be 3m high

with the goal ends featuring at 4.5m high nylon black mesh netting. The fence base below would be solid. The adjoining grass rugby pitch would be floodlit with an 108 average lux.

4.2 It is likely that the hours of use of the new facility would be as follows:-

Monday-Friday 10.00 - 22.00

Saturday 10.00 - 22.00

Sunday 10.00 - 21.00

With lighting but only when absolutely required before 15.30.

Monday-Friday 10.00* - 22.00

Saturday 10.00* - 22.00

Sunday 10.00* - 21.00'

*In the Winter season.

4.3 The AGP would be available for various users. In addition to BHHHC these include Berkhamsted Rugby Club, Berkhamsted Raiders Football Club, Berkhamsted Football Club, Macaly Football Club and Tring Hockey Club.

4.4 The Original Scheme (OS) has been superseded by the Revised Scheme (RS). The RS is for a slightly repositioned pitch, supported by an updated lighting scheme and statement, ecological report and drainage plan. The positional change has been to address the potential impact upon bats.

4.5 The application is supported by a range of documents. These include a very comprehensive design and access/ planning statement (DAS), community role statement, heritage, lighting, highway and drainage reports etc. It is not feasible to include detailed reference to all the issues referred by the respective documents, especially the DAS. The DAS is an essential document in explaining the background and overriding need for an AGP hockey facility in the Borough and specifically at the BHHHC site. It confirms why BHHHC consider the floodlit AGP proposal would be compatible with both the Green Belt and Chilterns AONB, supported by Appeal decisions/ cases whereby both other LPA Officers and the Planning Inspectorate have supported sports floodlighting in such locations.

4.6 BHHHC clarify that parking at the Club's site would be improved and extended adjoining the clubhouse providing 50 additional spaces. No details have been submitted and this falls outside the remit of the current application. There would also be the associated installation of 'low level lighting' for footpaths to link the AGP to existing access tracks which, also, do not form part of this application.

4.7 The application has been submitted against a background of the LPA's grant of non floodlit AGP in 1998 in a different location and more recently the subsequent initial objective of locating a floodlit AGP closer to the clubhouse. This was not feasible due to the impact upon the Scheduled Ancient Monument. A non floodlit facility at Cow Roast is now not an alternative option for BHHHC.

4.8 By providing the floodlit AGP this would enable BHHHC to host all its home fixtures at Cow Roast and train at the site. Currently a home fixture has to be based at RAF Halton (closing 2022) or Meadowbrook in Aylesbury. This takes into account the high level of use of

Tring Sports Centre hockey pitch. Each BHHHC week 6 teams travel individually to play home matches.

4.9 BHHHC confirms that the proposed AGP'S 'Borough's Benefits' are extensive. This is set against the Club's pivotal inclusive community focus. These range from its major youth hockey role/ links with local schools to supporting 'Back to Hockey' and 'Walking Hockey' engagement programmes aimed at addressing health and wellbeing, supported by Everyone Active. This Borough community role is directly and fully recognised through Sport England's response and its own consultation with England Hockey, reinforced by the submitted information/ documentation, including support from various groups/ clubs.

4.10 The BHHHC's has identified the AGP's following 'Benefits to the Borough':

- A Community Facility.
- Supporting Schools.
- Supporting Other Voluntary Organisations.
- Keeping Teens in Sport.
- Encouraging Women to Take Up Exercise.
- Encouraging Adults back into Exercise.
- Reducing Traffic.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications

4/0775/80 -
DET - 23rd June 1980

4/00152/98/FUL - Artificial playing surface with surrounding 1 metre high fence
GRA - 26th March 1998

4/01216/97/FUL - Artificial playing surface and fencing (resubmission)
WDN - 25th September 1997

4/00209/97/FUL - Astroturf pitch, associated fencing and floodlighting
WDN - 25th March 1997

6. CONSTRAINTS

Parking Accessibility Zone (DBLP): 4
Special Control for Advertisements: Advert Spec Contr
Area of Archaeological Significance: 23
Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: CAONB outside Dacorum
CIL Zone: CIL1
Former Land Use (Risk Zone): Former Landfill, Bottom House Lane, Wigginton
Former Land Use (Risk Zone): Former Landfills, Crawleys Lane, Wigginton
Green Belt: Policy: CS5
Parish: Northchurch CP

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: RAF HALTON: DOTTED BLACK ZONE

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

National Planning Policy Guidance

Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)

Policy NP1 - Supporting Development
Policy CS1 - Distribution of Development
Policy CS5 - Green Belt
Policy CS8 - Sustainable Transport
Policy CS12 - Quality of Design
Policy CS23 - Social Infrastructure
Policy CS27 - Quality of Historic Environment
Policy CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy CS32 - Air, Soil and Water Quality
Countryside Place Strategy

Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004) Saved Policies

Policy 13 – Planning Conditions and Planning Obligations
Policy 51- Development and Transport Impacts
Policy 54- Highway Design
Policy 58 - Private Parking Provision
Policy 62- Cyclists
Policy 75- Retention of Leisure Space
Policy 79- Footpath Network
Policy 97- Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Policy 99- Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands
Policy 100- Tree and Woodland Planting
Policy 102- Site of Importance to Nature Conservation
Policy 113- Exterior Lighting
Policy 118- Important Archaeological Remains
Appendix 5 - Parking Provision
Appendix 8- Exterior Lighting

Supplementary Planning Guidance
Chilterns Conservation Management Plan

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main planning issues in the determination of this application are:

- The Provision of Leisure Space/ Sports Facilities and the Need for the Floodlit AGP.
- Green Belt Implications.
- The AONB Implications

The Provision of Leisure Space/ Sports Facilities and the Need for the Floodlit AGP.

9.2 Policy CS23 addresses the provision of Social Infrastructure in the Dacorum. This includes open space and outdoor sports facilities. The policy encourages the provision of such facilities and the dual use of these will be encouraged. The Core Strategy's Paragraph 15.21 confirms that opportunities for sport and recreation will be supported. The NPPF's Part 8's 'Promoting healthy and safe communities' emphasizes the importance of health, inclusive and safe places, and through Paragraph 92 the provision of social, recreational cultural and cultural facilities. These include meeting places, sports venues and open space as expressed by Paragraphs 96 and 97. It is expected that there are robust and up to date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation which should form the basis of planning policies, with controls over building upon existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land.

9.3 Under the NPPF's Paragraph 97 criteria (b) and (c) the proposal would be replaced by an alternative which would provide more sporting/ recreational facilities which would outweigh the loss of the grassed apparently disused pitch. In this respect Sport England supports the AGP. On this basis there is no open space objection to the AGP.

BHHHC's Case for the Need

9.4 As clarified earlier the DAS comprehensively explains why there is the need for floodlit AGP within the Borough. This is set against BHHHC's own position, the wider Borough hockey and community needs and with reference to the following Council reports:

The 'Outdoor Leisure Facilities Study Assessment Report' (September 2014),

Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report (April 2019), and

Active Dacorum: A Physical Activity and Sport Strategy for Dacorum 2019- 2024

9.5 In this context the DAS clarifies the reasons why the AGP is needed at the site:

a). 20 to 30+ years ago hockey was the main, if not only sport played at Cow Roast.

b). Now as well as hockey BHHHC supports many sports. The club is a hub for all sports within the Dacorum area. The facilities are and currently shared with Rugby (Berkhamsted

Rugby Club); Football (Raiders, Maclay, Berkhamsted Football Club); Dog training; Allstars Dance Academy; Archers (Berkhamsted Bowmen).

c). Successful clubs like St. Albans, one of BHHHC's local rivals, have gained national success as a result of their ability to shape their own future, owning their own AGP and having access to limitless training for players at no direct cost to the club members. Success at BHHHC is being severely restricted by the lack of local facilities and the cost of providing access to such facilities that are available locally. Availability of compliant AGPs forms a direct 'cap' on the number of sessions available, a situation which is getting worse.

d). Tring Sports Centre is operating at capacity, its future uncertainty and the need to replace its surface in the next 2 years. League games must, under league rules, be played on Saturdays between the hours of 10.00hrs and 16.00hrs. In the whole of the Dacorum area there is not one single additional slot available for use by the two resident teams based within the Dacorum area.

e). The problems of travelling to host home fixtures.

f). The closure of Halton in 2022.

Overview with Reference to The Supporting Information and Sport England's Consultation Response

9.6 Sport England's (SE) response through this application has examined the need for additional hockey facilities in its role as a statutory consultee. SE confirms that the proposed AGP would substantially address BHHHC's requirements. This response is with reference to the Playing Pitch Strategy (2019) which forms part of the evidence base for the emerging local plan. SE recognises that the Playing Pitch Strategy has confirmed that there is a need for two hockey suitable AGPs in the Tring analysis area of the Borough. This is to meet the current needs of BHHHC and Tring Hockey Club i.e. the retention of the Tring School facility and a need for a new pitch. In doing so SE notes that The Strategy acknowledges BHHHC's aspiration to develop an AGP on its own site to meet this identified need and recommends that opportunities to deliver a further full size hockey suitable AGP within the Tring Analysis Area to service demand generated by BHHHC and Tring Hockey Club be explored. In this respect SE acknowledges that the Strategy's action plan specifically recommends that the feasibility of providing a full size floodlit AGP to satisfy the local need for hockey be explored on BHHHC's site.

9.7 Importantly SE's assessment takes into account its own separate consultation with England Hockey (EH) which has advised that one of the main objectives of the EH's Hockey Facilities Strategy (2017-21) is to strategically build new hockey facilities where there is an identified need. This is in association with the importance of delivering and maintaining suitable floodlit hockey playing surfaces in providing a strong platform from which to deliver their strategic priorities. As SE clarify EH have advised that the provision of an AGP would enhance BHHHC's community sporting role and that to satisfy the current demand and initiate further growth, it will be essential for there to be high-quality facilities within the Borough. On this basis EH fully supports the proposed development of an AGP on the application site.

9.8 In addition, SE's response explains the range of benefits that the AGP at the site would provide for the community for football and rugby with support from Football Foundation (that represents the FA and Herts County FA) and The Rugby Football Union. This is reinforced by the important opportunity for a community agreement to be established for the AGP to secure wider community access through the imposition of a planning condition.

Overview

9.9 For clarification the aforementioned documents are technical studies rather than policy documents. These do not outweigh normal planning policy considerations. Notwithstanding that there is an identified need for an AGP in the Borough with support from Sport England, England Hockey, the Football Foundation and Rugby Union, as confirmed by the Council's Strategic Planning Team this does not mean that it can be automatically accommodated.

9.10 Set against this background there is a need to consider the proposal's impact on the Green Belt and Chilterns AONB with reference to the NPPF's environmental objectives in delivering sustainable development.

Green Belt Implications

9.11 The NPPF's Part 13 addresses 'Protecting Green Belt land'. Paragraph 133 explains the Government's great importance of Green Belts. The fundamental aim is to keep the land permanently open- 'the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence'. Paragraph 134 clarifies that the Green Belt's 5 purposes include through criterion (c) the safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment.

9.12 Policy CS5 states that the Council will apply national Green Belt policy to protect the openness and character of the Green Belt, local distinctiveness and the physical separation of settlements. Small scale development can be supported including under its criterion (a) for a building for uses defined as appropriate in the Green Belt. This is subject to:

- i. it has no significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside; and
- ii. it supports the rural economy and maintenance of the wider countryside.

The policy is broadly consistent with the aims of those parts of the Framework which seek to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development.

9.13 Playing fields in the Green Belt retain this openness. It is fully recognised that outdoor sports/ recreational facilities in the Green Belt require some facilities. The NPPF's Paragraph 145 explains that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt are inappropriate development, with some exceptions. These include under criterion (b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with an existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport / outdoor recreation. This is so long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

9.14 The AGP comprises of several elements. The surfacing would maintain the openness of the Green Belt per se in replacing the existing grass surface. The fencing is, through the definition of 'development', a 'building operation'. Under the NPPF's Paragraph 145 (b) the AGP is considered to be inappropriate development. This is because the provision of the AGP fencing serving this 'outdoor sport' facility would not preserve the openness by day

having a significant spatial impact. It would establish a substantial permanent change, physically transforming an otherwise open tract of land. It is materially different to goal or rugby posts and cricket sight screens associated with playing fields. It would represent an encroachment of the countryside, conflicting with the NPPF'S Paragraphs 133 and 134, and Policy CS5.

9.15 The floodlight columns also constitute an engineering operation as referred to by the NPPF's Paragraph 146 (c). The floodlighting columns are considered to be 'not inappropriate' as individually and collectively they would preserve the openness of the Green Belt and adequately safeguard the countryside from encroachment.

9.16 By definition inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in 'very special circumstances' (VSC) as confirmed by the NPPF's Paragraph 143. In this respect Paragraph 144 explains that when considering any planning application, LPAs should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. On this basis VSC will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

BHHHC's Case

9.17 BHHHC's supporting DAS takes a wholly different approach to the provision of the AGP and with reference to other LPA/and Planning Inspector's decisions for such development. The DAS confirms that it is BHHHC's 'very strong contention that this development will protect the openness of the Green Belt for the following reasons:

- Aside from the AGP structure, it is not proposed to provide any further buildings which may detract from the openness in evidence today,
- the AGP is level and green in colour,
- the AGP is surrounded by a visually permeable fence which will not impede views of the surrounding environment – a stance accepted in many other cases,
- The AGP is located in an area already well screened by trees,
- New planting will be added,
- As a result of the above and because the AGP is located on a low part of the site, the AGP will not have a significant impact on openness',
- The proposed overspill car park is located appropriately,
- The lighting poles are slender in nature and can be painted an appropriately recessive colour by agreement with the Council. There are very many examples where councils and PINS inspectors have accepted fenced playing areas/courts to be appropriate development in the Green Belt.

9.18 With reference to the examples of other approved schemes the DAS explains that it is the club's very definite contention that the cases, planning appeals and associated comments from planning officers and Inspectors prove a case for the whole application by BHHHC to be regarded as 'appropriate development' within the Green Belt as defined in the NPPF.

9.19 In terms of openness and impact of the character and appearance of the area, pre-application advice indicated that the proposed development "with particular reference to the perimeter fencing and lighting columns, would significantly impact upon the openness of this Green Belt location." BHHHC refer to an allowed appeal in the Green Belt for an

all-weather pitch with floodlights at Amersham and Chalfont Hockey Club at Amersham and Wycombe College, Stanley Hill, Amersham. The DAS notes that the Inspector concluded that the proposed pitch and training areas would be “an appropriate outdoor facility”. The fencing around the pitch was proposed at 4.5 m high (in this application, the height is 3.5 m with an additional 1 m of sports netting at each of the short sides) and that there would be several 15m high floodlit columns, again similar to this application (15.34m in this case). In this respect PINS considered that cumulatively, the clubhouse, fencing and floodlights would fail to preserve openness, although the harm caused to openness. It was concluded, “would only be moderate given the nature of the wire mesh fencing” and due to the flat roof design of the clubhouse. It is officers’ view that such fence enclosures are generally noticeably assertive in both urban and rural settings due to their scale and robust design. Based upon its individual merits the proposed fencing in its setting would be assertive and represent a significant change to the openness and the effect could not be regarded as moderate.

9.20 BHHHC lists the following Very Special Circumstances in support of the application if the LPA considers the development to be inappropriate:

- a) Tring Sports Centre is the only hockey compliant AGP in the whole of the Dacorum area.
- b) Tring Sports Centre is soon to be refurbished/rebuilt. At that time there will be no changing facilities.
- c) The Tring playing surface is soon to receive a ‘deep clean’ as noted in an email to the HHC’s Chairman.
- d) This is not the replacement of the playing surface which is required since its ‘shelf life has already expired.
- e) Tring Sports Centre is let at capacity on the days when both BHHHC and Tring HC require playing slots under league rules. There is no further availability for hockey or any other sport.
- f) There are insufficient time slots at Tring Sports Centre to fulfil the requirements of the two clubs who reside and need to play within the Dacorum area.
- g) Tring Sports Centre is Community Use facility. It is unacceptable that the AGP is fully booked every Saturday of the playing season, purely for Hockey every year. No other community sports club has any chance to play on the AGP since it is block booked very week.
- h) Significant work is currently underway for the improvement of Tring Sports Centre. None of these works are designed to increase the capacity or quality of the playing surface.
- i) Were Tring Sports Centre to decide to upgrade the playing surface of the AGP to a 3G or 4G surface, Berkhamsted and Tring Hockey Clubs would have no compliant pitches on which to play within the Dacorum area. Under these circumstances it is difficult to see how BHHHC, a stalwart sports facility in the local area for more than 100 years could survive.
- j) The Cow Roast site is equidistant between the two Hockey Clubs that play in the Dacorum area, half way approximately between Berkhamsted and Tring.
- k) Overspill matches which accrue as a result of the insufficient slot availability at Tring are currently played outside the Dacorum area. This is displaced use.
- l) The pitch at RAF Halton is 7 miles from Berkhamsted Hockey Club and approximately 6 miles from Tring Hockey Club.
- m) The number of games played at RAF Halton last year amounted to 68.
- n) The cost of these slots for the year including training was over £31,000.

- o) An announcement has been made that RAF Halton will close in 2022 whereupon the pitch will no longer be available. This will mean that all overspill slots will need to be booked at Meadowcroft in Aylesbury for both Berkhamsted and Tring hockey clubs.
- p) Meadowcroft is approximately 22 miles from Berkhamsted Hockey Club and approx.19 miles from Tring Hockey Club.
- q) The number of games played at Meadowcroft last year amounted to 48.
- r) Reference to the concerns that there must be for the Council of the 'dismal scenario' of existing facilities at Tring being under unacceptable pressure. On this basis there are insufficient playing slots and an inability for any other sports club to utilise what is a community facility.
- s) BHHHC is the only hockey club in Dacorum that owns its own ground and has ultimate control over its use.
- t) Hockey has been played at Berkhamsted for over 100 years and this consent will allow the club to grow and compete on a National scale.
- u) A planning consent granted in 1998 provides a precedent for the development of a pitch with an associated 1m fence at BHHHC.
- v) There is only 1 house that has any view of the facilities.
- w) The pitch is screened from the Byway Open to All Traffic by mature hedging and trees. The trees are higher than the proposed lighting columns.
- x) Any limited harm to openness is outweighed by the desperate need for an AGP.

9.21 In addition there is a need to consider in this equation Sport England's response referring to the range benefits for BHHHC and the wider community with local clubs/ groups supporting the proposal.

Overview relating to Very Special Circumstances

9.22 These are individually and collectively all important factors in BHHHC's case for VSC with many clubs / organisations supporting the proposal. There is no doubt that the AGP will provide an opportunity for outdoor sport in accordance with the NPPF's Paragraph 141. However, in accordance with the NPPF's Paragraph 144 these VSC need to be considered against 'any other harm' resulting from the proposal. In this respect the VSC do not outweigh the consideration of the fundamental impact on the AONB.

Note: For clarification this Green Belt assessment excludes reference to the indicated use of the additional parking. As confirmed earlier this does not form part of the application. It would constitute an 'engineering operation' as referred to by the NPPF's Paragraph 146 (c).

Chilterns AONB Implications

Policy Background

9.23 There is a need to consider the implications of the development with reference to the expectations of the NPPF's Part 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment).

9.24 The application's consideration is set against Dacorum Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS24, C25 and CS27, saved DBLP Policy 97, the Countryside Place Strategy, the Chilterns Conservation Management Plan Chapter 10 (Development- Policies DP01 , DP02 DP03, DP1, DP2 and DP5) and Dacorum Landscape Character Assessment Area 117.

9.25 This is in association with the relevant lighting based policies/references. These are Policy CS32, the Countryside Place Strategy (Paragraph 26.19), saved DBP Policy 113 and

saved DBLP Appendix 8 and the Chilterns Conservation Board's Management Plan 2019-2024 Policy DP8.

9.26 The relevant development plan policies are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF's Paragraph 180. This clarifies that decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects of pollution on living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to the impacts that could arise from the development. This includes under (c) limiting the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.

9.27 This is set against of the Chilterns Conservation Board's response to the application in this E1 Environmental Lighting Zone – An intrinsically Dark Area including AONBs. BHHHC consider it to be an E2 Zone. The essential context is provided by the NPPF.

9.28 The NPPF refers to AONBs as being an asset of particular importance (footnote 6), giving great weight to protecting its landscape and scenic beauty (paragraph 172), and limiting the general scale/extent of development there (Paragraph172):

'Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas ...The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited. Planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- a).The need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting or, refusing it upon the local economy,
- b). the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the Need for it in some other way, and
- c). any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.

9.29 The NPPF confirms that as to whether a proposal is a major development is a matter for the decision maker. This takes into account its nature, scale and setting, and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purpose for which it has been designated or defined.

9.30 This is reinforced by the Chilterns Conservation Board's Policy DP3. It also explains developments below the size of the usual thresholds for major development could constitute major development in the AONB, for example a single large house in a prominent location on the Chilterns escarpment. It explains that the protocol for when to consult the Board on (p72) may be a useful indication of types of development more likely to be major. In deciding whether a proposal constitutes major development in the AONB, the Board recommends that decision makers (i.e in this case this Council) to consider whether the proposal, by reason of its nature, scale and setting, has the potential to have a significant adverse impact on the purpose of conserving and enhancing natural beauty, and on the special qualities of

the Chilterns AONB). It is expected that the potential for adverse impact will include the consideration of both the impact of cumulative development and the individual characteristics of each proposal and its context.

9.31 Set against this context, page 72 refers to 'Floodlighting or other intrusive lighting' as an LPA consultation expectation with the Board. In this respect the Chilterns Management Plan's Policy DP 8 specifies:

'Keep skies dark at night by only using light where and when needed. All new lighting should be the minimum required and meet or exceed guidance 53 for intrinsically dark zones. Avoid architectural designs that spill light out of large areas of glazing.

The Chilterns AONB has relatively dark skies for the south east, making it a place people can still experience the wonder of starry skies and good for wildlife. AONBs are intrinsically dark environments (Zone E1 in the Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance) and planning conditions should be applied to restrict and control lighting. Light pollution of all types should be first prevented, by avoiding light where it is not needed, and where it is, by designing lighting to mitigate harm, through shading, height of fixings, beam orientation, LUX, colour temperature and the proposed hours of use. For example, downward pointing, shielded, operated on timer, and with a 'warm white' colour temperature of 700-Kelvin maximum'.

BHHHC's Case for the Proposal in the AONB

9.32 The submitted DAS justification of the development in the AONB states:

a) The need has been proven.

b) There are no alternative opportunities for providing a new AGP as far as the club's extensive research has found. The supply of available land would always be well outside of the financial scope of any sports club certainly in relation to purchasing new land on which to develop a new facility. In any event were the club able to purchase new land locally to BHHHC, such land would undoubtedly be under the same umbrella in terms of Green Belt and AONB designation in any event.

c) The club would argue that there is limited detrimental effect on the environment and a very definite increase to the recreational opportunities within the Borough. In respect of the latter point, part c) of NPPF paragraph 180 seeks to limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.

d).The pitch would not be the only source of light in this area as the clubhouse is used at night, is well lit and has many windows. Orchard Cottage also has external lighting. It is also possible to see the lights of cars on the A41 to the west of the site. Auto Rama, the pub at the end of the access road, the car showroom and the service station are all also lit at night. As noted, the rugby club also uses demountable floodlights on one of the pitches on a regular basis.

e).The importance of modern floodlight technology In appeal ref APP/X0415/W/15/3089719 regarding Amersham and Chalfont Hockey Club, the Inspector noted:

Concerns have been raised by local residents about the impact of the proposed floodlighting. However, modern floodlighting installations are designed to concentrate light to the playing area with minimal light spillage beyond. Therefore, given the distance from the nearest houses, the fact that the footpaths and viewpoints would be unlikely to be used after nightfall when the floodlights would be largely in use, and that the lights would be against a backdrop of existing car park and security lighting at the college, I consider that there would be little adverse impact on the area or the living conditions of local residents.

In this case, the lighting report that accompanies the application documents notes that 50 metres from the lights, the lux level reduces to 0 lux.

f).The club has taken note of the policies and guidance published by the Chilterns Conservation Board. In relation to BHHHC's development the club is committed to reducing light pollution to an absolute minimum and will take into account all requirements and requests from the local planning authority and the Conservation Board in this regard. Concerning rights of way, the lighting will only be in use when conditions necessitate it and not continuously between 8:30 am and 9:30 pm as suggested within pre-application advice. Expensive floodlighting would be operational only when strictly necessary. At most times, it will be naturally light enough to play without lighting. Under these circumstances it might be suggested that during the periods the lights will be in use, there will be no one using the rights of way since it will be effectively dark. As stated in the lighting section of this statement, lights will operate only between the hours of 15.30 – 22.00 and only then when required.

g).In terms of landscape quality generally this proposed development is not located in the context of rolling and unspoiled meadow grasslands and wooded areas. BHHHC is positioned approximately 250m from the old A41 and approximately the same distance to the new A41 trunk road which links Watford to Aylesbury. The new A41 trunk road is clearly visible from the proposed development and obviously visible from all recreational routes and rights of way. The proposition that changing the surface of one hockey pitch with associated lighting and fencing would have any additional detrimental impact to that of the two major trunk roads which currently carve their way through the environment must be seen in this context'.

Overview/ Assessment

9.33 It is fully acknowledged that the lighting design is aimed at controlling the light pollution from the installation itself, reinforced by the Revised Scheme. This would be expected for any lighting scheme, with DBLP Appendix 8 setting the parameters for design and being a recognised template for good practice, with the context provided by saved Policy 113. This includes reference to Environmental Lighting Zones (since updated by the Institution of Lighting Professionals). DBLP Appendix 8 Paragraphs 8.14 and 8.15 address lighting in the AONB specifying the most strict control over outdoor lighting is essential to maintain the dark landscapes of the open countryside and AONB and confirming that proposals will be required to carefully consider and justify the role of external lighting. This includes under (b) sports pitches, noting these can be extremely intrusive.

9.34 Through the DBLP since 2004 the LPA has formally recognised the importance of carefully considering the impact of exterior lighting /light pollution, which is especially

sensitive in the AONB, and in reconciling this with the importance of the role of sport and recreational in both urban and countryside locations. The LPA has approved many floodlit and non floodlit sports schemes in the Borough in the ensuing period.

9.35 It is considered that not much weight can be given to use of the BHHHC site for floodlit rugby as a material consideration. Planning permission has neither been applied for or granted by the LPA for this and it is a far more transient in nature, being fundamentally different to the proposal.

9.36 Notwithstanding the lighting design's qualities per se, the introduction of an intensively used floodlit facility would permanently harm the AONB in the open countryside. It would form a constant /regular 'box of light' in an established intrinsic dark landscape in an isolated location which would exaggerate its effect. There is a fundamental objection in principle to the proposal, with due weight given to the Conservation Board's (CCB) fundamental objection. In doing so CCB notes 'the technical report accepts the sensitivities of this location but cannot overcome the intrinsically dark sky environment that must be engendered and promoted within such an open landscape'. This response has been set against the NPPF's Paragraph 172, with the starting point being a consideration of the special qualities of the AONB with reference to the Dacorum Landscape Character Assessment the Upper Bulbourne Valley analysis, with the Chiltern Way footpath being a part of the restricted bridleway that passes the site. CCB has fully taken into account BHHH's case for 'sport, recreation and public benefits provided'. In doing so CCB notes 'these must be balanced against the harm to the AONB and confirms that 'great weight must be attributed to the protection of the AONB landscape'.

9.37 Without any floodlighting the CCB would not raise any objection. Officers would agree with this approach, as in 1998. Also limited use match day lighting for a grass pitch in this location would be a balanced way forward at the BHHHC site for football and rugby. However, in this case it is fully recognised that the fundamental problem for BHHH is that it requires an AGP for hockey with floodlighting to compete from its historic base, set against the identified need for an AGP in the Borough.

9.38 Set against the above there would be overriding fundamental harm to the AONB which is not outweighed by the specified VSC.

Other Material Considerations

Impact upon Residential Amenity

9.39 This is with reference to the expectations of Dacorum Core Strategy Policies CS12 and CS32, saved Policy 113 and Appendix 8 of the Dacorum Local Plan and the NPPF regarding residential amenity and the local objections. It is not considered that there would be harm based upon light pollution, noise and disturbance.

Ecological and Implications

9.40 This is set against the proposed planting of additional hedging and the need for BHHHC to submit a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. This is explained by both Hertfordshire Ecology and Hertfordshire & Middlesex Wildlife in their respective initial responses to the application.

9.41 Hertfordshire Ecology's response to the submitted report is a precautionary approach, with no fundamental objection and a recommended condition to require a Landscape Management Plan.

Transportation/ Highway Safety/ Access/Sustainable Location Implications

9.42 This is with reference to the NPPF's Part 9 (Promoting Sustainable Transport), Policies CS8, CS12, and saved DBLP Policies 51, 52 58 and 113 / Appendix 8.

9.43 The exiting and entering the aforementioned 'A' road access with a 40mph speed limit is not straightforward due to the sight lines and the unlit access road's surface condition/ width. The elongated access road/BOAT's surfacing is in need of significant upgrading to accord with the construction standards for general and emergency vehicles.

9.44 Hertfordshire County Council Highways considers that the proposals would not have a severe residual impact upon highway safety or capacity. This includes the direct impact of the lighting upon highway safety as referred to by DBLP's Policy 113/ Appendix 8.

9.45 It is unclear how emergency services, especially an ambulance / paramedic's vehicle would access the AGP from the clubhouse area. It would be necessary to ensure that the footpath link is designed to ensure persons with disabilities and limited mobility would be able to safely access the AGP during the day and evening. If the application is approved it condition should be imposed to address the provision of such essential access requirements, in accordance with the aforementioned policies. This includes the expectations of the NPPF's Paragraph 110 (b) and (d).

9.46 This is not a sustainable location due its isolated siting for both day time and evening time use with an inbuilt inevitable reliance upon motor vehicles. Although this is understandable, it would nevertheless conflict with the NPPF's Paragraphs 102 and 108 and CS8 which encourages development to take place where the fullest use of walking, cycling and public transport can be made. This has taken into account that Cow Roast is regularly served by Bus Route 500 between Watford and Aylesbury. The new facility would generate significant increased use of the site outside the standard match days due to its availability each day and during the winter. This is notwithstanding that it is fully acknowledged that the significant match day benefits for BHHHC being able to host home fixtures matches rather than travel to alternative locations at Halton or Aylesbury. The club has estimated that it would lessen the amount of travelled miles by about 9,000.

9.47 In this context the Parking Report explains the estimated peak car parking requirements likely to occur on Sunday mornings when external football clubs use the pitches for junior football. This will be added to by junior hockey using the AGP. BHHHC has clarified that the existing parking spaces available are sufficient to cater for this requirement. The peak demand is likely to occur between 10am and 11 am or between noon and 1pm on a Sunday when external football clubs use the facility for junior football games. At the same time junior hockey would be using the AGP current zones typically used for parking. The two zones identified provide in total approximately 110 parking places. BHHHC consider that there 'is ample additional parking available' should this be required.

9.48 It is reiterated that the provision of formal permanent additional parking falls outside the remit of the application.

Archaeological Implications

9.49 Hertfordshire County Council Historic Environment raise no fundamental objections, with recommended conditions.

Drainage/ Contamination

9. 50 With the Lead Flood Authority's initial objection being addressed and no apparent contamination issues there are no objections.

Crime Prevention/ Security

9. 51 Hertfordshire Constabulary Crime Reduction Officer raises no objections.

Relationship with the A41M/Air Safeguarding Effects of the Floodlighting

9. 52 Highways England and NATS have no objection to both schemes.

Environmental Impact Assessment

9.53 This is not an EIA type development.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 BHHHC has expressed a very wide range of reasons why there is a case for the development to be granted permission, with the OS accompanied by support from various clubs / organisations. This is reinforced by the amount and content of the individual supporting third party representations responding to the application. There are however representations from local residents objecting to the proposal, with different respective responses from Northchurch and Wigginton Parish Councils to the OS.

10.2 The proposal would provide an inclusive new sports facility at a long established club site with documented Borough wide benefits for playing hockey and other sports addressing an apparent void in AGP provision for hockey in Dacorum.

10.3 The new facility would be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework's social objectives.

10.4 BHHHC has explained why it considers there is a case to support the application set against the site's location on the Green Belt. BHHHC consider it to be an appropriate development in the Green Belt and compatible with the AONB, and even if it is considered to be inappropriate development in their view there are overriding Very Special Circumstances.

10.5 Not all lighting is unacceptable in the AONB. Additional lighting for overriding security/ safety reasons within the AONB can sometimes be supported by the LPA, as explained by saved DBLP Appendix 8 Paragraphs A8.14 and A8.

10.6 Moreover, the LPA is, and has over the past 25 years, been very supportive of both floodlit community/ and private sports facilities within the Borough's towns and some villages, including some in the Green Belt and Rural Area, with a more restrictive approach in the AONB.

10.7 The application is not based upon providing floodlighting for a standard clubs weekend match days and evening fixtures requiring ‘ occasional lighting’, but a continual intense use for a substantial part of each year.

10.8 Notwithstanding the proposed individual lighting design, the principle of the introduction of a regularly/daily used floodlit facility would permanently harm the AONB in the open countryside establishing a regular ‘box of light’ in an established intrinsic dark landscape as explained through the NPPF’s Paragraphs 172 and 180.

10.9 This is a fundamentally testing watershed application for the AONB, set against BHHHC’s view of its future. It splits the Framework’s environmental and social objectives in delivering sustainable development.

10.10 Based upon its individual merits the identified permanent harm to the AONB is an overriding factor. There would be a fundamental conflict with the relevant environmental led NPPF and development plan policies. Accordingly this is not a sustainable development failing to be in accordance with the NPPF’s environmental objectives.

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reason:

1. The introduction of floodlighting within this isolated countryside location would permanently harm the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is not a sustainable development as it is not in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework’s environmental objective. The development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraphs 172 and 180), Policies CS1, CS24, CS32, and The Dacorum Countryside Placed Strategy of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013), saved Policies 97 and 113 and Appendix 8 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004) and the expectations of the Chilterns Management Plan 2019 - 2024 policies relating to the impact of new development including lighting.

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been refused for this proposal for the clear reasons set out in this decision notice. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant in an attempt to narrow down the reasons for refusal but fundamental objections could not be overcome. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
-----------	----------

Chilterns Conservation	ORIGINAL SCHEME
------------------------	-----------------

Board	<p>Artificial Games Pitch/ Multi Use Games Area with Fencing and floodlighting Berkhamsted Hockey Club Tring Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RF</p> <p>20/01235/MFA</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB). We have read the supporting papers and we note the body of support in the correspondence submitted. CCB as a body with statutory powers, must adhere to our defined core purpose.</p> <p>From the standpoint of a nationally protected AONB landscape and one deemed 'highly valued' in the Landscape Institute's guidance (GLVIA 3rd edition guidance) floodlighting in the open landscape of the AONB must be deemed harmful in this location. The NPPF at 172 requires that 'great weight' is given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. As the starting point here must be a consideration of the special qualities of the AONB, then we would revert to the Herts Landscape Character Assessment, which deals with the sweeping views of the Upper Bulborne Valley, as includes and surrounds the site.</p> <p>The Chiltern Way footpath is a part of the restricted bridleway that passes the site. Walkers, in the early evening /dusk period, notably in the winter months, will find the presence of such lighting to be discordant with the open landscape, no matter how sensitively designed.</p> <p>To assist in this application we would propose that the floodlighting is deleted.</p> <p>Legislation and Policy Background</p> <p>Section 85 of the CROW Act 2000 rightly sets a very high test which places an explicit duty on relevant authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of an AONB when exercising or performing any function in relation to or so as to affect an AONB. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF and in the Development Plan (especially The Development</p>
-------	---

Plan in Core Strategy CS1 (AONB within rural character) and Local Plan saved policy 97 (AONB policy) also apply and reinforce these duties. Section 85 of the Chilterns AONB protects the special qualities of the AONB. These special qualities are numerous and include ' a unique offering of ancient woodland, chalk streams, farmland, chalk downland and cultural heritage shaped not just by natural processes but also generations of human activity'. (2019-2024 Management Plan).

Site Specific Issues

This site is located within Herts Landscape Character Assessment - Upper Bulborne Valley (area 117) and this area is acknowledged for its sweeping views.

Such development cannot be deemed to conserve and enhance the AONB, as would be required by policy and in the discharge of the duty in s 85 of the CROW Act. From that standpoint CCB is also aware that the applicant places weight on sport, recreation and public benefits provided. We accept these points but they must be balanced against the harm to the AONB and great weight must be attributed to the protection of the AONB landscape.

The Chilterns Conservation Board was established by Parliamentary Order in 2004 and has two statutory purposes to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB and to increase the understanding and enjoyment of its special qualities. In fulfilling these purposes, the CCB has a duty to foster the economic and social wellbeing of local communities. Should a conflict exist, then the CCB must give greater weight to the conservation and enhancement of the special qualities of the AONB. That must apply in this case, when weighting up matters of social wellbeing as provided by sport and recreation. The National Planning Policy Framework at 172 is clear that 'great weight' must be given to such a core land-use objective. In the balancing of issues, therefore, greater weight must be given to AONB matters over other material considerations and in the discharge of other statutory duties.

CCB, therefore, has to raise objection to the floodlighting. The technical report accepts the sensitivities of this location but cannot overcome the intrinsically dark sky environment that must be engendered and promoted within such an open landscape. It

may be that a design solution exists but it is not immediately apparent. CCB does not oppose the principle of sports use. The area of archaeological significance is sufficient to justify non designated heritage assets of archaeological significance and the NPPF at 194 will also apply.

A nationally protected landscape is, by definition, highly valued in any landscape character assessment. Any development must therefore satisfy the legal and policy tests that conserve and enhance the special qualities of the AONB. This application harms those qualities by materially eroding the host landscape. Following the duties that govern the responsibilities of a Conservation Board (i.e. the CROW Act at section 87) the CCB concludes that the application for retention is harmful and does not satisfy national or local policy that protects the AONB, most notably DP8 of the AONB Management Plan (see below).

The new Chilterns AONB Management Plan 2019-2024 was adopted in February 2019 and may be a material consideration when assessing planning applications (as set out in Government's PPG para 040 on the Natural Environment). The planning objectives in the Management Plan are

DO1 Ensure planning decisions put the conservation and enhancement of the AONB first.

DO2 Ensure that where development happens, it leaves the AONB better than it was before - richer in wildlife, quieter, darker at night, designed to have a low impact on the environment, and beautiful to look at and enjoy.

DO3 Embrace opportunities to restore natural beauty on sites currently degraded by unsympathetic development, infrastructure or dereliction.

A number of detailed Chilterns AONB Management Plan policies deal with key principles that may apply to Development proposals.

DP1 Ensure planning decisions take full account of the importance of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB and the great weight given to its protection in the NPPF.

DP2 Reject development in the AONB unless it meets the

following criteria:

it is a use appropriate to its location,
it is appropriate to local landscape character,
it supports local distinctiveness,
it respects heritage and historic landscapes,
it enhances natural beauty, ecological and environmental
impacts are acceptable,
there are no detrimental impacts on chalk streams,
there is no harm to tranquillity through the generation of noise,
motion and light that spoil quiet enjoyment or disturb wildlife, and

there are no negative cumulative effects, including when
considered with other plans and proposals.

DP7 Only support development that is of the highest standards of
design that respects the natural beauty of the Chilterns, the
traditional character of Chilterns vernacular buildings, and
reinforces a sense of place and local distinctiveness. Require a
Design and Access Statement to accompany every application,
explaining how it complies with the Chilterns Buildings Design
Guide

www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planningdevelopment/buildings-design-guidance

DP8 Keep skies dark at night by only using light where and when
needed. All new lighting should be the minimum required and
meet or exceed guidance for intrinsically dark zones. Avoid
architectural designs that spill light out of large areas of glazing.

The Chilterns AONB is nationally protected as one of the finest
areas of countryside in the UK. Public bodies and statutory
undertakers have a statutory duty of regard to the purpose of
conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB
(Section 85 of CroW Act).

The Chilterns Conservation Board is a body that represents the
interests of all those people that live in and enjoy the Chilterns
AONB.

Should you require any further information please do not hesitate
to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

	The Chilterns Conservation Board
Parish/Town Council	<p>NORTHCHURCH PARISH COUNCIL :ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>First Response: 23.06.2020</p> <p>No comment.</p> <p>Second Response</p> <p>Northchurch Parish Council supports the application: 27.06.2020</p>
Environment Agency	<p>ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>Comments awaited.</p>
Archaeology Unit (HCC)	<p>ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>Please note that the following advice is based on the policies contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The proposed development is located in an Area of Archaeological Significance, as identified in the Local Plan (No 23). This covers the Late Iron Age & Roman settlement at Cow Roast, part of which is a Scheduled Monument [NHLE 1005254: Roman settlement at The Cow Roast Inn]. It is also close to Area of Archaeological Significance No 24, which covers an area that includes significant evidence for prehistoric and Roman settlement, excavated along the route of the A41 bypass, at Crawleys Lane. Three main phases of activity were identified, including late Neolithic and early Bronze Age occupation and a burial [Historic Environment Record No 11472], a Late Iron Age/Romano-British rectangular building and trackway [HER 11473] and a Late Roman decapitated burial [HER 11474].</p> <p>The development is therefore located in an area that possesses high archaeological potential.</p> <p>As mentioned in the Heritage Statement submitted with this application ('contact was made with Alison Tinniswood , Historic England Advisor from Natural, Historic and Built Environment</p>

Advisory Team at the request of the Planning Officer' ... 'to gauge the likely response should a planning application be presented to the council.'). I advised (e-mail dated 9th December 2019) that, given the (then) proposed location of the artificial grass hockey immediately adjacent to the boundary of the Scheduled Monument, and the very extensive evidence for Late Iron Age and Roman settlement in its vicinity, the potential for the survival of archaeological remains (non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest) of Late Iron Age and Roman date at this location was exceptionally high.

I further advised that the development should be regarded as likely to have an impact on significant heritage assets with archaeological interest, some of which may be of sufficient importance to meet National Planning Policy Framework, para. 194, fn no 63 (i.e. 'Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.'). This could represent a significant constraint on development.

I therefore recommended that an archaeological field evaluation, via trial trenching, should be carried out prior to, and to inform any planning application submitted.

I also suggested that if construction details could be provided for the pitch, we could review the proposal further, but that 'it remains likely that the scheme will require extensive mitigation, via intrusive archaeological investigations, or by raising ground levels to avoid impact.'

In subsequent discussions, the possibility of re-locating the pitch further from the Scheduled Monument was suggested, and this option has evidently been adopted. There does not appear, however, to be any detailed information on the planning website concerning the construction methodology for the sports pitch.

As the proposed location of the sports pitch is now further away from archaeological remains considered to be of high (national) significance, I no longer consider it appropriate to advise that the results of an archaeological field evaluation, via trial trenching, should be submitted prior to the determination of this application.

Nonetheless, given the proximity of the proposed location to significant archaeological remains of prehistoric and Roman date, I believe that the position and details of the proposed development are such that it should be regarded as likely to have an impact on significant heritage assets with archaeological interest. I recommend that the following provisions be made, should you be minded to grant consent:

- 1) the archaeological evaluation of the footprint of the new artificial pitch, via a process of 'strip, map and record' to the archaeological horizon, and the archaeological investigation of any remains encountered during this process
- 2) the archaeological monitoring of the groundworks of the development, such as services, footings, revised access and landscaping, as appropriate, and the archaeological investigation of any remains encountered during this process
- 3) the analysis of the results of the archaeological work with provisions for the subsequent production of a report and an archive and if appropriate, a publication of these results
- 4) such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the archaeological interest of the site.

I believe that these recommendations are both reasonable and necessary to provide properly for the likely archaeological implications of this development proposal. I further believe that these recommendations closely follow para. 199, etc. of the National Planning Policy Framework, relevant guidance contained in the National Planning Practice Guidance, www.hertfordshire.gov.uk

and in the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic England, 2015).

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

Condition A

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

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording as suggested by the evaluation

	<p>3. The programme for post investigation assessment</p> <p>4. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording</p> <p>5. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation</p> <p>6. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation</p> <p>7. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.</p> <p>Condition B</p> <p>i) Any demolition/development shall take place in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under Condition A.</p> <p>ii) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.</p> <p>If planning consent is granted, then this office can provide details of the requirements for the investigation and information on archaeological contractors who may be able to carry out the work.</p> <p>I hope that you will be able to accommodate the above recommendations.</p>
Parish/Town Council	<p>WIGGINTON PARISH COUNCIL : ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>Wigginton Parish Council objects to this planning application due to light pollution and flag lightning.</p>
Civil Aviation Authority	<p>ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>Response awaited.</p>
Conservation & Design (DBC)	<p>ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>I do not have any objection to this well argued application - I am</p>

	<p>assuming Hertfordshire County Council Historic Environment will place the relevant conditions regarding investigations in relation to the Scheduled Ancient Monument .The impact of the lighting is clearly the key new intervention</p>
EDF Energy	<p>ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>Response awaited.</p>
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	<p>ORIIGNAL SCHEME</p> <p>Decision Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>CONDITIONS No external lighting shall be installed other than in accordance with the lighting plan as illustrated and described on the submitted plans and is to be retained such that it will not cause glare beyond the site boundaries.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policies 17 and 21 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).</p> <p>INFORMATIVES 1. Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx or by</p>

telephoning 0300 1234047.

2. Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence.

Further information is available via the website

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

3. Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

COMMENTS

This application is for: Artificial Games Pitch/ Multi Use Games Area with Fencing and floodlighting.

The site lies to the southwest of the A4251 Tring Road and northeast of the A41.

ACCESS

The site is accessed via an unadopted track, which is a public right of way, Byway Open to All Traffic, leading south west from Tring Road to Bottom House Lane. The main 'in and out' route is to and from Tring Road, but it is also possible to exit the site via the track

towards Bottom House Lane to the southwest.

No new or altered vehicle or pedestrian access is proposed and no works are required in the highway.

PARKING

Car Parking Provision:

The applicant has stated that the peak demand for parking is likely to occur on Sunday mornings, when both junior football games and junior hockey would be using the AGP, however, the existing parking of approximately 110 parking spaces would be sufficient to cater for this requirement.

Car parking levels are within the remit of Dacorum Borough Council and it will ultimately be for the Borough Council to determine the acceptability of the parking provision.

Disabled Parking:

The applicant has not provided any information on disabled parking for this development. Provision for disabled parking needs to comply with DBC Parking Standards.

Cycle Parking:

The applicant has not identified whether any cycle parking will be provided.

FLOODLIGHTING

The proposal includes the installation of 6 no. 15m floodlighting columns.

The closest road to the site is the A41, at around 177m distance, and the playing surface of the proposed AGP-MUGA is 9m below the level of this road. The proposal is to mount the fixtures 15m

above the surface of the astro turf, to be 5m above eye level. Given the angle of the main beam from the fixture, drivers will be unable to see the light source directly and therefore should not be affected by glare.

It is unlikely, therefore, that the floodlights will have a significant impact on traffic on the A41.

	<p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>HCC as highway authority considers that the proposals would not have a severe residual impact upon highway safety or capacity, subject to the condition and informative notes above.</p>
Crime Prevention Design Advisor	<p>ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>In relation to crime prevention I have no objections to this application.</p>
Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust	<p>ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>This application has the potential to have a significant negative impact on biodiversity, particularly nocturnal wildlife and more specifically bats. This is acknowledged in the lighting strategy document. ODPM circular 06/05 states:</p> <p>'It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision.'</p> <p>In order to demonstrate compliance with this circular, an ecological survey should be submitted which shows how the development will not negatively impact nocturnal wildlife and specifically bat populations. If negative impacts are predicted, appropriate mitigation, which may include operational curfews, must be put forward. All statements of mitigation or compensation in the ecological report must be definitively stated (in accordance with BS 42020) so that they can be enforced.</p>
Highways Agency	<p>ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>Thank you for your email dated 26 May 2020 on the above planning application consultation and indicating a response was required by 16 June 2020.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic</p>

	<p>authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>In the case of this proposed development, Highways England is interested in the potential impact that the development might have the SRN, in particular on the M25, in particular Junction 20. We are interested as to whether there would be any adverse safety implications or material increase in queues and delays on the SRN as a result of development.</p> <p>Having read the applicants submission documents and noting the distance of the Multiple Use Games area and its associated floodlighting from the SRN, we believe the proposed development is unlikely to impact the SRN. Therefore, Highways England have no objection to this application.</p> <p>Please see attached the formal response from Highways England. If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact us at PlanningSE@highwaysengland.co.uk</p>
<p>Lead Local Flood Authority (HCC)</p>	<p>ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>Response1</p> <p>We have reviewed the information submitted in support of the planning application and provide the following comments; LLFA position In the absence of a surface water drainage assessment and flood risk assessment (FRA), we object to this application and recommend refusal of planning permission until a satisfactory surface water drainage assessment and FRA has been submitted. Reason A drainage assessment is required under the NPPF for all Major Planning Applications as amended from the 6 April 2015. An FRA and surface water drainage assessment is vital if the local planning authority is to make informed planning decisions. In the absence of an FRA and surface water drainage assessment, the flood risks resulting from the proposed development are unknown. The absence of an FRA and surface water drainage assessment is therefore sufficient reason in itself for a refusal of planning permission.</p>

	<p>The applicant should be aware that based on the Environment Agency's Areas Susceptible to surface water flood risk maps shows a potential surface water flow route to the south east of the proposed development. An assessment of this should be included within the FRA and demonstrate how the development will not increase any potential existing flood risk.</p> <p>For further advice on what we expect to be contained within the FRA and drainage assessment to support a planning application, please refer to our Developers Guide and Checklist on our surface water drainage webpage https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/recycling-waste-and-environment/water/surface-water-drainage/surface-water-drainage.aspx this link also includes HCC's policies on SuDS in Hertfordshire.</p> <p>Overcoming our objection</p> <p>Our objection can be overcome by undertaking an FRA and surface water drainage assessment which demonstrates that the development will not increase risk elsewhere and where possible reduces flood risk overall. If this cannot be achieved, we will consider whether there is a need to maintain our objection to the application. Production of an FRA and surface water drainage assessment will not in itself result in the removal of an objection. We ask to be re-consulted with the results of the FRA and surface water drainage assessment. We will provide you with bespoke comments within 21 days of receiving formal reconsultation. Our objection will be maintained until an adequate FRA and surface water drainage assessment has been submitted.</p> <p>Please note if the LPA decide to grant planning permission we wished to be notified for our records should there be any subsequent surface water flooding that we may be required to investigate as a result of the new development.</p> <p>Revised Information</p>
Ministry Of Defence (Wind Farms)	<p>ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Ministry of Defence (MOD) on the above planning application which was received by this office on</p>

	<p>26th May 2020. I can confirm the MOD has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.</p>
<p>National Air Traffic Services</p>	<p>ORIIGNAL SCHEME</p> <p>The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.</p> <p>However, please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NATS (that is responsible for the management of en route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly consulted.</p> <p>If any changes are proposed to the information supplied to NATS in regard to this application which become the basis of a revised, amended or further application for approval, then as a statutory consultee NERL requires that it be further consulted on any such changes prior to any planning permission or any consent being granted.</p>
<p>Sport England</p>	<p>ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>RESPONSE 1: 28.05.2020</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above planning application. The site is considered to constitute playing field, or land last used as playing field, as defined in The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (Statutory Instrument 2015 No. 595). As such Sport England is a statutory consultee.</p> <p>Sport England has sought to consider the application in light of the National Planning Policy Framework (particularly Para. 97) and against its own playing fields policy. Unfortunately, there is insufficient information to enable Sport England to adequately assess the proposal or to make a substantive response. Please</p>

therefore could the following information be provided as soon as possible .

1.Existing Playing Pitch Layouts: A site plan (to scale) showing the existing playing pitch layout on Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club's playing field. The plans submitted show the location of the proposed artificial grass pitch but do not show the existing natural turf playing pitch layouts. Based on Google Earth Pro images and information contained in the Dacorum Playing Pitch Strategy (2019), the area proposed for the facility is (or has in the past) been used for marking out a senior football pitch. This information is required to allow an informed assessment to be made of the impact of the proposals on natural turf playing pitch provision.

2.Proposed Playing Pitch Layout: A site plan (to scale) showing the proposed playing pitch layouts on Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club's playing field. The plans submitted show the location of the proposed artificial grass pitch but do not show the proposed natural turf playing pitch layout on the remainder of the playing field. This information is required to allow an informed assessment to be made of the impact of the proposals on natural turf playing pitch provision.

3.Playing Field Use: Details of the existing formal use of the area of the playing field proposed for the artificial grass pitch i.e. what clubs/teams use the pitches, what days/times, how often etc during the applicable sports season (e.g. 2019-20 football and rugby seasons). Details are also requested of how any potentially displaced users would be relocated in view of the expectation that the artificial grass pitch would be prioritised for hockey club use during peak times at weekends when the area of the playing field may currently be in use by other sports. Current and proposed indicative programmes of use of the artificial grass pitch and the remaining natural turf pitches during peak periods may assist in this regard. While it is acknowledged that other sports clubs that currently use the site have expressed support for the principle of the proposal, no details appear to have been provided of how the proposal would impact on the existing use of the area affected. This information is requested to allow an informed assessment to be made of the impact of the proposal on any existing formal sports use of the playing field.

4.Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) Design and Layout: Confirmation of

whether any design specifications of the AGP are currently available such as the pitch layout, surface specification, construction cross-section and fencing details or whether this would be submitted for approval at a later date if planning permission was forthcoming. This information is requested to allow an informed assessment to be made of the acceptability of the design and layout of the AGP.

Sport England's interim position on this proposal is to submit a holding objection which is our standard position for any proposal where insufficient information has been provided to allow a substantive response to be provided as a statutory consultee and should not be interpreted as being indicative of our position once the requested information has been provided. However we will happily review our position following the receipt of the further information requested above. As I am currently unable to make a substantive response, in accordance with the Order referred to above, the 21 days for formally responding to the consultation will not commence until I have received all the information requested above.

I would be happy to discuss the requested information further with the applicant and/or the local planning authority if necessary.

RESPPONSE 2: 09.06.2020

Further to my previous correspondence on the above planning application I have now completed consultations with the relevant sports governing bodies and while the information submitted in support of the application to date is broadly sufficient for allowing the governing bodies to assess the scheme, the Rugby Football Union (RFU) have raised several queries to allow them to make an informed assessment of the potential benefits and impacts of the scheme for rugby union which were not covered by my original request for additional information dated 26th May 2020.

I would therefore request that the following information be provided as soon as possible:

1. Proposed Playing Pitch Layout - Rugby Pitch Impact: Can a revised proposed pitch layout show the expected alignment of the proposed footpath that will link the AGP to the existing track

and clubhouse/parking areas so that the impact on playing pitches especially the rugby pitch can be understood. The layout should state the proposed rugby pitch dimensions having regard to the recommended dimensions for the touch and in-goal areas <https://laws.worldrugby.org/?law=1&language=EN> for rugby pitches and confirm whether the dimensions of the existing pitch would need to be reduced to accommodate a footpath (it would be helpful if the previously submitted existing playing pitch layout could show the dimensions of the existing rugby pitch if there is a need to amend the dimensions of the pitch to allow comparison). This information is required to allow an informed assessment to be made of the potential impact of the proposals on natural turf playing pitch provision.

2. Sports Lighting - Rugby Training: Confirmation is requested that the lux levels shown in the relevant isograms shown in the Musco Lighting Isograms document would be achieved by installing additional luminaries onto the proposed floodlight columns (F4, F5 and F6) for the AGP that would be directed to the light the rugby pitch (known as backlighting) rather than the light spilling from luminaries directed over the AGP. A brief explanation is also requested of the differences between the isograms shown on pages 5, 6 and 8 of the document so that they can be interpreted correctly in relation to the illuminance provided for the rugby pitch. As the proposed AGP lighting would appear to allow only part of the rugby pitch to provide average maintained lux levels that would meet the RFU's guidance (see attached) for training (100 lux) , clarity is requested that the rugby club would still be allowed (by the hockey club) to use mobile lighting if required to light areas of the rugby pitch for training which would not be sufficiently lit by the AGP luminaires (mainly to the eastern side of the rugby pitch) or areas outside of the rugby pitch that could be used for rugby training in the future such as the area where grass hockey pitches are currently marked out. This is pertinent because the rugby club may wish to rotate the areas that are used for training across different parts of the rugby pitch to balance wear on the pitch associated with training. This information is requested to allow an informed assessment to be made of the potential benefits and impacts of the proposal on rugby training.

3. Rugby Club Training Arrangements: Confirmation that the applicant will have discussions with Berkhamsted Rugby Club

about potential use of the AGP and the remaining natural turf playing field with a view to agreeing revised rugby club training arrangements in advance of construction commencing on the proposed AGP (if permitted) which could be incorporated into a potential community use agreement. This information is requested because the proposed AGP will have an impact on the rugby club's existing training arrangements on the site.

A holding objection to the application is made until the requested information has been received. This is our standard position for any proposal where insufficient information has been provided to allow a substantive response to be provided as a statutory consultee and should not be interpreted as being indicative of our position once the requested information has been provided. However we will happily review our position following the receipt of the further information requested above. As I am currently unable to make a substantive response, in accordance with the Order referred to above, the 21 days for formally responding to the consultation will not commence until I have received all the information requested above.

I would be happy to discuss the requested information further with the applicant and/or the local planning authority if necessary. I would wish to apologise for the need to make two separate requests for additional information on this occasion.

RESPONSE 3: 19.06.2020

Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above application.

Summary: Sport England raises no objection to this application as a statutory consultee which is considered to meet exception 5 of our adopted Playing Fields Policy and paragraph 97 of the NPPF subject to four planning conditions being imposed relating to the following matters as set out in this response:

- . Artificial Grass Pitch Design Specifications;
- . Footpath Alignment Details;
- . Continuity of Sports Provision During Construction Scheme;
- . Community Use Agreement.

The principle of the application is supported as a non-statutory consultee and advisory comments are made on the hours of use

and sports lighting of the proposed artificial grass pitch. The Council is urged not to impose any restrictions on the current use of portable floodlighting on the playing field if planning permission is forthcoming.

COMMENTS MADE AS A STATUTORY CONSULTEE

Sport England -Statutory Role and Policy

It is understood that the proposal prejudices the use, or leads to the loss of use, of land being used as a playing field or has been used as a playing field in the last five years, as defined in The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (Statutory Instrument 2015 No. 595). The consultation with Sport England is therefore a statutory requirement.

Sport England has considered the application in light of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (in particular Para. 97), and against its own playing fields policy, which states:

'Sport England will oppose the granting of planning permission for any development which would lead to the loss of, or would prejudice the use of:

- . all or any part of a playing field, or
- . land which has been used as a playing field and remains undeveloped, or
- . land allocated for use as a playing field

unless, in the judgement of Sport England, the development as a whole meets with one or more of five specific exceptions.'

Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document can be viewed via the below link:

https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy

The Proposal and Impact on Playing Field

In summary, the development involves a full size artificial grass pitch (AGP) with associated floodlights and fencing which would be sited on the south western part of the playing fields at

Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club's (BHHHC) site.

Assessment against Sport England Policy

This application principally relates to the provision of a new outdoor sports facility on the existing playing field at the above site. It therefore needs to be considered against exception 5 of the above policy, which states:

. 5 - The proposed development is for an indoor or outdoor sports facility, the provision of which would be of sufficient benefit to the development of sport as to outweigh the detriment caused by the loss of the playing field or playing fields.

I have therefore assessed the proposal against the above policy to determine whether it meet exception 5.

Sports Development Benefits

The key potential sports development benefits of the proposed development are set out in detail in the planning, design and access statement. In summary, the benefits are considered to be as follows:

. BHHHC Benefits. The proposed AGP would provide a modern all weather pitch surface that would be capable of intensive use throughout the year for hockey matches, training and coaching for the club. The AGP would substantially address the current requirement for BHHHC to use off-site venues for all of its matches and training. At present, there is only one existing AGP suitable for hockey in Dacorum Borough (at Tring Sports Centre) which is used to its capacity during the peak community use period and is shared with Tring Hockey Club and other sports. The club currently has to use the AGP at RAF Halton in Buckinghamshire for meeting its needs which cannot be met at Tring Sports Centre. However, RAF Halton is due to close in 2022 and the next nearest facility is at the Meadowcroft site in Aylesbury which is 22 miles away from the site. Added to this, the Tring Sports Centre AGP surface is in need of replacement within the next 2 years and if the carpet is not replaced or is replaced with a 3G surface (not suitable for hockey), all existing hockey use of the Tring Sports Centre facility would be displaced.

Providing a suitable AGP for BHHHC on its own site would allow the hockey club to avoid being dependent on such facilities which are not within their control and provide security for the club in the long term. It would also reduce the significant costs associated with hiring off-site facilities and help address the lost revenue associated with the clubhouse facilities not being fully used by hockey club members and visiting teams due to activities being focused off-site. The current requirement for much of the club's needs to be met off-site in locations that are often considerable distances from the club's site is not considered to be sustainable over a long term period and will not assist in terms of attracting and retaining members which has direct implications for participation in hockey in the Dacorum Borough Council area. Providing the facility would also offer additional pitch capacity that would offer the opportunity to expand and develop the club's teams and activities.

The proposed AGP would substantially address the above needs and issues that have all been identified in the Borough Council's recent Playing Pitch Strategy (2019) which forms part of the evidence base for the emerging local plan. The Playing Pitch Strategy has confirmed that there is a need for two hockey suitable AGPs in the Tring analysis area of the Borough to meet the current needs of BHHHC and Tring Hockey Club i.e. the retention of the Tring School facility plus a need for a new pitch. The strategy acknowledges BHHHC's aspiration to develop an AGP on its own site to meet this identified need and recommends that opportunities to deliver a further full size hockey suitable AGP within the Tring Analysis Area to service demand generated by BHHHC and Tring Hockey Club be explored. The strategy's action plan specifically recommends that the feasibility of providing a full size floodlit AGP to satisfy the local need for hockey be explored on BHHHC's site. No other opportunities have been specifically identified in the strategy for meeting this need. Consequently, the Council's evidence base identifies a clear need for an additional hockey suitable AGP in this area and the club's site is the only site that has been identified in the strategy for exploring for meeting this need;

I have consulted England Hockey (EH), the national governing body for hockey, for their comments. EH have advised that one of the main objectives of the England Hockey Facilities Strategy (2017-21) is to strategically build new hockey facilities where

there is an identified need and the ability to deliver and maintain. The sustainability of suitable floodlit hockey playing surfaces is critical in providing a strong platform from which to deliver their strategic priorities. EH have confirmed that the membership of the two hockey clubs in Dacorum has stayed constant during the 2017-21 period and their insight suggests that this is due to their being a lack of suitable facility provision within Dacorum Borough for the clubs to grow participation. Data collected by EH since 2013 shows that clubs that install new pitches grow on average by 55%. EH have confirmed the accuracy of the findings of the recent Dacorum Playing Pitch Strategy set out above. They have also confirmed that Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club is a pro-active and forward thinking club in terms of its drive and ambition to increase participation and that its main priorities are to increase membership, provide opportunities for adults and young people to play hockey and strengthen links with the local community. The club has links to many local primary and secondary schools and works on outreach programmes delivering curriculum and extra curriculum activity. The club runs successful Back to Hockey and Walking Hockey engagement programmes aimed at addressing health and wellbeing and are supported by Everyone Active. Both summer and winter hockey camps are held for local young people and these are currently run on the grass pitches on the application site. EH have advised that the provision of an AGP would enhance all the abovementioned activity in creating a far more appealing environment for new participants and that to satisfy the current demand and initiate further growth it will be essential for there to be high-quality facilities within the borough. Consequently, England Hockey fully supports the proposed development of an AGP on the application site.

. Wider Community Benefits: While BHHHC's site is owned and managed by the hockey club, the majority of the sporting activities that currently take place on the site are for other sports due to most hockey activity needing to take place off-site due to natural turf pitches not being suitable for community hockey needs. The natural turf pitches on the site are currently used extensively for football, rugby and archery by local sports clubs and the clubhouse is used for dance. The AGP would be of benefit to the football (Berkhamsted Raiders FC, Maclay FC and Berkhamsted FC) and rugby club (Berkhamsted Rugby Union FC) that currently use the site because while the proposed surface is not the preferred surface for either sport, it can be used

for football training and recreational football matches and for non-contact rugby training. The Council's Playing Pitch Strategy has identified significant deficiencies for both football and rugby pitches in this area and while the surface of the AGP would only be suitable for meeting some of the training needs of local clubs it would make a contribution in view of the identified shortage of floodlit training facilities that have been identified in the strategy for football and rugby.

The facility may also benefit Tring Hockey Club as the AGP could be made available for meeting their needs when not needed by BHHHC as the site would be closer to Tring HC's membership base than RAF Halton facility which is expected to close in 2022 as set out above.

The proposed lighting scheme for the AGP would also offer a direct benefit to Berkhamsted Rugby Union FC that use the rugby pitch that adjoins the site of the proposed AGP. The luminaires (F4, F5 and F6) along the eastern side of the AGP would be designed so that they could provide adequate lighting to a substantial part of the rugby pitch in order to facilitate training in the evenings. At present, the rugby club have to use portable halogen lighting to enable training on the playing field. The backlighting from the AGP would provide a more consistent and efficient lighting solution for the rugby club than relying entirely on portable lighting.

The AGP would also offer potential to be used by local schools during the week for meeting school curricular hockey needs.

I have consulted the Football Foundation (that represents the FA and Herts County FA) and they have advised that Berkhamsted Raiders FC it is a regular user of the grass pitches on the site and that the football club, and the Football Foundation are supportive of the Hockey Club's proposals. The Rugby Football Union have advised that both the RFU and Berkhamsted Rugby Football Club are supportive in principle of the development as it would have benefits for both rugby and hockey subject to some planning conditions being imposed to address the potential impact of the proposals on the rugby club's current use of the playing field.

If the application is approved and the AGP is implemented, BHHHC have advised that they would be willing to complete a community use agreement for the AGP to secure wider community access (beyond BHHHC's use) of the AGP. This

would help ensure that the benefits identified above are secured in practice over a long term period.

Impact on Playing Field

In relation to the impact on the playing field, the AGP would be sited on an area of the club's playing field that was marked out last for a football pitch around 3 years ago. As shown by the submitted playing pitch layouts, the proposed AGP would not affect any other existing playing pitches. A footpath is proposed to link the AGP to the clubhouse and car park along the southern periphery of the playing field but the indicative alignment of the footpath shown on Drawing BHHC02 Revision 3 shows that this would not impact on the playing pitches.

The area is currently used by Berkhamsted Rugby Union FC for training during midweek evenings in the rugby season facilitated by the use of portable halogen lighting. The rugby club use the area where the AGP is proposed rather than the rugby pitch in order to reduce wear on the rugby pitch. As set out above, backlighting from the AGP would offer an improved lighting solution to support rugby club training on the rugby pitch instead and the club would be keen to use the AGP for non-contact training. The AGP would be expected to reduce the need for portable halogen lighting to be used in the evenings by the rugby club as the club would focus training on the area adjoining the AGP that would be lit by the AGP luminaires. However, it would not completely negate the need for portable lighting. In order to protect areas of the rugby pitch from excessive wear associated with both match and training use, it is expected to be necessary during the season to rotate midweek evening training around different parts of the rugby pitch to allow areas closest to the AGP time to recover and this would necessitate the use of portable lighting if these areas were outside of the areas of the rugby pitch that could be adequately lit by the AGP lighting.

This area is also used though by Berkhamsted Bowmen archery club on Sunday mornings as an informal archery range. It is proposed that the area of the playing field closest to the clubhouse that is currently marked out for hockey pitches would be made available for football or rugby if required if the AGP was implemented because the hockey pitches have very limited use and the AGP would be used instead for hockey. The archery club

would be able to use other areas of the playing field which are not used on Sundays.

Conclusions and Recommendation

On the basis of the above assessment, I consider that the potential sports development benefits that the proposed AGP would offer would clearly outweigh the detriment caused by the impact on the playing field. I therefore consider that the proposed development would meet exception 5 of our playing fields policy. This being the case, Sport England does not wish to raise an objection to this application subject to the following conditions being attached to the decision notice should the local planning authority be minded to approve the application:

1. AGP Design Specifications: A condition requiring the detailed specifications of the AGP design and layout to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of the AGP. The condition should specifically require details to be provided of the surface, fencing and line markings. This is justified to ensure that the facility is fit for purpose and delivers the benefits to sport identified above. While the indicative details provided in the design and access statement about the proposed design specifications are considered to be acceptable in principle, the detailed contractor's specifications are required to be submitted for approval so that the specifications can be checked to ensure that they are compliant with the relevant design guidance. The club are encouraged to engage with England Hockey to discuss the design specifications in advance of submitting them for approval. When developing the specifications for the detailed design, attention should be given to the relevant Sport England and national governing body design guidance referred to in the informative below. It is therefore requested that the following condition and informative be imposed on any planning permission to address this matter (which is based on condition 9 of our model conditions schedule https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications):

"No development of the artificial grass pitch hereby approved shall commence until details of the artificial grass pitch design specifications including the surfacing, fencing and line markings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority after consultation with Sport England. The artificial grass pitch shall not be constructed other than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the development is fit for purpose and sustainable and to accord with Development Plan Policy **.

Informative: The applicant is advised that the design and layout of the artificial grass pitch should comply with the relevant industry Technical Design Guidance, including guidance published by Sport England, National Governing Bodies for Sport. Particular attention is drawn to: Sport England's Artificial Surfaces for Outdoor Sports' guidance note and England Hockey's Artificial Grass Pitch Guidance.

2. Footpath Alignment Details: A condition requiring the submission and approval of details of the alignment of the footpath that will connect the proposed artificial grass pitch with the clubhouse/car parking area. This is required because the alignment of the footpath shown on the submitted plan is indicative rather than the confirmed alignment and therefore may be subject to change when the details of the scheme are finalised. Due to the proximity to existing playing pitches, especially the rugby pitch, careful attention will need to be given to the footpath alignment to ensure that it does not impact on the pitches. It is therefore requested that the following condition be imposed on any planning permission to address this matter:

a. "No development of the artificial grass pitch hereby approved shall commence until details of the alignment of the footpath connecting the artificial grass pitch and the clubhouse/car parking area has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority after consultation with Sport England. The footpath shall not be constructed other than in accordance with the approved details.

b. Reason: To protect playing fields from damage, loss or availability of use and to accord with Development Plan Policy.

3. Continuity of Sports Provision During Construction Scheme. A condition requiring a scheme to be submitted and approved to address the temporary impacts of construction on the playing field. At this stage, the applicant has advised that it is unclear how the playing field will be impacted during the

	<p>construction of the AGP in terms of where a construction compound and haul road would be sited, how long the construction period would be expected to last, the time of the year the works would take place, whether any playing field restoration works would be required etc. Given the siting of the AGP and the anticipated need to access it via the adjoining playing field, it is expected that there would be some impacts on the playing field during the construction scheme. The submission and approval of a scheme should therefore help ensure that these impacts are fully considered and satisfactorily addressed as part of the project. The applicant is advocated to discuss and agree the scheme with users of the playing field and Sport England in advance of submitting the details. It is therefore requested that the following condition be imposed on any planning permission to address this matter (which is based on condition 2 of our model conditions schedule):</p> <p>No development shall commence until a scheme to ensure the continuity of the existing sports use on the playing fields shown on Drawing No. BHHHC 04 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority [after consultation with Sport England]. The scheme must set out details of the impact of construction related activities on the playing field, the construction programme, proposals for temporarily relocating existing playing field users (if applicable) and playing field restoration works (if applicable). The approved scheme shall be implemented and complied with in full throughout the carrying out of the development.</p> <p>Reason: To protect playing fields from damage, loss or availability of use during the construction of the development and to accord with Development Plan Policy.</p> <p>4. Community Use Agreement: A condition requiring a community use agreement for the artificial grass pitch and supporting facilities to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority (in consultation with Sport England) prior to first occupation of the artificial grass pitch in order to ensure that wider community access to the proposed facility is secured in practice over a long term period. A community use agreement sets out a sports club's policy and arrangements for community use of its sports facilities and covers matters such as hours of use, types</p>
The Chiltern Society	ORIGINAL SCHEME

Amenity Group

Customer objects to the Planning Application

- Affect local ecology
- Close to adjoining properties
- Development too high
- General dislike of proposal
- Inadequate access
- Inadequate parking provision
- Increase of pollution
- Noise nuisance
- Out of keeping with character of area
- Traffic or Highways

Although we would like to be able to support the Hockey Club's proposal for more sporting facilities, I am objecting on behalf of the Chiltern Society. The area in question is Chilterns AONB, where any development detrimental to the appearance and character of the area should be refused. Any structure must enhance the area.

This is certainly not the case with the very high floodlights, which would be higher than the surrounding trees. The trees are on two sides of the pitch, the clubhouse on one side, and the wonderful Chiltern views open out on the remaining side. The trees will give very little cover from the floodlights in winter. The light from the floodlights will always look the same, and will be unnatural and severely detrimental to the appearance of the area as a whole, and to the wildlife due to disturbance and the loss of dark skies.

The local residents and wildlife would also be greatly disturbed by the increase and noise of cars and people, supporting the matches.

Footpath NC28 runs across the top of the proposed new pitch, and of course this must be safeguarded. Walkers are bound to be

disturbed by the activities of the Hockey Club.

The entrance from the A4251 is totally inadequate even at the present time, without the proposed increased activity. This Restricted Byway WG10, which leads towards the Hockey Club, is the Chiltern Way and is constantly used by walkers. It is a single lane track, and traffic going to and from the A4251, particularly between matches, causes dangerous confrontations and queues on the main road at the junction.

	<p>We could reluctantly accept the Astroturf as we realise that Hockey needs to be played on a level pitch. But the lighting is certainly not acceptable, nor is the fencing as this would affect the openness which is expected in the AONB.</p>
<p>Hertfordshire Ecology</p>	<p>ORIGINAL SCHEME</p> <p>RESPONSE 1</p> <p>Thank you for your email of 23 June 2020 which refers, and for consulting Herts Ecology.</p> <p>It is understood this proposal seeks to create a new all weather-sports pitch with new fencing and lighting on the site of an existing sports pitch; no trees or hedgerows are to be felled or pruned. Please let me know if this is incorrect as it may modify the advice provided below.</p> <p>The Hertfordshire Environmental Record Centre does not have any records of notable ecological interest associated with this land or its immediate surroundings but it is situated within a typical rural landscape with extensive areas of farmland and semi-natural habitats nearby. Together these habitats are likely to provide roosting, foraging opportunities and commuting routes for bats; there are numerous records of bat activity in the area. Indeed, it is quite possible that bats will make use of the site for foraging or commuting to feeding areas elsewhere and they can travel considerable distances.</p> <p>All bats are afforded protection in law and policy and, as new lighting is proposed in a dark environment, foraging and commuting bats could be displaced (although direct effects on existing roosts are perhaps unlikely given the immediate surroundings).</p> <p>Paragraph 99 of ODPM Circular makes it clear that the presence of and impact on protected species must be established prior to the award of planning consent. However, no assessment of the ecological impact of the proposals has been made.</p> <p>In order to provide the evidence to enable the Council to discharge its obligations, it is essential that a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal is carried out by a suitably qualified and</p>

experienced ecologist. The contents of the reports should follow available best practice guidance (ie CIEEM Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Report Writing) and should not only describe the ecological characteristics of the development site but should also address adjacent sites and features, and the potential impacts of the development, direct or indirect, upon them. The report should also highlight any potential impacts on legally protected species on or off the development site and should include the results of any additional species surveys considered necessary.

Given the characteristics of this particular development, in particular that it proposes development on an existing sports field and no hedgerows will need to be removed, impacts on most groups and features can be ruled out but the effect of lighting on foraging and commuting bats would be an obvious issue to address.

In this regard, the PEA should also be informed by the Bat Conservation Trust Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition, 2016.

In broad terms, the PEA can be carried out at any time of year, within reason. However, as the function of a PEA is mainly to scope out issues that require further scrutiny, additional surveys may be necessary. In the case of bats, these are likely to comprise up to three 'activity' surveys which can only be carried out when bats are active, ideally between May and August inclusive.

Consequently, the applicant is urged to commission this work promptly if seasonal restrictions are not to unnecessarily delay this project.

All bat surveys should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council before the application is determined.

If necessary or possible, the PEA should identify suitable mitigation measures that would remove any threat (and allow the development to proceed) but this may have to await the completion of further surveys referred to above.

For the avoidance of doubt, the ODPM Circular makes it clear that such assessments cannot be conditioned and must be completed and considered by the Council prior to determination.

Whilst all studies should meet best practice, it is stressed that all need only be appropriate to the circumstances. Given the

restricted number of ecological features that are expected to be at risk, any PEA or other surveys need not be overly exhaustive. The appointed ecologist will be able to advise on this.

Should significant use of the area by bats be found, it is anticipated that one outcome would be the need to amend the existing Lighting Strategy.

This should describe levels of illumination prior to and post-development, with the results shown clearly in suitable contour plans and charts. I would expect the Strategy to also take account of reflected light and not just that emitted by the lamps. The Strategy should be amended until it can be demonstrated that harmful effects will not arise.

The lighting scheme should accord with best practice (Guidance Note 08/10: Bats and artificial lighting in the UK (BCT & ILP, 2018) and be maintained accordingly. No further external lighting should be added. Importantly, these proposals should also be accompanied by a statement by an ecologist on how it achieves these goals.

Alternatively, curfews could be employed to achieve the same outcome although lighting may still have to be minimised if the curfew is not to be so excessive it compromises the intended use.

If one is required, the amended Lighting Strategy should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council before the application is determined.

It is worth noting that the location chosen by the applicant is possibly the most ecologically damaging being at the corner of two hedgerows which bats typically forage around and commute along. A location nearer to the clubhouse would help reduce these impacts and should be considered.

Of course, if surveys show little or no use of the site is made by bats, some or all of these measures may not be necessary. Existing and emerging biodiversity policy and law encourages all development to not only avoid a net loss of biodiversity but to also deliver a net gain. This applies to this proposal as well whether bats or other features are affected or not. Again, the appointed ecologist should be able to advise but given the site's location, the

adoption of a more sympathetic management of the hedgerows and field margins around the perimeter of the club could go some way towards achieving this

RESPONSE 2

Thank for contacting Herts Ecology and for providing the (Preliminary Ecological Appraisal) PEA and Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA).

I have to say this isn't what I quite expected. The role of a PEA is to scope out potential issues and identify further work that might be necessary unless, of course, it shows that there are no issues to resolve. I didn't ask for a PRA as I didn't suspect that the surrounding hedgerows and scrub provided opportunities for roosts to be present.

The concerns I had (and I think I can say those put forward by the Trust) regarded the value of the site (and its boundaries and adjacent scrub) to provide foraging and commuting opportunities for bats. I therefore anticipated that the PEA would provide the grounds for it to suggest surveys in person and with automatic data-loggers along these areas to evaluate bat activity in the area and its relative importance. I consider that I made this clear towards the top of page 2 of my letter of 26 June 2020.

Arbtech has taken a different approach and assessed the impact of the scheme and the revised lighting. This is not necessarily an invalid approach but we are left with Arbtech's opinion that there will be minimal lightspill on part of the hedgerows but with no indication of how valuable those hedgerows are (or are not).

Although rather clumsily explained, I accept Arbtech's point that existing use of lighting within the locality may help preclude more light-intolerant bat species, but this cannot be relied on alone to rule out their presence entirely. This would include the possible presence of the particularly rare barbastelle bats which are known to be present in the area.

Therefore, I strongly suggest that the applicant/Arbtech carry out surveys of bat activity along the boundaries of the application site. As we are getting towards the end of the survey season the full value of such an effort may not be realised but it could provide a valuable indication of bat activity in the area but will need to be pursued urgently.

Returning to the lighting plan, Arbtech doesn't appear to have interrogated the proposals other than to suggest they are acceptable. I would have preferred to have seen an evidence-based based assessment of the change in illumination both before and after that also took account of reflection from the ground which often appears to be omitted. The lighting plan provided has no legend that describes the figures provided. It is possible that the proposed scheme will prevent significant lightspill on surrounding features, it's just that the evidence hasn't been interpreted to a sufficient degree just yet.

I welcome the 3000K warm light source proposed (as described in the original lighting strategy) but other details remain absent. Reference to the Bat Conservation trust/Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance note 08/18 (Bats and artificial lighting in the UK) should be made and followed. For instance, the original lighting report indicates that lightspill will remain 10 lux which could exceed recommendations in this Guidance Note. . I do not accept Arbtech's opinion that the introduction of lighting 'will facilitate an increase in available foraging and commuting habitat for bats compared to the current lighting situation'.

Moving onto other matters, Arbtech suggest the establishment of a new hedgerow along the south-east boundary. I would support this as it matches the suggestion in my letter. However, this (with an appropriate long-term management regime) will need to be secured by a condition.

Importantly, it is worth noting though that the value of this as a bat commuting feature may well be compromised by the current lighting proposals, the unidentified contours of which extend across it. It would be pointless establishing such a feature if its use was immediately compromised by the impact it was trying to mitigate.

I would also draw your attention to the question I posed towards the end of my previous letter. Could the new pitch and lighting be located closer to the clubhouse? It would appear to be the sensible thing to do in terms of bats.

Alternatively, a more vigorous curfew could be adopted from late spring to early autumn.

It seems we have a few options as follows:

1. Arbtech provide a more compelling review of the new

	<p>lighting plan to support their views which if they show no light spill on existing or proposed (the new hedge) habitats, may provide confidence for the existing scheme to proceed without the need for bat activity surveys - if they cannot, then surveys will probably be needed;</p> <p>2. Activity surveys are carried out to evaluate current usage - if none or very modest, the current scheme with some lightspill may again prove adequate. If use is significant, a more refined lighting plan may be needed;</p> <p>3. If time was not at a premium, I'd suggest (1) first but as we are so close to the end of the season any delay now could preclude the opportunity for survey this season and so, I'd probably recommend (2) first;</p> <p>4. In all scenarios, the new hedge is required as a minimum to address the need for biodiversity net gain;</p> <p>5. Life would be so much easier if the proposed site was relocated to lie adjacent to the clubhouse.</p>
Parish/Town Council	<p>NORTHCURCH PARISH COUNCIL: REVISED SCHEME</p> <p>Response awaited</p>
Lead Local Flood Authority (HCC)	<p>REVISED SCHEME</p> <p>Response awaited</p>
Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust	<p>REVISED SCHEME</p> <p>Response awaited</p>
The Chiltern Society	<p>Although we would like to be able to support the Hockey Club's proposal for more sporting facilities, I am objecting on behalf of the Chiltern Society. The area in question is Chilterns AONB, where any development detrimental to the appearance and character of the area should be refused. Any structure must enhance the area.</p> <p>This is certainly not the case with the very high floodlights, which would be higher than the surrounding trees. The trees are on two sides of the pitch, the clubhouse on one side, and the wonderful Chiltern views open out on the remaining side. The trees will give</p>

	<p>very little cover from the floodlights in winter. The light from the floodlights will always look the same, and will be unnatural and severely detrimental to the appearance of the area as a whole, and to the wildlife due to disturbance and the loss of dark skies.</p> <p>The local residents and wildlife would also be greatly disturbed by the increase and noise of cars and people, supporting the matches.</p> <p>Footpath NC28 runs across the top of the proposed new pitch, and of course this must be safeguarded. Walkers are bound to be disturbed by the activities of the Hockey Club.</p> <p>The entrance from the A4251 is totally inadequate even at the present time, without the proposed increased activity. This Restricted Byway WG10, which leads towards the Hockey Club, is the Chiltern Way and is constantly used by walkers. It is a single lane track, and traffic going to and from the A4251, particularly between matches, causes dangerous confrontations and queues on the main road at the junction.</p> <p>We could reluctantly accept the Astroturf as we realise that Hockey needs to be played on a level pitch. But the lighting is certainly not acceptable, nor is the fencing as this would affect the openness which is expected in the AONB.</p> <p>(Please Note: Also see Representations).</p>
<p>Lead Local Flood Authority (HCC)</p>	<p>RESPONSE TO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: 10.07.2020</p> <p>We previously objected to the proposed development dated 10 June 2020 as no surface water drainage assessment had been submitted in support of the application in compliance with the NPPF for all major planning applications.</p> <p>The applicant has submitted the following information in response to our latest response dated 10 June 2020;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment received by the LPA on the 29 June 2020 carried out by the applicant. <p>We have reviewed the information submitted in support of the planning application and provide the following comments;</p> <p>Existing flood risk</p> <p>It has been demonstrated that the proposed artificial pitch development lies outside of the identified Areas Susceptible to surface water flood risk, however the proposed access path is located within this area. We will therefore be conditioning that the</p>

access path should be set no higher than the existing ground levels as the construction details of this path has not been provided as part of this planning application. The land slopes to the north of the site where the existing Hockey Club House is located, it would therefore be in the applicant's interest to ensure there is no increase in flood risk from surface water to the site and the surrounding area.

Proposed surface water drainage

As the proposed development is surrounded by open land and is within the redline boundary and ownership of the applicant, any required space to provide attenuation SuDS features should be feasible. It has been acknowledged and agreed by the applicant that a formal detailed drainage proposal will be required due to the change in surface as a result of the artificial pitch and associated access paths and has agreed to provide this information as part of a recommended condition to the LPA should planning permission be granted. This includes undertaking infiltration tests in accordance with BRE Digest 365 to confirm the permeability of the site which will determine the final design of the drainage scheme. This assessment is normally required as part of the planning application, however in this instance the receptors at risk of flooding is the existing hockey club house and land within their ownership so therefore is in the interest of the applicant to ensure there is no increase in surface water run-off rates and volumes as a result of the development including the artificial pitch and associated access paths. In these specific circumstances we are satisfied to be able to recommend the following condition to the LPA;

LLFA Position

The proposed development will be acceptable if a planning condition is included requiring the following drainage details.

Condition

No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage strategy should demonstrate the surface water run-off generated up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change critical storm will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site following the corresponding rainfall event. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the

<p>Hertfordshire Ecology REVISED</p>	<p>development is completed.</p> <p>The scheme shall also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infiltration tests carried out in accordance with BRE Digest 365 - If infiltration is not feasible, demonstrate that the proposed surface water discharge rates can be discharged to the nearest water course, if this is not possible to the nearest surface water sewer with permission from the relevant water authority at a discharge rate no greater than the existing greenfield run-off rate. The greenfield run-off rates should be provided as part of the surface water calculations. - Surface water drainage calculations for all proposed impermeable areas including the access paths and artificial pitch to provide surface water rates and volumes www.hertfordshire.gov.uk generated by these areas for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change rainfall event - A SuDS hierarchy including appropriate SuDS measures, including a detailed proposed drainage layout plan showing the location of any proposed SuDS measures and associated infrastructure annotating the attenuation volumes for each SuDS measure. - Appropriate number of water quality treatment stages prior to the discharge of surface water from the development - Detailed design engineering drawings of the proposed SuDS measures including their dimensions and any inlets and outlets. - Confirmation that the sub-base of any proposed infiltration measure will be sited at least 1m above the highest ground water level. - Details of how the drainage scheme shall be maintained and managed for its lifetime - Confirmation that there will be changes in existing ground levels and no temporary storage of materials during construction within the area identified as an existing surface water flow path shown on the EA Areas Susceptible to surface water flood risk. - Assessment of exceedance flow paths showing their location on a proposed site layout plan <p>Reason To prevent the increased risk of flooding, both on and off site.</p> <p>Further to my letter of 26 June 2020 and subsequent emails with the applicant and planning department, your email of 2 October now provides me with a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and</p>
---	--

SCHEME

Preliminary Roost Assessment Survey (PEA/PRA) (Arbtech, August 2020), an updated Lighting Report (Musco, 27 August 2020) and an undated Lighting Strategy (Hillier Hopkins LLP) amongst other documents.

It is noted that the PEA/PRA provides, and draws on evidence provided by a lighting report by Musco of 5 August, different to that presented with this current application (ie 27 August). They appear to present noticeably different data.

The PEA/PRA does not really address the issues at stake, focusing on the impact on bat roosts where the primary concern relates to foraging or commuting bats; it does not, for example, appear to have carried out the three activity surveys I recommended in my previous letter meaning this potentially important information is absent. In addition, it does not draw on contemporary best practice¹ on the impact of lighting on bats to inform its decisions. Overall, the level of scrutiny appears to be superficial. For these reasons, it is put to one side.

Central to the other new information is an indication that the location of the proposed hockey pitch will be moved several metres to the north-west. However, I cannot find any form indication of exactly how far. This should be confirmed.

However, the new lighting report suggests that the relocation of the pitch and the associated lighting columns will result in a marked decline in illumination of the western perimeter hedgerow, which was my primary cause of concern previously. The image on p5 of the Lighting report shows that max illumination of the existing hedgerow does not exceed 0.5 lux along its length. This is an excellent outcome and removes the threat of harm to foraging and commuting bats along the western hedgerow and successfully addressing my primary concern.

As indicated in my previous letter, all development is expected to provide a biodiversity net gain. Modest suggestions for the establishment of a hedgerow are made in the PEA/PRA which I endorse, as they largely reflect the advice I previously made. However, no information is submitted to show that this will be adopted or implemented, and the proposals themselves are too vague to be relied upon at this point.

Therefore, I recommend that the production of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) is secured via a condition.

This should secure the delivery of a net gain and focus on improving connectivity within the landscape for bats. Whilst the measures adopted are a matter for the Club and its ecologists, I suggest the LEMP should not only comprise management of the existing hedgerows but should establish a new hedgerow along

<p>NATS REVISED SCHEME</p>	<p>the eastern boundary along its full length; it should comprise native species and a suitable species list is provided in the PEA/PRA. Use of a biodiversity metric would not be necessary in these circumstances.</p> <p>Whilst the relocation of the pitch will reduce illumination of the existing western hedgerow, it is presumed it will lead to greater illumination of the eastern boundary which could deter its use by bats and so compromise its effectiveness.</p> <p>To overcome this, I strongly recommended that where space allows, the new eastern hedgerow comprises two parallel hedgerows 3m metres apart, that are allowed to grow tall and blend into each other above head height. This will effectively create a dark tunnel which bats could exploit and go some way to negate the effect of lighting.</p> <p>All boundary features should be managed for the foreseeable future and for a period not less than 30 years. This should include the maintenance of a clear tunnel within the double-hedgerow. The LEMP should be produced by a competent, professional ecologist and I will be happy to comment on it in due course.</p> <p>Provided the location of the pitch is confirmed and that the LEMP is conditioned, all ecological constraints would be removed, and the application can be determined accordingly.</p> <p>The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.</p> <p>However, please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NATS (that is responsible for the management of en route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly consulted.</p> <p>If any changes are proposed to the information supplied to NATS in regard to this application which become the basis of a revised, amended or further application for approval, then as a statutory consultee NERL requires that it be further consulted on any such changes prior to any planning permission or any consent being granted.</p>
---------------------------------------	--

<p>Highways England REVISED SCHEME</p>	<p>Thank you for your email dated 22 September 2020 on the above planning application re-consultation and indicating a response was required by 13 October 2020.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>In the case of this proposed development, Highways England is interested in the potential impact that the development might have the SRN, in particular on the M25, in particular Junction 20. We are interested as to whether there would be any adverse safety implications or material increase in queues and delays on the SRN as a result of development.</p> <p>In our previous response dated 2nd June 2020, Highways England had no objection to the planning application as the site and its associated floodlighting is located some distance away from the SRN. Having reviewed the additional information, including a submitting lighting assessment, we consider that the proposed development remains unlikely to impact the SRN.</p> <p>Therefore, Highways England have no objection to this application.</p> <p>Our formal response provided on 2nd June 2020 is unchanged following this additional information. Please see a copy of our formal response (HEPR) re-attached for your reference.</p>
<p>Strategic Planning</p>	<p>The LPA should always try to accommodate the needs of our local communities wherever policy reasonably allows us to do so. However, this may not be possible in all cases, especially where harm to key national policies cannot be avoided.</p> <p>SP appreciate the difficulties of the BHHHC in securing both improved facilities at Cow Roast and the long term future of the Club (It is note a lot of local and external support for the application from a range of organisations).</p> <p>SP cannot give a definitive answer to the question regarding the weight to be given to the conclusions of the Playing Pitch Strategy</p>

(PPS) and Playing Pitch Strategy and Action Plan (PPSAP) regarding the above site. These documents identify future hockey playing pitch/AGP needs (this is already neatly summarised in the applicant's Design and Access Statement). The studies can be accessed using the following links:

- http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/playing-pitch-strategy-assessment-report.pdf?sfvrsn=14cd0a9e_8
- http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/playing-pitch-strategy-and-action-plan.pdf?sfvrsn=33cd0a9e_8

SP would add that these documents are technical studies rather than policy documents. They do not outweigh normal planning policy considerations. Just because a need has been identified does not mean that it can be automatically accommodated in every situation. A planning judgement will always have to be made.

The proposed AGP is seen as meeting this identified need. However, the starting point for the LPA's consideration should be the proposal's impact on the Green Belt and CAONB. The NPPF and Local Plan policies gives high priority to their protection from development. Certainly, this is a sensitive rural location away from the main built-up edge of Berkhamsted (or Tring). The LPA will to consider whether the scheme does or does not result in harm to these assets. I note the proposal comprises of an AGP with 3m high wire mesh fencing extending across a pitch of 97m x 61m. It also includes 6 lighting columns of 15m in height. The AGP is to function as a MUGA.

The LPA will need to assess the impact of these built and urban-type features on this rural location. If it is considered that any harm is minimal or can generally be mitigated (e.g. through siting, design, screening, etc.) then the two studies can add to the argument in support of the proposal (and possibly very special circumstances (VSC) if considered inappropriate in GB terms). They will be a material consideration along with other factors, as appropriate, the applicant puts forward. However, if any identified harm is so great and cannot be effectively moderated, then SP do not consider the studies by themselves can overcome this and it will be difficult to support the scheme in policy terms.

SP would add that there is scope through the preparation of the Local Plan to look at potential opportunities to accommodate an

	AGP and other leisure needs in some of the larger emerging housing allocations. However, no detailed decisions have been made on this and other matters just yet.
--	---

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
33	227	2	11	211

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
13 Hartwell Crescent Bedfordshire Leighton Buzzard LU7 1NP	<p>Hockey is a rare sport in the fact that it is one where both men and women play on equal terms and, with the initiatives put in place by Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club, one in which many young people in the area get the chance to enjoy.</p> <p>I have been playing at the club for over 25 years and in that time one of the biggest things holding back the sport locally - and young people in in the area - has been the lack of quality and suitable facilities for games and training.</p> <p>The pitch at Tring (which is on its last legs due to the complete lack of maintenance and upkeep) is unable to cope with the demands of hockey in the area, and since there are no other suitable playing surfaces in Dacorum, the club has already been forced to travel to other town and cities to fulfil all its home fixtures.</p> <p>With the pitch at RAF Halton now under threat (due to the possible closure of the RAF base) this will mean that players will have to travel much further to play to home games - let alone away ones. The nearest grounds will soon be in Aylesbury, Watford and St. Albans - all of which are fully utilised to support teams in their own areas.</p> <p>Finding a suitable pitch will be increasingly difficult - if not impossible - and could quickly spell the end of hockey in the area.</p>

	<p>This opportunity is a great chance to support all ages (from 8 to 80) and a range of diverse groups in the local community in getting fit and having fun.</p> <p>As an Olympic and Commonwealth sport, with an increasing television coverage, wouldn't it be wonderful for a local youngster to get the chance to play at one of those great tournaments. That could happen if permission for a new pitch at the hockey club could be granted.</p>
<p>Longcroft 3 Hastoe Farm Barns Browns Lane Hastoe Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6QD</p>	<p>I have been associated with BHHHC for 32 years. In that time the club has lost many a high standard player or promising youth player to other Hertfordshire clubs due to our lack of facilities. Dacorum is poorly served by adequate hockey training facilities, unlike other Hertfordshire towns and clubs - just visit St Albans, Hertford, Hertfordshire University, etc..</p> <p>This is a family club with multiple generations representing the local area. What other sport would see a 14 year old playing alongside a 70 year old? The development of youngsters from young children to well functioning adults is all part of the team ethos at the club - and is wonderful to witness. As a club we put in huge efforts to encourage the youngsters from a very early age - and at present their coaching takes place on inadequate facilities in the borough. It is a real shame that the club loses youth team members to other clubs, and struggles to attract others to the club because of its mid 20th century facilities.</p> <p>When we did use to play on the grass in front of the club house the club really did fully function as a meeting and community hub. We try as much as possible, with social events and grass tournaments to keep the esprit de corps functioning, but it is very difficult with teams playing "away" from home at Halton and Tring.</p> <p>As the ladies elite team coach I find it frustrating that we can only train once a week, on half a pitch (the men have the other half), and the only slot we can get at Halton finishes at 22:15 - which precludes some younger members of the squad who need to be at school the next day. With our own astro turf in front of the club house our training times could be much more flexible and the club house could be used for tactics (we have nowhere to do that in mid winter at Halton!).</p> <p>Hockey has seen a resurgence since the Olympic gold medal 4 years ago and unfortunately we are unable to make the most of offering this wonderful sport to the local community - people in the local area really do want to play. We have found recently that when parents bring their youngsters to youth training it often inspires them to come training and re-kindle their own love of the sport. Hockey provides a real alternative to the over subscription of football and parents concern with rugby and its associated injuries. Hockey is a skilful sport which teaches discipline and team spirit. It is therefore a shame that Dacorum can not provide</p>

	<p>adequate facilities for the people in its borough. This planning application is 30 years over due and would provide the local community with a wonderful facility that we know would be fully utilised. Flood lighting would allow maximum use throughout the winter months. Please recommend this application!</p>
<p>Chiltern House Chesham Road Wigginton Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6JE</p>	<p>'I strongly support the development of an Astro turf at Cow Roast. My two sons and I played hockey for Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey club (BHHHC) for many years. I believe this development is long overdue and it will enhance the development of young boys and girls in the future and bring families into the sporting arena together and give them lots of outdoor exercise and enjoyment. This site has been used for sport for many years and so the opportunity to upgrade the facilities to include a top class Astro turf should not be missed. The benefits it will bring to the people using it will be enormous. Please consider this excellent proposal positively and give joy and hope to our children and grandchildren. Thank you.</p>
<p>The Bungalow Bridgewater Middle School Bridle Way Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1ES</p>	<p>I am Deputy Head teacher for Bridgewater Primary School in Berkhamsted. We have over 400 children at our school and we teach hockey as one of our core National Curriculum sports. We encourage our Key Stage 2 children to join their local hockey club to further develop their skills and BHHHC is the most local club to our school. There is a shortage of full sized astro turfs for hockey in Dacorum because many astros have gone down the 4G route for football and this is not suitable for hockey. We fully support the application and would like to use the astro by holding festivals and tournaments for our school against other local schools. This would form part of the School Games initiative of competing in a broad range of subjects and also help to enable children to meet the chief medical officers recommendation for all children to achieve 60 minutes exercise a day. We have seen several of our key stage 2 children grow in confidence since joining BHHHC and we believe that the new astro would provide many opportunities for children in our school to embrace hockey.</p>
<p>West End Farm House, Long Marston Road Cheddington Leighton Buzzard LU7 0RS</p>	<p>My children and I are all members at the applicant hockey club. Hockey is a big part of our social and sporting lives. However, I know from experience elsewhere that it's incredibly difficult for a hockey club to thrive when it is reliant on distant third party pitches, even when they are readily available. However, it is clear there is already insufficient provision in the area and that the availability is likely to worsen. By permitting the development, the Council will be supporting the future of the club and the positive social and sporting impact it has for many families, including</p>

	mine.
Westbrook Hay School London Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2RF	I fully support this project, it is well planned and overdue. There are a lack of artificial pitches in the local area and this is to the detriment of the youth (and adults) in the area. As the Headmaster of a local prep school I would be keen to explore using this facility for school matches/training. We have children who would love to play hockey and this facility may make that possible. Aside from this element, we should not just be approving projects like this, but we should be fast tracking them. Sport provides a phenomenal number of benefits to those who take part and we should be encouraging children to try as many sports as possible - not just football and rugby. Hockey is one of few co-ed sports and the social benefits of playing sport are unquestionable.
6 Barberry Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1SD	I strongly support this development. This will mee a sporting asset to the area that is much needed, will secure the future operation of a long-standing local sports club, and of sport in general at the site. There is currently under-provision of the artificial sports pitches in the Dacorum district, requiring Berkahmsted club to schedule some games in Aylesbury, with attendant travel and CO2 footprint for both home and away teams. There seems risk of further pressure on these resources with uncertain futures for Tring school and RAF Halton.
Hillcote Doctors Commons Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3DR	I support this application to provide vital facilities for a thriving community sports club. At present the club cannot play home matches on its home turf, and are forced to compete at a range of other facilities some distance from Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead. For the club to be able to continue to offer sporting opportunities to so many local people of all ages it needs proper facilities at its home ground.
12 the green edlesborough lu6 2jf	Hockey at BHHHC is a great family oriented game that could hugely benefit from an astro pitch to reduce the needs to travel out of county. This will contribute to the efforts of reducing global warming due to reduction in travel by 4 ladies, 5 mens and growing junior teams. The current pitches we use - Tring is worn out and in need of a new carpet (If they decided to do that in the season that's the end of Hockey in Tring) and Halton (soon to be in the hands of a developer? Who Knows) but way out of our area and in the wrong County! As a community we would therefore love a hockey club we know we can rely on to keep the sport in the county thriving.
134 Chiltern Park	Hockey is a fantastic family sport, suitable for all ages and fitness

<p>Avenue Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1EZ</p>	<p>levels. Berkhamsted Hockey Club run sessions for children through to 'Back to Hockey' for those looking to return to the sport.</p> <p>The facilities in Berkhamsted are severely lacking. The club uses Tring School to train and the pitch is in need of upgrading.</p> <p>In order to train and have fun, suitable facilities are required. The community and local schools would massively benefit from upgraded facilities.</p>
<p>2 Lyme Avenue Northchurch Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3SG</p>	<p>As a parent of two teenagers in Northchurch and a former hockey player in my younger years, I was keen to introduce them to the sport. Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey club (BHHHC) were hugely welcoming to my family through their junior training sessions which are conducted on a tiny piece of multi-purpose astro in the locality. They have a track record of encouraging former players to rekindle their love of hockey and I am one such recruit, having done so in order to improve my fitness as much as for the enjoyment I get from playing.</p> <p>Right now we have very few options for playing in the vicinity - we shuffle between 3 pitches for our home games, one of which (Tring School) is worn out and in dire need of replacement, a second (Halton) which is likely to disappear shortly, and a third on the other side of Aylesbury which is a 80 minute round trip to get to. I firmly believe that whilst BHHHC is a great club to be a member of, it is significantly constrained by the lack of a home pitch on site.</p> <p>We wholeheartedly support the planning application which would provide an incredible asset for generations to come in our community. Without it we fear that due to the expected changes in the other facilities that the club uses, we could be left without any viable playing surfaces which could jeopardise the future of this great family-orientated club.</p>
<p>21 South Park Gardens Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1JA</p>	<p>I strongly support this application - it will be a much needed asset to the BHHHC and the wider community. This is a thriving family club but there is a huge lack of Astro facilities within the area.</p>
<p>1 Chiltern Way Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JX</p>	<p>I want to express my support for this additional, essential development for our local hockey club. I believe it's so important that clubs are allowed to develop their facilities to keep in line with Hockey Association 'demands' and to attract new members and retain current ones and keep the club viable and healthy financially, which in turn benefits the health and wellbeing of it's members and potential new members, so important in these</p>

	<p>current times and beyond. The positioning of the new pitch is as unobtrusive as possible and the current parking capacity is more than adequate. I believe this development is wholly positive and beneficial for the local community and the club and it's members.</p>
<p>77 Bridgewater Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1JN</p>	<p>I am very much in favour of this application. As a retired teacher who was heavily involved in games coaching (I am an ex county hockey player and coach) in the local area, I am well aware how vital exercise coupled with good facilities is to the current generation of teenagers and below. Hockey is one of the few sports that attract male and female of all ages, while it's popularity has grown, especially with our Olympic successes. However, this has only happened in areas where artificial surfaces are provided. Dacorum, and especially Tring and Berkhamsted have been crying out for this kind of facility for decades. Being based in Berkhamsted myself, my 25 years of teaching in this area has meant Having to travel for coaching and matches in Watford, Halton, Tring as well as Aylesbury. This facility will give the game a massive boost to the area and give all ages a much overdue playing facility.</p>
<p>Jelmac House 269 High Street Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1AA</p>	<p>I have been associated with Berkhamsted Hockey Club since the early 1960's. Throughout all that time it has been a welcoming and friendly club and has provided playing and coaching facilities to countless youngsters and adults of all abilities. Sport moves on and gone are the days of muddy grass pitches and sub standard all weather surfaces. For the club to continue to provide much needed sporting opportunities to local youngsters and a top class facility for both men and women to play, an artificial pitch is essential. I fully support the application as it will provide a fantastic amenity for future generations to enjoy and play sport in a modern environment.</p>
<p>12 Breakspeare Road Abbots Langley WD5 0EP</p>	<p>I support the BHHHC pitch as it will benefit so many people and make hockey accessible to more people in Berkhamstead and Hemel Hempstead. The lack of an AstroTurf pitch is a huge barrier to the club and impacts its development and success.</p>
<p>19 Fantail Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4EN</p>	<p>I support the application as it will provide a recreational amenity for the community without causing much interruption to neighbouring properties.</p>
<p>18 Rosebery Way Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5DS</p>	<p>I strongly support this application</p>
<p>53 Longfield Road Tring Hertfordshire</p>	<p>As a player of the club for my whole childhood, I believe that with the available land, parking and locality would improve the sporting access in Dacorum and many schools that don't have</p>

<p>HP23 4DF</p>	<p>access to an astro. Having an astro located in an area that lacks quality local pitches is one of the many benefits it could bring to the club and the area.</p> <p>It's something that is needed for public health alongside social well being. With Halton's astro being unavailable and Tring's being in a poor condition and in very high demand - the opportunity for Dacorum schools and the many hockey clubs that are all requiring pitches, in my opinion greatly outweighs any negatives.</p> <p>It just makes sense to utilise the land which we call the roots of the club, which has a fully updated and functioning club house.</p>
<p>Wardscoombe Main Road North, Dagnall Berkhamsted HP4 1RE</p>	<p>Berkhamsted has long needed a high quality astro turf facility in or near to the town for its local hockey club and which can also be offered to local schools to support their sport provision.</p> <p>This development will ensure a better and more assured long-term future for the hockey club which is a sport for all ages and genders. I am wholly supportive of the proposal.</p>
<p>Keepers Cottage Swing Gate Lane Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2RP</p>	<p>We strongly support this planning application. This new facility as proposed will offer huge amounts of benefits to the local community. Berkhamsted Hockey club provides a wonderfully nurturing and inclusive environment for young players but has been limited for years by access to modern facilities.</p> <p>This astro turf will not only allow the hockey club to continue to flourish for young and old, but also provide an excellent venue and social benefit for the wider community.</p>
<p>The Finings, Finings Road, Lane End High Wycombe HP14 3LP</p>	<p>I support this proposal, as the Hockey club has given years of enjoyment, family togetherness, and friendship to many, building this sports pitch will add to all of these, and make the club stronger, from the junior players to the older ones.</p>
<p>Tinkers Lodge Bottom House Lane Wigginton HP23 6DP Rtcoyneuk@gmail.com</p>	<p>We are writing to object to the above Planning application for the development of Artificial Games Area with Floodlighting and Fencing.</p> <p>The impact of such a development would be damaging in many ways to an area of outstanding natural beauty (AoNB) as well as further erosion of the Green belt which would materially change the aesthetic look and feel as well as cause environmental damage.</p> <p>The noise, light pollution and disturbance caused by such a development would have a detrimental impact on our family life and privacy. You will be aware of previous planning appeals and rejection of a proposed Traveller site which is in the same vicinity.</p> <p>The BOAT (Byway Open all Traffic) which is part of the Chiltern walk is at best a mud track used for recreation by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and school aged camping trips. There have</p>

	<p>been incidents that could have resulted in injury due to speeding cars or motorcycles so to install such a facility would increase traffic volumes and impact Highway safety at both ends of the track. Without material change in use of this track and access from Bottom House Lane or through traffic from the Cow Roast this would be a major risk to Highway Safety and increased volumes of traffic.</p> <p>We have no issue to people participating in sports or exercise but we believe this development materially changes the landscape and environment, and will have a major detrimental lasting impact for the local community.</p>
<p>Fendley Barn Cow Roast Tring HP23 5RG</p>	<p>We would like to object the application state above due to the following considerations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extensive light pollution, light disturbance and noise pollution. The extensive lighting and the long hours of use stated will create a huge amount of light disturbance and noise pollution. The poles mentioned in the application are higher than the surrounding trees that only partially cover the proposed pitch already. This will cause a huge amount of light disturbance for the surrounding houses and especially in winter when there will be no trees on the leaves acting as a screen and when the pitches will be in use on the dark evenings. The applicants have falsely claimed that the trees will screen the lights and due to the long periods stated for us it will create a continual unfair disturbance for local households such as ours which face the proposed pitch. As well as the light pollution there will also be noise pollution. The hockey club regularly without the large increase in the amount of people using the facility and the night time use from both cars and people. 2. A4251 Road entry and exit level of danger. The single lane in place is so far from adequate for the proposed 90 cars that will be arriving at the new proposed pitch. This 'track' is already overused due to 40 or so cars parking there already on weekdays due to Stratstone Garage's use of it and sometimes on Saturdays when the lower pitches are used for Football. This creates an overspill already on to the main road which is dangerous for the local residence and for the Hockey Club members themselves. The potential to have around 100 cars using this entrance and exit poorly surfaced track is unrealistic and dangerous for the 100 or so cars to be pulling out on a blind corner where often traffic is going 60mph instead of the proposed 40mph in Cow Roast. This stretch of road has seen multiple accidents over the years and the addition of 100's of cars entering this corner under pressure from large amounts of cars all also trying to leave at the same time is dangerous. It is not only cars pulling out that is the issue but also cars pulling in. It is a one-way section so if there are queues to get in this will lead to cars sticking out in to the main road. Due to the nature of matches this is highly likely with teams and supporters arriving at the same time and exiting together.

	<p>This level of danger will only be heightened further when the Cow Roast Pub reopens and there are adjacent exits with no priority processes in place and this only enhances the blind spot even further by having others car entering and exiting alongside.</p> <p>3. The local area is an area has the status of outstanding natural beauty (AONB). The development put forward would go against this and it should continue to be protected due to its AONB status. Many people use this area to go on walks through the landscape and it has many rolling hills situated around the proposed development. The proposed site would be clearly visible and damage this natural beauty.</p> <p>4. Car parking levels underestimation and dangerous spill over. Stratstone Garage use the track road leading up to the proposed pitch already and this has led to problems already. Normal days can see a significant amount of cars already parked there. They were stopped from parking on the more suitable parking area that was built alongside BHHHC and now use this stretch of the one lane track. The levels of car parking required are far more than proposed by BHHHC. The planning application does not take the garage in to account and the increase in the number of cars that would be entering the sight. This again only heightens the level of danger entering and exiting the sight as well as the over spill of cars forced to park on the verges when there is not enough space.</p> <p>We would like Dacorum Borough Council to consider these dangers and points mentioned when considering this application. There will be extensive light and noise pollution and the proposed pitch is not going to be built in the correct location for something of its size and for the high amount of use. We have already seen from previous high-speed accidents in and around Cow Roast that the vast increase in the amount of cars entering and exiting the sight from a single track means a life changing accident is only a matter of time.</p>
<p>34 Cross Oak Road BERKHAMSTED HP4 3EH</p>	<p>Fantastic opportunity to help options for children in the community to play sports.</p>
<p>The Garden House 2A Hall Park Gate Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2NJ</p>	<p>BHHHC provide amazing hockey training for children and adults alike across the towns and this new pitch would allow for many more matches and training to take place.</p> <p>We fully support this application and feel it will really benefit the health and well-being of so many in our area.</p>
<p>20 Highfield Lane, Tyttenhanger St Albans AL4 0RQ</p>	<p>Having been a member of Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey club from 1986 to 2016 I would like to add my support to the plans to develop the Cow Roast grounds.</p> <p>I have read many comments of support and a couple of</p>

objections that although I understand these I certainly do not agree with and would like to add my support as I whole heartedly believe that this development is vital for not only the hockey but the wider sporting community.

Aside from the obvious Health benefits of encouragement and facilitation of various sporting activities would bring I would like to highlight some very important aspects that may not be so obvious.

As a young player at the club I and many others were brought up playing on grass but soon were unable to continue to play at the club grounds due to our matches having to be played on Astro turf, this in my opinion ripped the heart out of the club.

When we used to have 5 men's and three ladies teams all playing on a Saturday afternoon at the club there was a very special community feel where families could all play, stay and socialise all together. I understand times change but by having to play 'home' games in up to three different Astros in various distances from the Cow Roast this is simply not conducive to develop a successful sporting club that has so much potential. The club has done amazingly well and has punched above their weight for many years, on and off the pitch.

The amount of players that would have been attracted to play and stay at the club if the facilities upgraded should not be underestimated.

In my time at the club we lost many good players to the likes of St Albans all down to the facilities and structure that the investment in such facilities allows. Having looked at the plans I am convinced that if we had such facilities 10-15 years ago the club would be flourishing and be the hub of the sporting community for Berkhamsted, Tring and the surrounding areas. On a personal note I am sure my children would all have been playing and enjoying the sport if such facilities were in place but alas they have all plied their various sports trades away from the Cow Roast, I just hope that the decision makes sense and allow the community to unlock such amazing potential for so many sports and past times to flourish.

I'll allow more articulate people to outline the overwhelming positives and also to give evidence prove there are not any negatives to such planned development of the area, there are no health and safety issues with access and anyone who objects from an 'eyesore' view just beggars belief as this is the most hidden set of fields you can find and can only just be seen if you look hard enough from the biggest eyesore in the area which happens to be the A41 bypass.

Anyway, let's face it, this is long overdue - do the right thing - give planning permission and support the community.

<p>Broome Cottage Vicarage Road Potten End Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2RA</p>	<p>I am in favour of the hockey club having a new astroturf with fencing + floodlights</p>
<p>Orchard House 1A Barncroft Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3NL</p>	<p>I am a strong supporter of this AGP and am delighted that we are so close to gaining this obvious enhancement to our town and its people, not least because so many have worked so hard to get this far. I have played hockey all my life from childhood and I have loved being a part of Berkhamsted Hockey Club and its community spirit.</p> <p>If the club were to receive approval it would be a huge benefit to both the current members who have been patiently waiting and hoping for it to happen and also to the future of a new generation of members - the club has a thriving youth section and a hardworking and dedicated team who give so much of their time to make it happen. The very obvious current health and mental health benefits for us all should not be overlooked - surely it our duty and responsibility to finally make this happen!</p>
<p>Flat 5, Risborough House 28-30 Sycamore Road Amersham HP6 5DR</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madame</p> <p>Having lived in Berkhamsted since the age of 5 (now 30+) I have benefited from the various services and facilities Dacorum provide. However, this has been hindered greatly due to a distinct lack of quality astro turf's in the area and those that are available are not fit for purpose especially hockey in particular. Having nearly lost an eye because of playing tennis too late because there was no lighting available at the time would like to highlight the essential necessity of this part of the proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of existing services, insufficient standard/capabilities of those that do exist and even removing (eg Berkhamsted Sport Centre - even if it was wrong surface/size for hockey). 2. Society should be providing local facilities for the future generations (and everyone alike), as I feel my own experiences/potential was hindered greatly by the lack of available facilities to train at so much so that I had to commute huge distances to get to training. 3. Hockey is a sport which requires a lot of light to play so with limited time the light is available and the artificial lights only being on for a few hours at the weekend (16:00-18:00) and weekdays (19:00-21:00). 4. Currently myself and many others can't train on evenings within the borough due to the lack of available facilities. This plan

	<p>would alleviate this issue and prevent us having to leave the borough to another that better understands the needs of its constituents.</p> <p>5. Noise Pollution - you can currently hear the cars from the bypass from the clubhouse so if you weren't concerned about that and granted planning permission then I don't see why this is relevant considering the shouts from the pitch will be drowned out by the cars.</p> <p>6. Light pollution - once again I cannot understand how this can be an issue if you approved plans for the bypass. In addition to this the lights are essential as I highlighted earlier. The light pollution argument is very weak with the lack of close by residents impacted so is a mute point. As for it affecting drivers on the bypass - a precedent has been set by other already approved fully functional artificial pitches within even closer proximity to even larger main roads.</p> <p>7. Area's of outstanding beauty is a topic close to my own heart but things must evolve over time and I believe those that embrace the future whilst respecting the past achieve this the best. Dacorum is a beautiful place but also a council looking to the future and 'evolving' so finding a balance is the key. I think this proposal achieves that and as a fully qualified archaeologist believe it will also respect the past.</p> <p>Things have changed a lot over the last few months and we must not be afraid to embrace the future. When the borough is fully re-opened after Covid19 then it's important that we can build a legacy for the future of hockey within Dacorum Borough.</p>
<p>33 Stoneycroft Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RP</p>	<p>Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead hockey club has been a key part of the local community in encouraging youth and all ages to participate in sport for many years. I feel very privileged to have been a part of this huge extended family for over 35 years.</p> <p>Being able to fully utilise the facility and fantastic open space we have in such close proximity to our club house will bring together finally a vision that has been the clubs desire for many years.</p> <p>With the addition of compulsory playing of the game of hockey on astro during the 90's made the fantastic facility and grass pitches we have at the Cow Roast essentially null & void for league hockey. T</p> <p>The addition of the pitch will allow the club to finally move on and support the desire to play at a higher level and in pulling through the local youth who ultimately are and will be the lifeblood of the</p>

	<p>club moving forward.</p> <p>This will undoubtedly be a huge boost for the local area and wider community in offering hockey, not only as a fantastic participative team sport (and other sports), but also an adequate facility where first class coaching can be delivered.</p> <p>The recent addition of a astro and club house at Blueharts hockey club, Hitchin, is a fantastic recent example of the impact that this kind of facility can have on the local area. Blueharts being a very similar age club to BHHHC. I would encourage the panel to view the outcome of the above and the obvious impact that it has had for Blueharts and the wider sports community there, the facility is first class. Making this a reality for BHHHC would be simply amazing.</p>
<p>26 Nathaniel Walk Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5DG</p>	<p>Whilst I am Chairman of Tring Sports Forum please not that these are my opinions and do not necessarily reflect the views of the forum. What, I am sure everyone will agree is that it is important to support our local sports clubs in improving facilities for the local population.</p> <p>What this application if approved, will allow Berkhamsted Hockey Club to offer a multi use facility for the benefit of all local residents in a superb location that will not have an adverse impact on the environment.</p> <p>I 100% support this application.</p>
<p>19 Dukes Way Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1JP</p>	<p>This will reduce the carbon footprint of the club and allow players to cycle from surrounding villages to matches instead of driving. This will also raise the profile of the sport and allow more people to take part and stay healthy.</p>
<p>7 Wigginton Bottom Wigginton Hertfordshire HP23 6HN</p>	<p>I strongly support this application.</p> <p>I have been a member of BHHHC for 14 years and have lived locally for 30 years. This provision is long overdue in terms of providing a proper facility for members of the club.</p> <p>After challenging times when sports clubs and community groups have been unable to play together an astro-turf facility would provide a local all-weather surface for hockey players and many other sports players for Berkhamsted, Tring and local villages.</p> <p>The club and affiliated clubs allow both our youngest and oldest members of society to partake in sporting events something which is vital for the local community. Currently players are having to travel many miles to use other facilities, which is adding to carbon emissions not least reducing the club's team atmosphere. I am sure that reducing pollution is a key aim for the</p>

	council.
West Leith Barn West Leith Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6JR	<p>As a member of the Hockey Club for over 10 years and a graduated Urban and Regional Planning Student from the University of Birmingham, currently pursuing a Masters in this field, I feel I am personally connected to this cause.</p> <p>I have assessed the given application and I am extremely impressed by both its professionalism and detail.</p> <p>From personal experience I have seen the positive impact this sports club has on communities and families and the influence will be fuelled further by the availability of a home pitch. The hockey club has proven their professionalism and financial stability over recent years by creating a shared space for communities such as rugby, archery and football clubs to name a few.</p> <p>This highlights the reach of a new development not only benefitting the hockey club but also teams and businesses from the surrounding area.</p> <p>Overall, this application shows a clear plan and an understanding of the importance of regulation and conservation. Therefore, I am confident in the benefits of this application if approved.</p>
Struanlea Grantown-on-Spey PH26 3PN	I believe these facilities will enhance facilities for all ages to take part in physical activity
98 Chiltern Park Avenue Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1EY	<p>I joined BHHHC last year when I moved to the area and found it a great way to meet people and stay fit. I would like to see this club/sport invested in for the future. The club caters to all abilities and ages, which is great to see.</p> <p>There is already a grass pitch on site, and it makes sense to modernise this to allow the club to fully function to it's purpose.</p> <p>When we have home games, teams will come to the club house after the match for teas, which means there is already traffic going into the area most Saturdays.</p> <p>I joined BHHHC last year when I moved to the area and found it a great way to meet people and stay fit. I would like to see this club/sport invested in for the future. The club caters to all abilities and ages, which is great to see.</p> <p>There is already a grass pitch on site, and it makes sense to modernise this to allow the club to fully function to it's purpose.</p> <p>When we have home games, teams will come to the club house</p>

	<p>after the match for teas, which means there is already traffic going into the area most Saturdays.</p>
<p>28 Bell View St Albans AL4 0SQ</p>	<p>An AGP at BHHHC is long overdue and so needed for the town and surrounding towns and villages. I wholeheartedly support this application!</p> <p>As a Berkhamsted resident for over 30 years, a hockey player and a local PE teacher it is evident that there is a distinct lack of hockey facilities in the area despite the demand and enthusiasm for one. Whilst at Ashlyns School my family fund raised and contributed to a proposed astro due to be built in 2001 and a sport center due in 2004. These plans disappeared and the pitch was built 11 years later and therefore became a 3G pitch in collaboration with Berkhamsted Raiders. It has done wonders for the town and football in the town but obviously did not incorporate hockey. We are still in need of a hockey facility and this could have a similar impact. With the success of the GB Women's Team in London 2012 and Rio 2016 the demand for hockey is there and it has been great to see the club grow and junior system flourish in recent years.</p> <p>A local quality facility will enable more children and adults to participate in physical activity, be it hockey, or the other sport that BHHHC have encouraged and supported, and maybe other new clubs too. It would be great for the local schools to have a facility and I would willing help with school tournaments. It would enable the survival and growth of the club and stop members from having to move to other clubs to play their hockey.</p> <p>The pitch is located alongside the A41 so the impact to wildlife, noise, light pollution will be minimal and it surely makes for an ideal location in an ever expanding town and borough. Having a local facility would reduce the amount of travel for hockey players to the current venues used and thus help the environment (especially visiting teams driving from the East region via Berkhamsted to Halton/Aylesbury - taking at least 20-30min of drive time off everyone's journeys).</p> <p>An AGP at BHHHC is long overdue and so needed for the town and surrounding towns and villages. I wholeheartedly support this application!</p> <p>As a Berkhamsted resident for over 30 years, a hockey player and a local PE teacher it is evident that there is a distinct lack of hockey facilities in the area despite the demand and enthusiasm for one. Whilst at Ashlyns School my family fund raised and contributed to a proposed astro due to be built in 2001 and a sport center due in 2004. These plans disappeared and the pitch was built 11 years later and therefore became a 3G pitch in</p>

	<p>collaboration with Berkhamsted Raiders. It has done wonders for the town and football in the town but obviously did not incorporate hockey. We are still in need of a hockey facility and this could have a similar impact. With the success of the GB Women's Team in London 2012 and Rio 2016 the demand for hockey is there and it has been great to see the club grow and junior system flourish in recent years.</p> <p>A local quality facility will enable more children and adults to participate in physical activity, be it hockey, or the other sport that BHHHC have encouraged and supported, and maybe other new clubs too. It would be great for the local schools to have a facility and I would willing help with school tournaments. It would enable the survival and growth of the club and stop members from having to move to other clubs to play their hockey.</p> <p>The pitch is located alongside the A41 so the impact to wildlife, noise, light pollution will be minimal and it surely makes for an ideal location in an ever expanding town and borough. Having a local facility would reduce the amount of travel for hockey players to the current venues used and thus help the environment (especially visiting teams driving from the East region via Berkhamsted to Halton/Aylesbury - taking at least 20-30min of drive time off everyone's journeys).</p>
<p>27 Covert Road Northchurch Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3RS</p>	<p>I would like to support this application for the addition of a multi-sports pitch in our community, which is well-overdue. As parent to 2 teenagers who are keen hockey players, we have to travel out of Dacorum each week for them to access training and matches for their age as there has been no opportunity for that to be provided locally in an affordable way for hockey clubs.</p> <p>As a hockey player myself, the continued absence of local facilities and the uncertainty surrounding the longterm future availability of 2 of the existing pitches we use (RAF Halton, Tring School) poses a real and immediate threat to ongoing hockey in the area and could see clubs close down. The prospect of having to drive to next closest clubs at Aylesbury or Watford in order to continue to play my chosen sport would be disappointing and not economically viable. I have only been a member at Berkhamsted Hockey Club for 4 years, as with many local community sport clubs, it has a longstanding sense of community and support for its members which is at significant risk should there cease to be playing pitches in the area that we can use. Having access to a pitch surface which complies with England Hockey league rules for playing competitive matches on is much needed - I have seen no proposals within Dacorum Borough Council's ongoing sports development plans to provide multi-sport pitches; here we have a</p>

local sports club, run by volunteer members who willing to provide and manage such a facility on their own land, available in the community and for the community - in my view this should be supported. The benefits to large numbers of the local population are overwhelming.

This is not just about a hockey pitch for a hockey club: In my role as involved in the local Scout movement I have previously been approached to enquire whether we could provide hockey taster-sessions to the local Cub and Scout group - I have had to decline, given that we would have needed to privately hire a pitch outside Berkhamsted, the cost and logistics of which made that impossible: access to a local multi-sport facility could mean groups of children who have never had the opportunity to experience hockey could do so in their own town. Similarly, I have run a hockey-club at local primary school for a group of 20 children: across Dacorum we ran inter-school matches, and took a team to represent Dacorum at the Herts School Games (hosted at Oaklands College). None of the other local Dacorum primary schools had access to a suitable playing surface either - we had to play on a tarmac playgrounds which limited the scope of what we could achieve: I am sure that had a facility as proposed in this application would have been beneficial in both these scenarios, and provided our local community children with opportunities they have not experienced, not just for hockey but other sports too.

The Cow Roast site would provide an opportunity for the community to broaden its range of sports provision.

In terms of the proposed location of the pitch on site, it is farthest away from the main residential area of Cow Roast, and any light-spill is bound to be minuscule in comparison to the floodlighting at the car garage which is visible from the approach road at Tring! I support the proposed siting of the pitch on Club land - the pitch would be further away from the main row of Cow Roast houses than the existing car garage, difficult to see how any pitch lights would even be visible to residents when taking into account the tree-lined lane.

In terms of traffic to site: whilst matches are currently played at other locations, the players already return to the clubhouse for 'teas' after each game, therefore the number and flow of vehicles to site on match days is unlikely to be greater than at present.

I urge the Committee to approve this planning application.

I would like to support this application for the addition of a multi-sports pitch in our community, which is well-overdue.

As parent to 2 teenagers who are keen hockey players, we have to travel out of Dacorum each week for them to access training and matches for their age as there has been no opportunity for that to be provided locally in an affordable way for hockey clubs.

As a hockey player myself, the continued absence of local facilities and the uncertainty surrounding the longterm future availability of 2 of the existing pitches we use (RAF Halton, Tring School) poses a real and immediate threat to ongoing hockey in the area and could see clubs close down. The prospect of having to drive to next closest clubs at Aylesbury or Watford in order to continue to play my chosen sport would be disappointing and not economically viable. I have only been a member at Berkhamsted Hockey Club for 4 years, as with many local community sport clubs, it has a longstanding sense of community and support for its members which is at significant risk should there cease to be playing pitches in the area that we can use. Having access to a pitch surface which complies with England Hockey league rules for playing competitive matches on is much needed - I have seen no proposals within Dacorum Borough Council's ongoing sports development plans to provide multi-sport pitches; here we have a local sports club, run by volunteer members who willing to provide and manage such a facility on their own land, available in the community and for the community - in my view this should be supported. The benefits to large numbers of the local population are overwhelming.

This is not just about a hockey pitch for a hockey club: In my role as involved in the local Scout movement I have previously been approached ot enquire whether we could provide hockey taster-sessions to the local Cub and Scout group - I have had to decline, given that we would have needed to privately hire a pitch outside Berkhamsted, the cost and logistics of which made that impossible: access to a local multi-sport facility could mean groups of children who have never had the opportunity to experience hockey could do so in their own town. Similarly, I have run a hockey-club at local primary school for a group of 20 children: across Dacorum we ran inter-school matches, and took a team to represent Dacorum at the Herts School Games (hosted at Oaklands College). None of the other local Dacorum primary schools had access to a suitable playing surface either - we had to play on a tarmac playgrounds which limited the scope of what we could achieve: I am sure that had a facility as proposed in this application would have been beneficial in both theses scenarios, and provided our local community children with opportunities they have not experienced, not just for hockey but other sports too.

The Cow Roast site would provide an opportunity for the community to broaden its range of sports provision.

In terms of the proposed location of the pitch on site, it is farthest away from the main residential area of Cow Roast, and any light-spill is bound to be minuscule in comparison to the floodlighting at the car garage which is visible from the approach road at Tring! I support the proposed siting of the pitch on Club land - the pitch would be further away from the main row of Cow Roast houses than the existing car garage, difficult to see how

	<p>any pitch lights would even be visible to residents when taking into account the tree-lined lane.</p> <p>In terms of traffic to site: whilst matches are currently played at other locations, the players already return to the clubhouse for 'teas' after each game, therefore the number and flow of vehicles to site on match days is unlikely to be greater than at present.</p> <p>I urge the Committee to approve this planning application.</p>
<p>225 Chambersbury Lane Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8BQ</p>	<p>I fully support this application for a long overdue astroturf pitch at the cow roast. The lack of suitable pitches in the area has been well documented by others so no need to repeat their comments.</p> <p>The club is situated in an ideal location and the arrival of an astro would enhance the facilities, plus giving schools etc a safe environment to play sport.</p>
<p>West Leith Barn West Leith Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6JR</p>	<p>I have lived for over 20 years in Tring and have increasing concern. By the lack of sports facilities available to the community and its wider areas.</p> <p>The Berko hockey club in cowroast is an ideal venue to help improve sports facilities in the area and to the villages of Wiggington/Aldbury/Berkhamsted/cowroast /Tring with easy access for away teams . Sport we have seen is so important to the mental health of all ages and we must take up opportunities to improve our communities to enhance our wellbeing and therefore I wholly support the application for this multi games area.</p>
<p>FALDO FARM FALDO ROAD Barton le Clay MK45 4RF</p>	<p>I am President of Southgate Hockey Club in North London and we as a club wish to support Berkhamstead Hockey Club in its application for Artificial Pitch at its own premise.</p> <p>Hockey is still a growing sport with noticeable increasing participation and undoubtedly the 2 Artificial surfaces at our own premise have dramatically improved the Playing experience all through our club. Demonstrably leading to increased numbers of Juniors on a Sunday, then leading to parents coming back to Hockey and allowing Veterans continuing to play well into their 60;s and some beyond. Without the artificial pitches alongside our Clubhouse we could not cater for all these growth areas.</p> <p>We are also much more of a family club after 20 years of pitches adjacent our own Clubhouse. We can offer excellent facilities for spectators and families watching and camaraderie to all visiting teams.</p> <p>Having played over many years verses Berkhamstead and Tring Hockey Clubs I look forward to the day when we do not have to travel to a School pitch or RAF facility, to play our matches with modest or no changing facilities. As often happens many players arrive changed, play the game and then disappear immediately after the match and do not join in with the very important social and administrative side of Hockey.</p>

	<p>I have no doubt having an Artificial quality Hockey Pitch at the Club will be rewarding in many ways</p> <p>President Southgate Hockey Club</p>
<p>15 Meadow Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1EA</p>	<p>I have been a local resident for over 70 years. As a parent of a hockey player, and ex player myself, I fully endorse the need for an AGP in Berkhamsted. There is a definite demand for this facility which would benefit schools and individuals as there is currently no full size Astro in Berkhamsted. Schools encourage children to play hockey and join local clubs. The success of the Olympic team inspired even more people to take up the sport. Lockdown has emphasised the importance of exercising and socialising. An AGP would eliminate the need for teams having to travel further afield to enable them to play on a pitch that meets league regulations. Visiting teams are also affected as it means extra time and mileage incurred each time BHHHC have a 'home game. Ten years ago my daughter had to switch clubs in order to play to the pitch standards set at her level. This meant travelling a total of 26 miles, several times a week, for training and games as opposed to only four miles. This extra travelling is detrimental to the environment, more so at a time when we are all being urged to do our bit. I believe, despite being in an AONB, it is in a tucked away position and backing on to the A41 bypass therefore is not intrusive.</p>

<p>Cherry Tree Tring Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RF</p>	<p>Whilst not in opposition to the planned area, as a resident I would like to comment about the access. The dirt track leading to the hockey club is very busy most days already (before the lockdown) and the entrance on the main road is not wide enough for two cars. This results in cars having to stop on the busy main road and is becoming increasingly dangerous for cars coming in and out of that entrance. Also, although I myself do not use the dirt track that often, I worry for my neighbours who live in the two bungalows who cannot access their homes from the main road and would suffer from the increase in traffic the new development will undoubtedly cause.</p> <p>I would suggest that improvements to the entrance needs to be included in the planning.</p>
<p>20 Cow Roast Tring Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RF</p>	<p>As the Council is well aware, the application is for development in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which must be preserved for the benefit of current and future generations and thus changes must be handled with sensitivity toward the AONB environment.</p> <p>Whilst we have not yet been able to read all of the copious documentation, we make the following observations:-</p> <p>1. We are concerned about the height of the 27 lighting poles (15.2 metres or 49 foot high). This will exceed the general height of the surrounding woodland and thus be visible, more so when in operation. Light pollution is an increasing problem in the countryside and should be avoided.</p> <p>2. Hours of operation are stated to be between the hours of 10:00 and 22:00 Monday to Saturday and 10:00 and 21:00 on Sunday. BHHHC' supporting documentation indicates lighting would be operational from 15:30 (or dusk) in summer or for the full period in winter. to the final time indicated. This is not to be desired in an AONB.</p> <p>3a. 23 of the lighting heads will consume 1170 Watts (total 22.28Kw) while 4 will be rated at 900 Watts (total 8.19Kw). The documentation shows that will consume altogether 30.47Kw while in operation which might have an impact on the relatively unreliable power supply to the Cow Roast community. It is assumed that the proposed lighting will have power factor correction and therefore not affect the efficiency of the local distribution transformer. Since the lighting would mostly be used in the colder time of year there may be an impact on the supply circuits. As yet we see no comments from UK Power Networks who maintain the district power.</p> <p>3b. With HM Government policy to eliminate fossil fuel</p>

transportation by 2050 and sale of fossil fuelled vehicles by 2035, there will be an increased demand for vehicle charging in Cow Roast, particularly at night. we do not know if the additional 30.47Kw electrical load on the 11Kv distribution system imposed by the proposed lighting will be sustainable with the existing infrastructure.

4. We note the designed light output (according to document 20_01235_MFA-4_LIGHTING_STRATEGY_-_MUSCO_ISOGR_AMS-1080095.pdf) will be 136,000 plus 89,600 lumens (total 225,600 lumens) at a colour temperature of 5,700Kelvin. This translates to 282 Cool White 800 lumen domestic light bulbs. We note that BHHHC's supporting documentation indicates that lighting would have a colour temperature of 3000Kelvin (which is at variance with other supporting documentation) to mitigate effects on the bat population.

5. It is not certain what effect the proposed AGP and lighting will have on the local wildlife. There is considerable nocturnal animal life and the lighting is certain to have an effect on the avian population. The area of the AGP will reduce the insect and earthworm population and may affect the food chain for larger mammals and birds.

6. It is stated that the AGP and lighting will reduce carbon emissions by reducing travel to playing fields elsewhere. However, there would be a significant increase in carbon emissions in Cow Roast, at least in the short to medium term (see point 3b above), as well as a substantial increase of traffic by players and spectators on the associated Byway Open to All Traffic. This is confirmed by the need to increase parking facilities as described in the documentation.

7. According to carbonindependent.org the carbon factor per Kwh is 0.277Kge (2019 figure). Thus the additional indirect carbon emissions for the lighting will be 8.4Kg for every hour of use, though we recognise this will reduce in time and in line with HM Government policy.

8. We noticed the following quote from BHHHC's documentation:-

"Occupants of Properties on the A4251. These properties will be at minimum 500m away from the closest fixture that would provide any glare. Again, with the glare angle of the lighting fixture, the occupants will not be able to see the light source directly. Further there is extensive woodland between the proposed site for the AGP which minimizes the risk even further."

	<p>We note the comment but suggest that some properties can directly see the field in question and the argument that trees will shield the lighting is not valid in winter, when lighting would be most used, as the trees will have shed their leaves. The quote above indicates that the lighting will be seen indirectly by residents.</p> <p>We therefore ask Dacorum Borough Council to consider these points when deciding whether to grant permission for the applicant to proceed.</p>
<p>St Helia Tring Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RF</p>	<p>My family are writing to OBJECT to the planning application (Ref 20/01235/MFA)</p> <p>Our objections to this application are based on both general and local site-specific concerns;</p> <p>Our general concerns are that the application proposals represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt that conflict with requirements in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and there are no "very special circumstances" to warrant setting aside Green Belt development restraint policies to justify this development and intensification of use. Furthermore, the proposals conflict with the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) insofar as this application relates to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty where the key aims of the CROW Act is to protect the land (in an AONB) and to conserve and enhance its natural beauty.</p> <p>Our local site specific reasons for objecting are that the proposed development includes installation of flood lights within this visually sensitive AONB location, and that the proposals will create noise and disturbance to surrounding residents, together with the lack of provision of adequate carparking without the inevitable creation of additional substantial hardstanding, that will involve development for parking upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument together with a significant increase in the number of motor vehicles using a Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT No 10) and the dangerous highways access from the BOAT onto the busy A4251 where historically there have been a number of road traffic accidents.</p> <p>We will explain these points further as follows; Green Belt - These proposals represent "Inappropriate Development" as defined in the NPPF where paragraph 143 of NPPF states that, "Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances" . Whilst outdoor sport and recreation can be appropriate, paragraph 145 (g) specifies that development in the Green Belt should "... not have a greater</p>

impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development" . We contend that the application will incorporate formal artificial surfaces on the land which together with the proposed floodlighting, fencing and formalised parking areas will create an unnatural prominent feature that will impact on the "openness" of the area and as such should therefore be refused consent.

AONB - Likewise it is difficult to see how the development of artificial playing fields with their formalised appearance combined with the artificial floodlighting (see later comments) can in any way be regarded as contributing to "conserving or enhancing" the natural beauty of the area.

Floodlighting - the application states that the current halogen lighting will be replaced with LED. The current floodlights are recent additions to the field, are mobile, not fixed, not very high and are only used occasionally. Even so some of this lighting has been clearly visible from our property in the winter when the trees have lost their leaves. The site is visually sensitive and can be seen from various well-trodden public footpaths from the surrounding hills. The installation of high, permanent floodlights will be an intrusion in the otherwise unlit rural outlook the rear of our property enjoys and will be clearly visible from surrounding footpaths. This light pollution will only be increased by the number of vehicle lights in the winter months using the otherwise unlit BOAT No 10. Please note there is only one streetlight on the A4251 in Cow Roast.

Availability of Parking - Within the application documents the aerial photograph of the site shows two blue areas together with other areas of parking on the second field adjoining the line of houses. However, the application does not indicate that the blue areas would be the only areas used for car parking. The second field is not only AONB, Green Belt but also a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

Only a small portion of these blue areas are currently hardstanding car parking facilities.

The area behind the clubhouse is rough grass and used for storage of paraphernalia associated with the hockey club and for the burning of rubbish. It is not currently used for car parking. This area could not be used as an all-weather, daily use car parking facility unless a hard surface is created.

There is an area indicated as car parking which is actually shown to be on the playing field itself. Whereas this has very occasionally been the case it is hardly suitable for all year round, high usage car parking without replacing the grass with some form of hardstanding which surely would require planning permission/a change of use application?

The car park is often already in use early evenings by the people

attending the dance club held at the clubhouse, thereby reducing the number of spaces available to support the proposed application. As such the application represents a significant intensification of use that will have adverse effects upon local residents nearby.

Areas of parked cars are shown in two areas in the second field closest to the houses. There is an area of parking evident in the photograph at the top of the second field. This field is not only Green Belt, AONB but forms part of the Scheduled Ancient Monument area. This rough car park was recently created by unlawful development within the Scheduled Ancient Monument area for lease by BHHHC to Specialist Cars, Tring (BMW & Mini) for parking. However, I have had sight of an email from Dacorum Borough Council Enforcement Team that appears to confirm that car parking should not be taking place at this development and that Historic England have responded and in communication with BHHHC.

Extract from the email - " I can confirm that on the 16th May 2019, Historic England sent communication to the owners of the land, advising them of the next required steps. This includes remediation works to remove the stakes, with trial pits to be excavated around the site to ensure that the stakes have not already impacted any archaeological remains. The trial pits will enable HE and the owner to assess where the archaeological horizon is and determine whether the stakes have penetrated this. If they have, then further measures will have to be implemented - including archaeological recording.

It is understood that the parking of cars on the area has now ceased and that a new planning application may be forthcoming. HE have made it clear that the removal of the posts needs to take place before any submission of an application"

No remediation works have been done.

The area of parking closest to the houses adjacent to BOAT No 10 is an unmade area of land belonging the BHHHC. This has always been used for parking for weekend football matches during the season for a few hours Saturday and Sunday. However, following the "closure" of the "car park" Specialist Cars have simply moved their parking further below on land belonging to BHHHC adjacent to BOAT No 10. This involves 30 cars or more 6 days a week from 8am until 5/6pm (pre Covid 19). Again, this is Scheduled Ancient Monument land and the boundary between the BOAT and the edge of the playing field is being eroded away as more unsuitable materials are being used to make the area more suitable for car parking. If BHHHC need to rely on this and any other area on this field for car parking use on a daily basis then surely a change of use/planning application

needs to be considered.

Neither area shown in the field closest to the houses are suitable for regular, prolonged, all year-round car parking without hardstanding. Being Scheduled Ancient Monument, Green Belt and AONB permission for the development of a permanent car parking area is highly unlikely to be granted.

BOAT No 10.

Access to the proposed facility is via BOAT No 10 - a single track, unsurfaced highway that whilst capable of being used by motorised vehicles is primarily intended for use by pedestrians cyclists and horse riders. No other means of access is available to BHHHC.

Section 66(1) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 defines a byway open to all traffic ("BOAT") as: "a highway over which the public have a right of way for vehicular and all other kinds of traffic, but which is used by the public mainly for the purpose for which footpaths and bridleways are so used". Additional heavy use of BOAT No 10 would deter from its primary use.

BHHHC (and Specialist Cars) have attempted to resurface/repair BOAT No 10 on several occasions with use of inappropriate materials within the AONB such as road plainings and concrete posts. The proposed huge increase of traffic flow can only lead to a (further) massive degradation of the BOAT and result in further attempts to resurface/repair, which again is inappropriate development within the AONB also bearing in mind BOAT No 10 runs through Scheduled Ancient Monument land

HIGHWAYS / SAFETY: -

BOAT No 10's single track leads to the A4251. This junction is proved to be extremely dangerous and hazardous and is on a blind bend with very limited visibility either entering or exiting BOAT No 10. The application implies usage of the proposed facilities by other clubs and schools. Schools would require minibuses or coaches to travel to the facility. BOAT No 10 & its junction with the A4251 is totally unsuitable for this kind of traffic.

There is a private access track off BOAT No 10 to the rear of the houses and garages. For the first two properties, this is there only access to their property. The junction of this private track with BOAT No 10 is completely blind on exit and thereby the huge increase in vehicle movements would significantly increase the risk of accidents. The private track and vehicles exiting it are not visible to vehicles going up the BOAT.

The application discusses in length the provision of parking and the number of vehicles they can accommodate; however, we

have not seen any estimates of vehicle movements expected on a daily basis on BOAT No 10. If BHHHC are stating they can accommodate approximately 90 cars this could give rise to the potential movements of 90 vehicles several times per day, all using BOAT No 10, a Byway Open to All Traffic with a use primarily for walkers and riders. Without changing the status of BOAT No 10, proper road surfacing as well as changing the road lay out on the A4251 to accommodate this volume of vehicles, we fail to see how the proposed use of the BOAT is either viable or acceptable in terms of highway safety.

The Hockey Club could also be accessed via Bottom House Lane, however this stretch of BOAT No 10 rarely used by vehicles and remains a narrow single, unsurfaced, rural track used mainly by walkers and ramblers. It too would therefore be an inappropriate access causing significant disturbance to the residents in Tinkers Lodge.

I would like to draw your attention the Secretary Of State's Decision letter dated 5th March 2003 (Ref APP/A1910/A/02/1094452, APP/A/1919/C/02/1086492:1086497 & 1086503) in response to an application for a small Gypsy site in the location immediately behind the proposed artificial pitch accessed via BOAT No 10 and in particular to the Inspectors Conclusions paragraphs 141 - 145 describing the unsuitability of BOAT No 10 for increased volumes of traffic, the hazardous junction with the A4251 and how any improvements to the BOAT to ease the movement of traffic would be undesirable and contrary to the status of a BOAT. This decision was upheld by the Secretary of State and remains as relevant today as then. As there is no way of attaching a copy of this to these comments I will recite the relevant paragraphs below:

"141. Turning now to the third issue, there are two main aspects to consider i.e. the use of BOAT No 10, and the suitability of the connections between this route and the public highway network.

142. With regard to the first point, as has been stated by the responsible highway authority and others, the function of a BOAT within the hierarchy of transportation routes is principally for the purposes of a footpath or bridleway. BOAT No 10 is not in my opinion constructed in such a form in engineering terms as to be suitable to cater for the movement of very much vehicular traffic. Nor due to its restrictive width, unsatisfactory alignment and unmade surface would this driveway constitute a satisfactory means of access to the appeal site, especially given the considerable number of traffic movements likely to be involved, estimated at around 70 per day or more, which could well include not only private cars but also larger vehicles and commercial

traffic. So in all these respects it seems to that to allow a gypsy caravan site to become established in this particular position and especially of this size and type, would be likely to lead to an excessive use of BOAT No 10 in traffic terms. This would be quite inconsistent with its main role and could well give rise to further degradation. It would also be likely to result in conflict with other uses of this route who could legitimately feel that their passage either on foot or as equestrians should have priority. Consequently for all these reasons I would consider that BOAT No 10 is not an appropriate nor satisfactory route to serve this particular development. Nor would it be desirable to undertake any improvements in this respect so as to ease the movement of motorised traffic, since to do so would be contrary to the status of a BOAT, quite apart from the adverse effects in terms of amenity to which I will return later below.

143. As to matters of road safety, traffic generated from the appeal property would need to use the public highway network either to the west or east of this site. To the west the junction between BOAT No 10 and Bottom House Lane has poor visibility, at least in a northerly direction. Bottom House Lane itself is narrow with less than ideal alignment and no footpaths. The junction to the north where it joins the main A421 (via Hemp Lane) is also substandard. Bearing these points in mind I would find this route to and from the appeal site to be less than ideal and potentially hazardous, especially given the volume and type of traffic which could result from the envisaged occupancy of the appeal premises by up to 10 separate family units. Accordingly notwithstanding the representations made on behalf of the appellants in this connection, I would not regard the use of this route to be likely to be safe nor acceptable in highway terms. To the contrary it should be described as deficient to cater for the additional vehicle movements which in all probability would be generated and hence prejudicial to highway safety.

144. The route to and from the east would involve negotiating a considerable length of BOAT No 10, with consequential drawbacks in that regard as set out in paragraph 142 above. There would then be a need to utilise the junction between the BOAT and the busy main A4251. Having driven in and out of this junction for myself, I can well understand the reservations expressed by the Highway Authority and many local people in this regard, due to its position on the inside of a bend and next to the car-park serving the Cow Roast Public House, the very confined dimensions which are involved, and the sub-standard visibility which is available in all directions. In these circumstances I can fully appreciate that the use of this junction should be minimised as far as possible in the interests of road safety. Consequently it would not in my view be appropriate to agree to the development which is involved here, since to do so

	<p>would in all likelihood result in additional manoeuvres occurring at this location in significant numbers on a regular basis, which would not be safe nor satisfactory. Thus on these grounds also, which represent clear conflict with important policy intentions as contained for example in Policies 22 and 29 of the Structure Plan, and Policy 8 in the Borough Local Plan, this means of access to the appeal site should not be accepted either.</p> <p>145. I conclude that so far as the third issue is concerned further important reasons can be added to support and reinforce the analysis set out previously above to the effect that planning permission should not be granted."</p> <p>GENERAL AMENITY: - The application appears clear in its commercial intentions. To provide wider sporting facilities all day and evening, 7 days per week, not only for BHHHC but for numerous other clubs and schools within the wider community. We fail to see how this is appropriate in terms of amenity to existing residents nearby let alone within the Green Belt, AONB and when a Scheduled Ancient Monument will be adversely affected. The National Planning Policy Framework states "Development should only be granted in "very special circumstances"." It is hard to see how the proposed unnatural artificial features such a pitches, artificial lighting, huge additional traffic movement on a Byway Open to All Traffic together with car parking for approximately 90 vehicles, for use by BHHHC , a wider range of clubs and schools, 10/12 hours per day, 7 days a week could be regarded as acceptable.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that sport and outdoor recreation is to be encouraged, it is impossible to see how such a general objective that could be fulfilled elsewhere could outweigh the harm both in terms of national policy and local amenity. In this regard we fail to see any very special circumstances for this application can be justified and the application should therefore NOT be approved.</p>
<p>Chiltern House Tring Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RF</p>	<p>Planning Application DBC 20/01235/MFA Installation of Artificial Grass Pitch and Lighting at Cow Roast by Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club (BHHHC)</p> <p>We would like to object to the above application on the following grounds</p> <p>1. Inappropriate and damaging development in an AONB. The proposed development would damage the natural beauty of the area which should be protected due to its AONB status. The size of the fencing and light poles means it will be visible from the land and footpaths around the area. The sweeping views are a key part of the beauty of the area and due to the rolling nature of the landscape some of the near-by footpaths are on high ground and will have clear sight of the fencing and poles. Walking and enjoying the AONB is a recreational pastime and this</p>

development would reduce this important amenity for large numbers of people. A large number of letters of support have been provided for the application but I am concerned that the applicants did not explain to these organisations that this is and AONB.

2. Extensive light pollution and light disturbance. The strong lighting and the long hours of operation will result in extensive light pollution which will be damaging to wildlife. We have bats and red kites living in the area which will be significantly disturbed. The poles described in the application are higher than the trees that only partially surround the proposed pitch. Also, these trees will not act as a screen in the winter as they will lose their leaves. Light is multi directional and hence, direct line of sight is not the relevant criteria for disturbance. As residents we will have strong lights disturbance for up to 6.5 hours per day from the proposed development. It is disingenuous for the applicants to claim that trees will screen the lights and only direct vision is important.

3. Dangerous exit and entry junction with the A4251. The documents estimate up to 90 cars arriving at the new development via the single lane BOAT. The planning application failed to mention the approximately 40 cars parked every weekday and some on Saturdays on the BOAT by Stratstone Garage. Hence well over 100 cars per day could be arriving and leaving from the single lane entrance/exit to the BOAT. The end of one match and start of the next will see a lot of cars leave at the same time while others are arriving, which already happens with the football matches held at Cow Roast. This causes traffic to back up on the A4251 outside the pub, waiting for cars to exit the BOAT before others can turn in. This is a blind corner. Despite a 40mph speed restriction traffic regularly comes round this corner and through Cow Roast in excess of 60mph including emergency vehicles. Speed measurements were made by Hertfordshire CC about 10 years ago when the residents asked for traffic calming measures. The CC acknowledged these excessive speeds but said that they were 'expected on a road of this type' and refused any calming. Traffic standing at the blind corner would present a significant danger to life. Even without standing traffic, pulling out from the BOAT is very dangerous because of the lack of sight due to the blind corner. It is not safe to increase the amount of cars pulling out from this junction to over 100 per day. The stretch of road through Cow Roast has seen multiple accidents and standing traffic waiting to turn into the BOAT or more cars pulling out on the blind corner will result in serious accidents.

4. Under estimation of car parking levels. As noted above, Stratstone Garage use the BOAT as part of their commercial operations to store cars arriving for servicing. Normal days see about 40 cars parked from 8am to 6pm. Since they have been stopped from parking on the car park that was built in collaboration with BHHHC and, we understand without planning

permission, they park the length of the BOAT. Hence the levels and locations of car parking included in the planning application are inadequate as they ignore this. This parking on the BOAT restricts its width and will exacerbate the entry and exit problems discussed in point 2 above.

We would ask Dacorum Borough Council to consider these points when considering this application.

Supporting sporting activities are important but this is the wrong location for such an intrusive and highly used facility.

Planning Application DBC 20/01235/MFA Installation of Artificial Grass Pitch and Lighting at Cow Roast by Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club (BHHHC)

We would like to object to the above application on the following grounds

1. Inappropriate and damaging development in an AONB. The proposed development would damage the natural beauty of the area which should be protected due to its AONB status. The size of the fencing and light poles means it will be visible from the land and footpaths around the area. The sweeping views are a key part of the beauty of the area and due to the rolling nature of the landscape some of the near-by footpaths are on high ground and will have clear sight of the fencing and poles. Walking and enjoying the AONB is a recreational pastime and this development would reduce this important amenity for large numbers of people. A large number of letters of support have been provided for the application but I am concerned that the applicants did not explain to these organisations that this is an AONB.

2. Extensive light pollution and light disturbance. The strong lighting and the long hours of operation will result in extensive light pollution which will be damaging to wildlife. We have bats and red kites living in the area which will be significantly disturbed. The poles described in the application are higher than the trees that only partially surround the proposed pitch. Also, these trees will not act as a screen in the winter as they will lose their leaves. Light is multi directional and hence, direct line of sight is not the relevant criteria for disturbance. As residents we will have strong light disturbance for up to 6.5 hours per day from the proposed development. It is disingenuous for the applicants to claim that trees will screen the lights and only direct vision is important.

3. Dangerous exit and entry junction with the A4251. The documents estimate up to 90 cars arriving at the new development via the single lane BOAT. The planning application failed to mention the approximately 40 cars parked every weekday and some on Saturdays on the BOAT by Stratstone Garage. Hence well over 100 cars per day could be arriving and leaving from the single lane entrance/exit to the BOAT. The end of one match and start of the next will see a lot of cars leave at the

same time while others are arriving, which already happens with the football matches held at Cow Roast. This causes traffic to back up on the A4251 outside the pub, waiting for cars to exit the BOAT before others can turn in. This is a blind corner. Despite a 40mph speed restriction traffic regularly comes round this corner and through Cow Roast in excess of 60mph including emergency vehicles. Speed measurements were made by Hertfordshire CC about 10 years ago when the residents asked for traffic calming measures. The CC acknowledged these excessive speeds but said that they were 'expected on a road of this type' and refused any calming. Traffic standing at the blind corner would present a significant danger to life. Even without standing traffic, pulling out from the BOAT is very dangerous because of the lack of sight due to the blind corner. It is not safe to increase the amount of cars pulling out from this junction to over 100 per day. The stretch of road through Cow Roast has seen multiple accidents and standing traffic waiting to turn into the BOAT or more cars pulling out on the blind corner will result in serious accidents.

4. Under estimation of car parking levels. As noted above, Stratstone Garage use the BOAT as part of their commercial operations to store cars arriving for servicing. Normal days see about 40 cars parked from 8am to 6pm. Since they have been stopped from parking on the car park that was built in collaboration with BHHHC and, we understand without planning permission, they park the length of the BOAT. Hence the levels and locations of car parking included in the planning application are inadequate as they ignore this. This parking on the BOAT restricts its width and will exacerbate the entry and exit problems discussed in point 2 above.

We would ask Dacorum Borough Council to consider these points when considering this application.

Supporting sporting activities are important but this is the wrong location for such an intrusive and highly used facility.

Planning Application DBC 20/01235/MFA Installation of Artificial Grass Pitch and Lighting at Cow Roast by Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club (BHHHC)

I provided comments on the above application in June 2020. On 22nd September, I received a letter asking for comments on the same application. No explanation of changes or why we were being asked to comment again was provided. I have contacted the planning officer, Mr Gibbs, on multiple occasions for an explanation but he has not returned my calls.

My comments remain the same as they were in June 2020 (shown below).

Additional comments - October 2020

I notice that Hertfordshire Highways commented on the proposal on June 17th 2020. While they have made a statement about the

existence of a junction with Tring Road (it is usually called London Road) - they have made no mention of the nature of this junction and have made no comment on the safety of a fast road/single track intersection. I am concerned that they have not visited the site and/or do not have local knowledge. As I set out in my June 2020 comments, the junction is approached via a blind corner. Traffic is travelling at 40mph or much higher and will not be able to see stationary traffic waiting to pull into the single track road to the site. A few years ago a car crashed through a resident's fence at this very spot because of the high speed it was travelling around the blind corner. Further accidents will occur at this spot - and they may well involve children being taken to play hockey on the proposed pitch. I would ask the planners and the hockey club to demonstrate attention to the safety of children and others using this planned pitch and other road users - and clearly understand and address the very serious road safety concerns this application raises.

Comments submitted in June 2020

We would like to object to the above application on the following grounds

1. Inappropriate and damaging development in an AONB. The proposed development would damage the natural beauty of the area which should be protected due to its AONB status. The size of the fencing and light poles means it will be visible from the land and footpaths around the area. The sweeping views are a key part of the beauty of the area and due to the rolling nature of the landscape some of the near-by footpaths are on high ground and will have clear sight of the fencing and poles. Walking and enjoying the AONB is a recreational pastime and this development would reduce this important amenity for large numbers of people. A large number of letters of support have been provided for the application but I am concerned that the applicants did not explain to these organisations that this is an AONB.

2. Extensive light pollution and light disturbance. The strong lighting and the long hours of operation will result in extensive light pollution which will be damaging to wildlife. We have bats and red kites living in the area which will be significantly disturbed. The poles described in the application are higher than the trees that only partially surround the proposed pitch. Also, these trees will not act as a screen in the winter as they will lose their leaves. Light is multi directional and hence, direct line of sight is not the relevant criteria for disturbance. As residents we will have strong light disturbance for up to 6.5 hours per day from the proposed development. It is disingenuous for the applicants to claim that trees will screen the lights and only direct vision is important.

3. Dangerous exit and entry junction with the A4251. The documents estimate up to 90 cars arriving at the new

development via the single lane BOAT. The planning application failed to mention the approximately 40 cars parked every weekday and some on Saturdays on the BOAT by Stratstone Garage. Hence well over 100 cars per day could be arriving and leaving from the single lane entrance/exit to the BOAT. The end of one match and start of the next will see a lot of cars leave at the same time while others are arriving, which already happens with the football matches held at Cow Roast. This causes traffic to back up on the A4251 outside the pub, waiting for cars to exit the BOAT before others can turn in. This is a blind corner. Despite a 40mph speed restriction traffic regularly comes round this corner and through Cow Roast in excess of 60mph including emergency vehicles. Speed measurements were made by Hertfordshire CC about 10 years ago when the residents asked for traffic calming measures. The CC acknowledged these excessive speeds but said that they were 'expected on a road of this type' and refused any calming. Traffic standing at the blind corner would present a significant danger to life. Even without standing traffic, pulling out from the BOAT is very dangerous because of the lack of sight due to the blind corner. It is not safe to increase the amount of cars pulling out from this junction to over 100 per day. The stretch of road through Cow Roast has seen multiple accidents and standing traffic waiting to turn into the BOAT or more cars pulling out on the blind corner will result in serious accidents. If and when the pub reopens or this building is redeveloped there will be two adjacent exit/entry points with no priority markings further complicating and slowing this dangerous section of road.

4. Under estimation of car parking levels. As noted above, Stratstone Garage use the BOAT as part of their commercial operations to store cars arriving for servicing. Normal days see about 40 cars parked from 8am to 6pm. Since they have been stopped from parking on the car park that was built in collaboration with BHHHC and, we understand without planning permission, they park the length of the BOAT. Hence the levels and locations of car parking included in the planning application are inadequate as they ignore this. This parking on the BOAT restricts its width and will exacerbate the entry and exit problems discussed in point 2 above.

Additional comment - October 2020

The photo below shows the cars from Stratstone parked at Cow Roast at 8am on Friday 2nd October. There is no one using the field at this time - all of this is the commercial parking from Stratstone which continues to use both the grass verge of the BOAT and the car park that was built without planning permission.

(picture supplied to planning officer and available on request)

	<p>We would ask Dacorum Borough Council to consider these points when considering this application. Supporting sporting activities are important but this is the wrong location for such an intrusive and highly used facility.</p> <p>Carol and Elizabeth Daniel Chiltern House Cow Roast</p>
<p>28 Cow Roast Tring Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RF</p>	<p>To whomever this may concern,</p> <p>I am writing to you concerning the planning for the Artificial games pitch at Berkhamsted hockey club.</p> <p>We have grave concerns for this AONB (area of outstanding natural beauty) the list of these concerns are as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Local wildlife and potential disturbance of their habitat. * Light pollution - although the council letter states that there is an 'extensive woodland' blocking the view of occupants housing. There is, in fact only a tree line and during the winter months there will be no leaves on the trees therefore we will have full view. This is proven as the portable lighting currently used for winter training can be clearly seen when in use. The current lighting is also a lot smaller than the proposed 49ft lighting. * Traffic is likely to increase due to the pitch being used more frequently. Therefore, the turning coming into the hockey club by the cowroast pub has the potential to cause accidents if more people are using it as it's quite hidden off the main road and is a dangerous turning. * The times the pitch is in use seems to be extensive (up to 12 hours a day as stated in the planning) * Is the pitch going to be rented out to other parties? * We have had power outages here over the years on several occasions. Seeing as there would clearly be more power used for the lighting we can't see how that will improve cowroast residents situation with further potential power outages. <p>Concluding this there has been numerous years this space has been used successfully without the need for AstroTurf. We currently have all weather AstroTurf pitches at Ashlyn's school and another at Tring school so don't see the need for another in the local area.</p> <p>From what we have seen on the council site, the people that are in agreement with the planning don't appear to be local residents so won't affect them in terms of disturbance.</p> <p>We hope you consider all the local objection when making your</p>

	<p>decision.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>
<p>2 Cow Roast Tring Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RF</p>	<p>We do have concerns with regards to this application:</p> <p>The installation of six 15.2 m high floodlights poles seems excessive for the area. No attempt was made to show how they would look in situ. I believe these would extend way above the tree lines - which I would estimate to be around 6 m to 8 m high. They would also be unsightly in a protected area. In addition, the light and sight of these would be disruptive to the residents of Cow Roast.</p> <p>We have great concerns with regards to the single track/road access route via the A4251. This is both dangerous on entry and exit. Any additional traffic will just make this situation worse. The identified parking spaces areas are not suitable for commercial use and/or winter parking. The grass areas (as shown in the plans) would very quickly turn into mud baths and will force drivers to find alternative parking along the side of the access route and/or elsewhere. This has already happened with a car park area on the other playing field, where cars now park ad hoc on the grass or single/track road.</p> <p>There is a public footpath that runs across the playing field. I would be keen for this path to be incorporated in the plans and clearly indicated on how the paths would connect. At best the artificial pitch will have a negative impact on what is currently a pleasant country walk and at worst it would cut off an important footpath connecting Cow Roast to Northchurch.</p> <p>We are sympathetic to the desire of having an artificial floodlit pitch however the current proposal seem ill-suited to the local environment where little consideration has been shown on the impact for local residents, structural appearance and traffic flow management.</p>
<p>112 Windmill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 4BW</p>	<p>I am a member of the hockey club I think we will benefit from the astro in the long run as we will be able to host/put on goalkeeping camps an academy's and events an help keep the community active an mental fitness</p>
<p>47 Magdala Terrace Galashiels TD1 2HS</p>	<p>Having had the great experience of playing for this very community-centric club a few years ago now, I am delighted to see that the application to utilize and develop the location to the benefit of the community and the sport that I love has progressed. The hockey community for Berko and Tring has always been one of respect for the wider community combined with the</p>

	development of the sport for the whole family. I live in Amsterdam at the moment and have witnessed first hand what this family-oriented sport can bring.
14 Heynings Close Knaith Park Gainsborough DN21 5FB	Berkhamsted Hockey Club really needs an astro of their own to help further their ambitions. The current arrangement for them playing at Tring School will be never really allow them to develop properly as a sports club, and this is the perfect location for a new purpose built astro.
The Barn Broughton Aylesbury HP22 5AW	I am in full support of this application. The addition of an astro playing field would be a beneficial asset to the surrounding areas as well as reducing the overall carbon footprint of Berkhamsted hockey club as the club house is already on-site and the majority of players make their way down there every Saturday for teas anyway. I feel this would make good use of the land that would otherwise go unused for the majority of the year.
3 Ballinger Row Blackthorne Lane, Ballinger Great Missenden HP16 9LN	<p>This is a much needed local facility. Sadly, there are few AstroTurf hockey facilities in the locality.</p> <p>This would provide an excellent facility for local hockey players and sports people across Berkhamsted, Hemel and Tring. Hockey is a fully inclusive sport, played, watched and supported by men, women and children of all ages. Flyerz hockey also supports those with physical and cognitive disabilities. As Manager of the Great Britain Men's hockey team having also lived in the area for 40 years, I know this facility is long overdue.</p> <p>I wholeheartedly support this application.</p>
97 Woodcroft Avenue Aberdeen Aberdeen AB22 8DW	Encourage community sport and fitness outdoor & enhance likely visitors to area to use
7 Millfield Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2PB	<p>My wife has already responded in support of the planning application and I echo her support.</p> <p>Put simply, I fear for the survival of Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club without a floodlit artificial pitch at Cow Roast. Hockey is now universally played on artificial pitches and the off-site pitches currently used by the Club are either too far away or of insufficient quality. Without its own floodlit artificial pitch, the Club is likely to have to look to move. There are no obvious alternative locations for the Club and, even if there were any, the Club may well not be able to afford the cost of buying land, applying for more planning permissions, building a new clubhouse etc. The Club is a Community Amateur Sports Club, so is not profit making, and has little reserves.</p>

To try to address some of the concerns raised in other responses:

1. Location within an AONB. The proposed pitch is as close as possible to the A41 (and as far away as possible from the houses at Cow Roast) and in the most tree-lined area the Club owns. I believe the A41 has a much more significant impact on views than an artificial pitch would. The industrial estate at Cow Roast which includes BMW and the other garages have, with the A41, already brought down the standard of the AONB. The development of the artificial pitch will guarantee the presence of a sports club on the land which will protect the area.

2. Light pollution. I have not been involved in the Club's planning application but I know how sensitive the Club is to the effect of the floodlights on local residents. The Club does not want residents to be opposed to the scheme and very much hopes they will be able to benefit by joining the Club and using the new pitch. Every effort has been made to minimise light pollution. There will be no glare from the lights and local residents will not be able to see the light source directly due to the design of the luminaire. They will also not be able to see the illuminated surface. The lighting poles (there are 6, not 27 as suggested in one response) are 15 metres high. The tallest trees in the local area are approximately 18 metres high. Due to the oblique arrangement of woodland in respect to the houses, and the extent of the brush and the woodland, I do not believe that the line of sight between the pitch and the properties on the A4251 will be significantly different in the winter when some trees have shed their leaves.

3. Traffic. I do not expect any increased traffic density. Hockey teams already return to the Club after matches. With a new pitch at the Club, teams would not have to drive to the pitch (at the moment, sometimes in Aylesbury) for a match and then to Cow Roast after the match to socialise with the visiting team. Teams would have a single journey to Cow Roast and stay there for the match and a drink or food afterwards. The Club has been in use for over 100 years and for the last 30 years has always had a level of traffic. I am not aware of any incidents resulting in injury on the BOAT.

4. Exit onto the A4251. Hertfordshire Highways had no objection to the Club's previous planning application.

5. Local wildlife. I believe that the proposed artificial pitch will have negligible effect on local wildlife especially given the proximity of the A41. The lighting is designed to reduce the effect on bats.

6. Carbon emissions from floodlighting. The Club is developing its net carbon zero strategy in accordance with the UKGBC guidelines. As part of that process the Club is looking to change to a green tariff so there should be no additional carbon emitted by the floodlights. In any case, carbon emissions caused by the

	<p>evening lighting at darker times of the year will be more than offset by the reduction in travel, both because the pitch is much closer to where Club members live and in avoiding, as outlined above, the additional travel currently experienced in driving to a match and then going onto the clubhouse afterwards. Cow Roast is accessible by bus from both Hemel Hempstead and Berkhamsted. Here is the comment of my 8 year old daughter: "I really enjoy playing hockey but I don't want to go far in the car to make pollution and hurt the polar bears."</p>
<p>78 Victoria Road Cambridge CB4 3DU</p>	<p>Nowadays, all school and club hockey matches are played on artificial pitches, and the lack of appropriate facilities has a negative impact on the continued participation in this sport and the health and wellbeing of the local community.</p> <p>With hockey being a winter sport having pitches with adequate floodlighting is essential for midweek matches and evening training after school/work during the week.</p> <p>The above application seeks to address this by providing a much needed high-quality astroturf pitch as an alternative to the ageing facility at Tring School, ensuring that hockey can continue to be played in Dacorum.</p> <p>The application includes a sensitive and well-thought-through lighting strategy. This uses the latest LED technology to ensure the floodlights provide light levels that meet the requirements of Sport England while also minimising light pollution to local properties the nearest of which is 400m away. Indeed with the height of the floodlights at 15m, being below the surrounding trees at 18m light spillage is minimal.</p> <p>While there is likely to be an increase in traffic due to the improved facilities, this will be mainly in the evenings during the winter months when the proposed floodlights will allow training to place there. This will be both modest and at a time of day when the roads are not busy.</p> <p>Finally, while the development takes place in an area of outstanding natural beauty, the particular location, close to a major road (A41) and near an industrial estate/garage suggests the impact will be minimal.</p> <p>For all these reasons, I would commend the scheme, which is comparable to the successful application for floodlit hockey facilities that I was involved with at the University of Cambridge's Wilberforce Road Ground. This scheme has now been implemented and has had a hugely positive effect on university and club hockey with minimal impact on local residents and the highly sensitive local environment.</p>
<p>Holmedene 14 Anglefield Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3JA</p>	<p>BHHHC is a great place for all ages to become involved in physical activity, especially young people finding a new skill, but having our "home" pitches so far away this makes things difficult. From personal experience, transitioning into the more difficult stages of education I found myself having to decide between</p>

	<p>work that was needed to be done or spending my time with my teammates after a match, due to large time spent travelling to and from all matches. It would be nice to see people in my position in a few years time to be able to enjoy socialising with their fellow teammates and community whilst still feeling comfortable with the amount of time they can spend on other necessary tasks, even if this means playing a match every fortnight (just home games). Having our "home" grounds closer to our actual homes would benefit this. Thank you.</p>
<p>4 Peters Place Northchurch Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3RU</p>	<p>This is a fantasy opportunity for young people to have access to year round sporting facility and it will be well used by both football and hockey organisations. Fully endorse this development.</p>
<p>24 Finch Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3LH</p>	<p>BHHHC are a family friendly hockey club with mens, ladies and junior teams playing in variety of official leagues. The Club support the local community through development and access to sport for children of all ages and a welcome back to hockey as part of (I believe) a Sport England program to encourage people back into sport for health and fitness reasons.</p> <p>There are no suitable pitches in the Northchurch, Berkhamsted or Hemel area with the club required to go into Buckinghamshire to have access to artificial pitches.</p> <p>I understand there are objections from a very small few but I believe the benefits to the community through health, fitness and community activities out way any objections to this proposal.</p>
<p>7 Millfield Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2PB</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of my family who are fully in support of a multi-use sports pitch and flood lighting at Cow Roast.</p> <p>My husband and I have both played hockey for most of our lives. On moving to Berkhamsted we were disappointed at the poor quality of AstroTurf provision in the area. The enthusiasm and welcoming nature of the club's members encouraged us to join the club. The dedication of the many volunteers ensure 5 men's and 4 ladies teams can play league hockey every week. We have to make several 40 minute round trips to Halton and 30 minutes to Tring several times a week for our mid-week training and games. Sometimes our home games can involve a 70-80 minute round trip to play in Aylesbury. A pitch at the club would vastly reduce the carbon footprint of the clubs members.</p> <p>Our two daughters play hockey in the junior section which has over 100 members and I am a volunteer coach. Hockey is quite unique that mixed teams of women and men regularly play together. My husband is a volunteer coach in the 'Back to Hockey' section where our oldest member is over 70 and many</p>

parents are encouraged to pick up a stick and play again. The hockey club is a fantastic asset to the community.

However, many talented youngsters go off to other clubs where a higher level of training and matches can be provided on modern pitches. The pitches at Tring are outdated and indeed the league has deemed them not suitable for our first teams to play on. We understand that the Halton pitch is due to be redeveloped. Without a new pitch and lighting at the club I can see that this club and also Tring (which use the same pitches) will disappear in the next 5 years.

A new pitch with floodlights at Cow Roast will fully utilise this recreational area. The floodlights will allow the pitch to be used for mid-week training and all the clubs games on a Saturday in winter. The pitch can be used for a range of other sports and community groups with the benefit of a clubhouse amenity on site. Granting consent to the club to provide a modern pitch will ensure the physical and mental benefits of playing team sports are embedded in many generations of the borough's residents. A true sense of place and community can be generated by allowing the passionate club members to develop their clubs facilities.

I strongly recommend you approve this application and grasp this opportunity to provide a legacy off health and well being to the Borough's residents.

I am writing on behalf of my family who are fully in support of a multi-use sports pitch and flood lighting at Cow Roast.

My husband and I have both played hockey for most of our lives. On moving to Berkhamsted we were disappointed at the poor quality of AstroTurf provision in the area. The enthusiasm and welcoming nature of the club's members encouraged us to join the club. The dedication of the many volunteers ensure 5 men's and 4 ladies teams can play league hockey every week. We have to make several 40 minute round trips to Halton and 30 minutes to Tring several times a week for our mid-week training and games. Sometimes our home games can involve a 70-80 minute round trip to play in Aylesbury. A pitch at the club would vastly reduce the carbon footprint of the clubs members.

Our two daughters play hockey in the junior section which has over 100 members and I am a volunteer coach. Hockey is quite unique that mixed teams of women and men regularly play together. My husband is a volunteer coach in the 'Back to Hockey' section where our oldest member is over 70 and many parents are encouraged to pick up a stick and play again. The hockey club is a fantastic asset to the community.

	<p>However, many talented youngsters go off to other clubs where a higher level of training and matches can be provided on modern pitches. The pitches at Tring are outdated and indeed the league has deemed them not suitable for our first teams to play on. We understand that the Halton pitch is due to be redeveloped. Without a new pitch and lighting at the club I can see that this club and also Tring (which use the same pitches) will disappear in the next 5 years.</p> <p>A new pitch with floodlights at Cow Roast will fully utilise this recreational area. The floodlights will allow the pitch to be used for mid-week training and all the clubs games on a Saturday in winter. The pitch can be used for a range of other sports and community groups with the benefit of a clubhouse amenity on site. Granting consent to the club to provide a modern pitch will ensure the physical and mental benefits of playing team sports are embedded in many generations of the borough's residents. A true sense of place and community can be generated by allowing the passionate club members to develop their clubs facilities.</p> <p>I strongly recommend you approve this application and grasp this opportunity to provide a legacy off health and well being to the Borough's residents.</p>
<p>little abbots hyde lane nash mills hp3 8sa</p>	<p>Sport is an essential part of our lives and for BHHHC to continue it is imperative they are able to modernize their facility. I understand there maybe concerns regarding the application and I would like to confirm positive aspects of the proposed plan.</p> <p>There is only 1 astro in the whole of the borough of Dacorum that you can play league hockey on. That astro is at Tring School and is nearing the end of its life. If, for whatever reason that were not to be replaced that would essentially be the end of hockey in Dacorum.</p> <p>The floodlights will be 15m high. The tallest trees in the local area are about 18m high. The way they are designed means that even if the local residents could see the poles and light fittings, they will not be able to see the lights directly and so there will be no glare. It is most doubtful that the local residents who have complained about the application will be able to see the illuminated surface ie the astro itself because they are either too far away (about 425m) or there is way too much brush and trees in the way. Their closest neighbour who would be most affected is in favour of the scheme. They are also going to use particular LED light sources which reduce the impact on the wildlife. They have had planning permission for an astro in the past but without floodlights the astro cannot be used in the winter evenings which significantly reduces its benefit to the community and makes the scheme unviable.</p>

	<p>They do not expect the density of traffic to increase over what it is now and what it has been in the past. There will be more traffic because we hope that the community will use the facility during the weekdays.</p> <p>The AONB extends from Luton to Reading so is a vast area. This site of the astro is about 300m away from the A41 and about 800m away from the BMW garage and other industrial / commercial operations. Arguably it is probably one of the most developed parts of the AONB in the area. Locating a green surface (albeit and artificial one) will have minimal visible impact.</p>
<p>12 Sheldon Way Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1FH</p>	<p>Please bring an Astro to Cow Roast! BHHHC is a fantastic and very social club. One that will only get better and stronger by giving it its own pitch next to the club house.</p> <p>When I first came to Berko it took me a few years to find a club as I didn't think Berko had one, only in Tring or Chesham. Having a Berko hockey club based in Tring, Halton AND Aylesbury is very confusing for newcomers and so has certainly put people off from joining in the past. Giving us an Astro will give us a very strong identity and encourage people from Berko and HH area to join, rather than finding other clubs outside of the area, as BHHHC is also currently based outside the area.</p>
<p>Chartridge Barncroft Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3NL</p>	<p>I understand development will not be close to residents, any lights would be blocked by existing trees and no increased traffic at site (fixed number of training sessions same as before). I think it is really important to have good quality, safe and accessible to all leisure facilities locally for children and adults to engage in sport which is important for physical and mental health. Site is well located for Berkhamsted and Tring as well as surrounding villages and excellent supportive, nurturing club already operating from existing site.</p>
<p>South Gables 22 Meadway Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2PN</p>	<p>Astro is needed as the Tring pitch is poor and very busy plus Halton is being redeveloped. Hockey As a diverse sport attracts men and women equally And children play from a young age. It also generates a community spirit and Benefits young people socially and mentally. The Astro pitch also is well positioned for the communities of Hemel Hempstead Tring and Berkhamsted</p>
<p>6 Ashlyns Court Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3BU</p>	<p>I fully support this application. I have played hockey for over 50 years and joined Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club (BHHHC) in 1983. At that time, we played on grass and practically every Saturday afternoon the six grass pitches at the Cowroast were used weekly from September to April fielding twelve teams of 11 = 132 people. The pitches were also used on</p>

Sundays during the season for mixed and youth training. At that time for at least ten years, the club prospered with an active playing and social membership with over 132 people visiting the site each weekend making it a vibrant place. It was one of the top clubs in the county with a number of county, national and international player members in the ladies' section. We also ran an annual schools' county hockey tournament during this time at the Cowroast.

In the 1990's Astroturf was introduced, and it changed the face of hockey and dramatically affected many hockey clubs across the country, including BHHHC. With just one Astroturf pitch nearby in Tring, shared with Tring Hockey Club at weekends, and limited access to the pitch during mid-week evenings for training due to football, our membership started to decline rapidly. Players started to move away, and new young players joined other clubs who had onsite Astroturf pitches and offered home league games, extensive training sessions and good coaches such as St Albans, West Herts and Amersham and Chalfont. By 2009 the club had declined so much that its 106-year history was seriously at risk. At the following and critical AGM, the membership agreed to work together to rebuild the club with the vision to have an Astroturf; for hockey to be offered and accessible to all people in our community, to secure the future of the Club, as well as to make our facilities open to other sports and groups.

Over the last ten years we have invested a significant amount of money in maintaining the land, pitches and clubhouse at Cowroast and we have been able to do this by hiring out the facilities to other clubs such as Berkhamsted Bowmen, Berkhamsted Rugby Club, Raiders Football Club, a dance school and dog training company. We have also invested in top level hockey coaches and run youth and adult training programmes to bring people back to hockey in Dacorum. Our club is now growing again, and our youth programme has been particularly successful with membership increasing and making a positive impact to our adult teams - our ladies section has recovered from dropping down to one team up to four and with potential to grow further. This increased in demand and interest is a positive sign that hockey is needed in our community.

The provision of hockey pitches in the area is extremely poor and has had a detrimental effect on our club, as well as restricting the availability of the sport for people in our local community. Our 'shared' access with the Tring Astroturf on Saturdays means several of our nine teams have to play league games at RAF Halton, Aylesbury and Watford. The pitch at Tring is in poor condition and is no longer suitable to play the league games of our ladies and men's since they were promoted. The future of the pitch at RAF Halton is also in doubt as the land is to be sold so we

are again at a critical point to keep hockey in the community.

Our membership is really proud of our club and the positive way we have protected and maintained the grounds and facilities at the Cowroast for several decades. I have been involved with the management of the club for many years and I am currently a director on the Executive Committee. Since 2010, when we initiated our vision to have an Astroturf at Cowroast, we have worked hard and invested a significant amount of time and money, as well as researched the latest technology and materials, to minimise any detrimental impact to the countryside, nature and our local residents at Cowroast. We have given particular consideration to a number of areas:

For the lighting, we have specified six lighting poles 15.2m high which would not exceed the height of the surrounding woodland which is 18m high.

For wildlife, we have been advised that the latest BS5489 guidance notes that a colour temperature of 3000k reduces the effect of lighting on bats. Hockey requires high levels of illumination at pitch level to allow the sport to be played safely but when the facility is being used by other sports, the lighting levels will be reduced. LG (2006) published by the Society of Light and Lighting indicate that association football requires 200lux (Class 11) and rugby training 100Lux while hockey requires 300Lux (Class 11). For other wildlife such as insects and earthworms, we believe the proposed AGP will have negligible effect on local wildlife, especially given the proximity of the A41.

The use of energy for the lighting is clearly a discussion with UKPN, however the site currently has a 3-ph 100A supply and therefore we anticipate no additional upgrades are necessary. We are aware of the HM Government policy to eliminate fossil fuel transport and potential increased demand for vehicle charging but we feel it is unreasonable to include potential additional load on the energy infrastructure at this time, when development is unknown in the future.

The level of carbon emissions at the Cowroast and use of the Byway Open to All Traffic will has been significantly low since hockey moved to playing on Astroturf. At the moment, teams return to the club house at Cowroast after their matches so there will be no difference in carbon emissions or use of the track. The additional carbon emissions associated with travelling to the Cowroast for evening training sessions is more than offset by the reduction in travel to the Astroturf's in Aylesbury, Watford and RAF Halton. Over a twenty-year period in the 1980s and 1990s, all six grass pitches at the Cowroast were used and the carbon emissions were significantly higher at that time with 132 players

	<p>travelling to the site by car, far in excess of carbon emissions now and in the future with an Astroturf.</p> <p>We are developing our net carbon zero strategy in accordance with the UKGBC guidelines and as part of that process we are looking to change to a green tariff. Therefore, there should be no additional indirect carbon emitted by the lights.</p> <p>We have carefully considered the potential glare or light pollution to local residents and we will be using appropriate lighting which minimises spill light above the horizontal and so minimise glare while keeping the lighting close to the area to be lit. We believe the properties will not be able to see the light source or illuminated surface of the AGP. Due to the oblique arrangement of the woodland in respect to the houses, we believe that winter conditions will not be significantly different to summer conditions as there is sufficient wood (branches, trunks and hedgerow) in the line of site between the properties on the A4351 and the pitch.</p> <p>We totally appreciate the site is in an AONB but the A41 runs straight through the area, as does the industrial estate which includes the BMW showroom. We believe the Astroturf will help, long term, to protect the AONB as the club will remain on the site and ensure the remaining land is left green.</p> <p>Hockey has profoundly changed my life and as a player, coach and umpire, I have seen the positive impact it has on players starting at 5 years up to those coming back to hockey in their 70s. Hockey is a game for all people, of all ages and the only team sport where you can play mixed abilities, ages and genders in one game, as well as encouraging those with disabilities. It is a truly inclusive sport. An Astroturf at the Cowroast will make a huge impact in the community and will provide Berkhamsted and the surround area with a facility to be used by all. It will raise the level of participation in sport, give access to higher competition, promote social inclusion, encourage fitness and help to reduce obesity.</p>
<p>17 Watermill Way Weston Turville HP22 5SR</p>	<p>I have been a member of BHHHC for 10 years and in that time, the club have helped me develop into the person I am today. They are all so welcoming, and having an AstroTurf at the club would help them expand, meaning they can reach more people.</p> <p>Currently the Men's and Ladies' first teams play at a standard too high for the only pitch in Dacorum, Tring School, and have to travel to either Watford or Halton meaning the standard of hockey contained within Dacorum is very limited.</p> <p>With the club able to expand, it will encourage more young people to take up exercise, because the pitch will not only be able</p>

	to be used for hockey, but also football and other non-contact sports.
70 Billet Lane Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1DR	<p>I am strongly supportive of this planning application. The current provision of astroturf facilities within the Dacorum area are woeful; players need therefore to travel significant distances in order to play hockey on Saturdays. Furthermore, this significantly constrains the training facilities available during weekday evenings, resulting in slots at anti-social times which preclude attendance by some of the younger players.</p> <p>Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead hockey club is family-focussed and has made great strides in recent years in encouraging children to play hockey, and also to encourage former players 'back to hockey'. However, the lack of appropriate playing facilities is a significant barrier to participation. The provision of an astroturf pitch at the club's home in Cow Roast will reduce traffic to home games (currently teams have to travel to the other side of Aylesbury for some home games, as well as to RAF Halton and Tring), as well as providing facilities for other hockey clubs and to the local community, and for other sports.</p> <p>Floodlighting for the facility is key to allow community access during winter months. The technology available now means that such lighting has a minimal impact on the environment and on local residents.</p> <p>I am strongly supportive of this application.</p>
10 Daggsdell Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 3PW	<p>Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club has been in existence for in excess of 100 years.</p> <p>For all these years, the club has looked after the land and provided a facility to not only hockey players but for numerous other sports too. In recent years, this has included youth football teams, archery clubs, a ballet school, yoga classes and now a growing and thriving rugby club. All this has occurred due to the community led spirit, hard work and inclusiveness of BHHHC's committee members for many many years.</p> <p>The committee is made up of volunteers from all walks of life from across Dacorum's community, and deems that it's its duty to continue this legacy for generations to come.</p> <p>A number of years ago, England Hockey enforced some legislation that meant that for teams over and above a certain standard, hockey must be played on astroturf and no-longer on grass. This applied to every team at Berkhamstead and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club. This affected BHHHC in that it could no longer play on the pitches in front of the clubhouse and had to find a lot of money to start renting astro turf pitches. It also had an</p>

	<p>affect, in that some of the community spirit was lost as players didn't always come back to the club house for post match teas and general integration.</p> <p>Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club has been providing a sporting outlet for many youngsters (for decades) who may not enjoy the likes of more popular sports such as netball,swimming, rugby or football. It has supported and trained youngsters to go on to achieve county standard and to national level hockey. The current Youth section is one of the largest in the county and far exceeds that of many neighbouring clubs.</p> <p>In my opinion, a 1st class astroturf pitch at BHHHC is imperative to ensure the clubs' survival, growth and future.</p> <p>It cannot continue to rely on pitches that are miles away (and according to Hockey England, not suitable enough for Mens 1st nor Ladies 1st team Hockey) or are under threat from construction.The club has lost players to teams outside of the borough who have far better facilities. It would also provide a centralised facility that would create an even better and far more inclusive community for the whole of Dacorum. Over and above this, it would attract more players to the sport and secure BHHHC's huge commitment to youth hockey.</p> <p>BHHHC could be in threat of not surviving if players (of all ages) are attracted to more modern and better suited facilities. An astroturf pitch would ensure the legacy continues for another 100 years. This is the duty of our generation - to our community, to our health and to our children.</p>
<p>19 New Mill Terrace Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5ET</p>	<p>I support this application</p>
<p>3 luttlemarsh milton keynes mk7 7jd</p>	<p>Hockey is a fantastic sport, played by all genders and all ages and Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey club provides sports facilities for almost 250 local players.</p> <p>The club needs proper facilities which are lacking within the Dacorum area. Laying a modern pitch will not cause extra disruption for local residents but will secure the clubs future. The council is fortunate to have a forward thinking and enthusiastic club and should support the application</p>
<p>43 Pembridge Road Bovingdon Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0QN</p>	<p>This development is essential for the continuation of a club that is not only part of the local community but also all the families that grow up through the club and the new families joining with young children whose mums and dads are taking part and are now enjoying a sport that they had forgotten about. This development</p>

	<p>therefore creates and promotes mental wellbeing through fitness and social interaction bonding neighbours who otherwise would not have know each other. In a time where COVID has allowed us to explorer our local areas and get to know those we live near, a club such as this is vital for the community as a whole and provides support to those who need it. The facilities near the site are run down and need upgrading. Even if the nearest site upgraded their pitch we have too many teams and require more space. This in itself means the development will be well used. In addition, the quality of the pitch will attract more people, create interest in the sport and hopefully mean more local families can enjoy the benefits of a supportive and wonderful club.</p>
<p>The Long Barn Home Farm Nettleden Road Little Gaddesden Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1PN</p>	<p>I strongly support this application. The Dacorum Sports report highlighted that there are insufficient publicly accessible facilities for hockey in the local area and it is imperative that for the current and future generations we support a greater access to a wider variety of sports that people of all ages can play. These facilities massively enrich the lives of a wide proportion of the community.</p> <p>The Cow Roast area is located on an already busy road providing easy access from the A41, without travelling through built-up residential areas, as a result I wouldn't see the additional traffic impacting the local area, indeed as Cow Roast is in need of investment these new sports facilities would help to promote the area.</p> <p>I can't comment positively enough and it is great to see so much local support for these proposals - these plans should definitely be approved!</p>
<p>46 Nathaniel Walk Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5DG</p>	<p>I completely support the development of an Astroturf at Cow Roast. I believe this development is long overdue and its absence has threatened the sport of hockey over the last few years. Current facilities are not enough. Tring is very much in need of replacement and Halton may be lost.</p> <p>We should be encouraging as much sport as possible but we need the facilities to be able to do this - in all weathers. The current and growing obesity of the population and consequential increase in demand on the NHS is a real issue and financial drain which needs addressing . Hockey is a family sport and a great way to keep fit and healthy and improve mental health. Personally , I don't see any negatives to approving this planning. It will bring trade for local trades people in the construction and promote health and well being which can be enjoyed by all the family. Local schools and other sporting clubs will also be able to benefit from such a fabulous amenity. Its location is perfect - it has no impact on others and any wildlife impacts can be addressed in planning conditions and compensating planting /</p>

	<p>habitat reconstruction .</p> <p>Floodlighting is key to allow community access during winter months and modern lighting technologies and techniques will ensure that the impact on the environment and on local residents will be minimal.</p>
<p>49 Tun Furlong Pitstone LU79GE</p>	<p>Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead hockey club (BHHHC) is an integral part of my families life. I was a late starter with hockey but have now been playing the sport for fifteen years. In those fifteen years i have played at the highest level for BHHHC and played at some of the most fantastic hockey clubs in the south east most recently the Olympic hockey stadium in Stratford.</p> <p>The clubs management structure is the most organised and motivated i have seen at the club. The work they have put into developing the club at a club level is nothing short of incredible, but what has been striking is the level of interest and participation the youth hockey has gained over the past few years. I continue to play for the club and have now started supporting the goalkeeping element of the coaching of young hockey players at the club training sessions. The club really do need the facilities to attract new players and retain the superb youngsters flourishing at the junior levels. For too long the club has been at a disadvatage with other clubs in national leagues enticing our youth to play for them.</p> <p>With that in mind the implementation of a 21st Century hockey facility with exisiting supporting infrastructure would be enough to ensure the youth of our area develop and represent the towns of Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead as well as the smaller villages that surround them, instead of leaving for other clubs. The Local Astro turf pitch in Tring is sub standard for modern hockey which continues to evolve. The pitch at RAF Halton is situated in Buckinghamshire as is the meadowcroft pitches in Aylesbury. These are not suitable for use for a club looking to develop.</p> <p>The club has big aspirations and the drive to secure excellent quality hockey for the Dacorum area. The club needs a new hockey pitch to continue it's success in the local community and ensure the teams that play have the best facilities available to them.</p> <p>I fully support the application.</p>
<p>Dryden Gravel Path Berkhamsted Hertfordshire</p>	<p>I strongly support the proposed astroturf at Cow Roast. I am a relatively recent member of the hockey club. I joined to play with my son, not having played for over 25 years. Hockey is a great family sport, is open to all ages, male and female, all shapes and</p>

HP4 2PJ	<p>sizes. There are few team sports in which you can play competitively with your teenage son. Hockey has the potential to bring together people right across the community in a much broader way than most team sports. But it obviously needs the right facilities to do so. To build an astroturf at Cow Roast next to the existing club house, in a relatively secluded and unobtrusive location, seems to me a great opportunity. As things stand, hockey playing facilities in the immediate area are poor. The club currently plays home matches at Tring school, Halton or Meadowcroft. None of these locations is at all ideal; the pitch at Tring school is in need of refurbishment in any event. A new pitch would provide a much needed facility, a focal point for the sport, the club and a wider community.</p>
<p>47 Rosebery Way Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5DU</p>	<p>I absolutely support this application as I strongly feel that there is a huge need for Astro facilities to allow the sport to be played. This development will be continuing the growth of the sport.</p>
<p>West Leith Barn West Leith Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6JR</p>	<p>I totally support this plan for an Astro pitch Our locality is in crisis for the needs of sporting facilities for adults and even more pressing for youth Cut backs in available spending for council run facilities have been impacted greatly in past years so applications such as this from a thriving sports club with many decades of strong governance should be supported and strongly encouraged to provide a pitch that can be used for and far beyond the hockey club. Floodlights utilising modern technologies will extend the positive usage of the new pitch with minimal impact to local residents. In summary this application if successful will have a huge positive impact for sports for Tring Berkhamsted Hemel Hempstead and beyond across the generations and allow this excellent club to extend its passion for family sport</p>
<p>Woodside Farm Kings Langley Wd4 8lr</p>	
<p>6 Bay Court Doctors Commons Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3DN</p>	<p>As a member of Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club (BHHHC), I support this application as the current provision for suitable full sized pitches for hockey in Dacorum is inadequate, resulting in a significant number of home league fixtures on Saturdays having to be played outside of Dacorum at RAF Halton and at Meadowcroft Open Space in Aylesbury and/or at relatively unsuitable times late in the afternoon when it is already dark in winter.</p> <p>It is worth noting having to play fixtures at Meadowcroft Open Space in Aylesbury means that it actually takes longer to travel to some of our home games than it does to away games against several other local hockey clubs (Harpenden, Rickmansworth, St Albans, and West Herts in Watford).</p>

Having an AGP on the same site as the its clubhouse, would allow Berkhamsted & Hemel Hockey Club to increase the amount of training it offers. This would improve community engagement as more children would be able to participate both directly through BHHHC and through use of the facility by local schools. It would also attract adult players living in Dacorum who are currently lost to other clubs outside of Dacorum that have better facilities.

As a member of Berkhamsted & Hemel Hockey Club, I support this application as the current provision for suitable full sized pitches for hockey in Dacorum is inadequate, resulting in a significant number of home league fixtures on Saturdays having to be played outside of Dacorum at RAF Halton and at Meadowcroft Open Space in Aylesbury and/or at relatively unsuitable times late in the afternoon when it is already dark in winter.

It is worth noting having to play fixtures at Meadowcroft Open Space in Aylesbury means that it actually takes longer to travel to some of our home games than it does to away games against several other local hockey clubs (Harpenden, Rickmansworth, St Albans, and West Herts in Watford).

Having an AGP on the same site as the its clubhouse, would allow Berkhamsted & Hemel Hockey Club to increase the amount of training it offers. This would improve community engagement as more children would be able to participate. It would also attract adult players living in Dacorum who are currently lost to other clubs outside of Dacorum that have better facilities.

As a member of Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club (BHHHC), I support this application as the current provision for suitable full sized pitches for hockey in Dacorum is inadequate, resulting in a significant number of home league fixtures on Saturdays having to be played outside of Dacorum at RAF Halton and at Meadowcroft Open Space in Aylesbury and/or at relatively unsuitable times late in the afternoon when it is already dark in winter.

It is worth noting having to play fixtures at Meadowcroft Open Space in Aylesbury means that it actually takes longer to travel to some of our home games than it does to away games against several other local hockey clubs (Harpenden, Rickmansworth, St Albans, and West Herts in Watford).

Having an AGP on the same site as the its clubhouse, would allow Berkhamsted & Hemel Hockey Club to increase the amount of training it offers. This would improve community engagement as more children would be able to participate both directly through BHHHC and through use of the facility by local schools. It

	would also attract adult players living in Dacorum who are currently lost to other clubs outside of Dacorum that have better facilities.
19 New Mill Terrace Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5ET	Improvement of local amenities and improve sports facilities for the area
Dundale Junior Mixed Infants School Bettys Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5DJ	This will be a great addition to local sports provision which the whole community will be able to benefit from.
19 St Asaphs Ave Studley B80 7JB	A local sporting facility for community use. Exercise is an essential element for health and this will enable the club to develop. Youth development will benefit - a good quality hockey pitch and setup to be proud of.
62 Hughenden Road St Albans AL4 9QS	<p>Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead HC is an inclusive and family run sports club in the west of Hertfordshire. Not only does the club supply hockey, but it is a rugby training facility, dance facility and can host special events for the local community. It has the care for it's members and the wider community at its heart.</p> <p>To my knowledge there are no, privately owned astro-turfs this far West of the county (or that east of Buckinghamshire and south Bedfordshire), meaning they have relied on local schools, RAF Halton and travelling to Aylesbury for a number of years. This puts a lot of pressure to keep the community together, and tricky to develop opportunities for wider participation when stretched over various venues.</p> <p>The club is a stalwart in the East Region for hockey, being one of the first to play at the highest level in the region. There is now an opportunity for the club to create a legacy for physical activity, a supportive environment and promote well-being by being part of a community.</p> <p>It would mean less travel for all members (so hopefully a reduction in CO2, as some members would be able to cycle there), and those who come to play the club. More opportunities for lift shares, and to one location, rather than spreading out throughout the surrounding area.</p> <p>I understand there are concerns for the wildlife, which should be taken into account. However, with the pitch being situated next to the dual carriageway (I think that's what I saw on the plans). I would hope that any initial large damage done, would have been previously caused by the main road being put there with lights flashing past and the noise too.</p>

	<p>I have never played at the club, but when we moved to the area it was the first club my Mum was part of. Hockey clubs are a wonderful welcoming place for all. I hope that this can go ahead for the wider community.</p>
<p>27 Elizabeth II Avenue Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3BF</p>	<p>I am in full support of this planning application. There is a gross insufficiency of AGP's in the borough as identified by DBC (Apr. 2019) and this is well overdue for the enjoyment, participation and health of the wider community of the Dacorum borough.</p> <p>The AGP at Tring School is past its' best, & deemed inadequate for the level of hockey BHHHC participate at. Developing a new AGP will bolster the efforts of the "Active Dacorum" incentive, and support the wider govt. initiative to increase sports participation to support local physical & mental wellbeing.</p> <p>The closest acceptable standard AGP is in out of county, which unnecessarily increases CO2 emissions via excessive motor travel on the A41 & beyond. The development would also allow DBC to retain & grow sports participation directly within Dacorum, rather than in neighbouring counties.</p> <p>I support the efforts by BHHHC to engage a lighting company who will use methods to minimise glare and reach of the lights. As demonstrated on supporting docs 4A & 4B, the floodlights support green belt regulations. Light will be restricted to an environmentally compliant level for the AONB / green belt - one of which will be much more discreet than the A4251 / petrol station lighting. In support of maintaining the green belt, BHHHC will utilise a common approach that other AGPs granted within green belt areas employ. These factors in addition to the large trees, hedge rows and >500m of fields will assist in the reduction of light pollution, sound pollution and ensure local privacy to the neighbouring residents.</p> <p>As outlined in the plans (fig 2 - parking provision), BHHHC will have ample parking to easily accommodate all visiting participants. Having one 'heart' of hockey in the community for BHHHC players and families will provide a legacy for local sport. It will be pivotal in development of the thriving junior club, development of Hockey at a regional level and will provide a truly inclusive sport for all ages, abilities and genders for many decades to come. A true investment in the wellbeing of the local populous.</p> <p>Road/ Entrance access : The lane has several parts where cars can pass, and due to the nature of the BOAT and nearby pedestrians, cars proceed with caution. The AGP will not increase risk of danger for these reasons.</p>

	<p>There will also not be any risk of 'crossover' of matches as teams arrive during the time the previous match is still being played. For this reason anticipated risk on the junction with the A4251 is low and will allow smooth logistics on match and training days.</p> <p>In conclusion, the positive benefits to the Berkhamsted, Tring, Hemel Hempstead and surrounding neighbourhoods in terms of physical and mental wellbeing, community engagement and local sport participation, in my opinion, far outweigh and satisfy the concerns raised in objection. I am in full support of the well overdue need for such sporting ground and improvement to our local community.</p>
<p>12 the green Edlesborough Lu6 2jf</p>	<p>This is a first class application, supporting Both the development of sports and community facilities in a location which avoid the congestion of other areas.</p> <p>I enthusiastically support the development of an Astroturf at Cow Roast. I believe this development is long overdue and its absence has threatened the sport of hockey over the lasts few years in my experience.</p> <p>Hockey is a family sport. At Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey club, there are large numbers of male, female and youth hockey players who for years have been under-served. 5 mens' teams and 4 ladies' teams play every week during the season (a large membership) and mixed hockey is played throughout the summer with the youngsters.</p> <p>Huge efforts are made to encourage young players into the sport, and we do our best training but the facilities are far from ideal and are in disparate locations disabling the club to have a strong identity. There is sufficient appetite for hockey in Berkhamsted alone to warrant the building of such an astroturf. Look further afield and we would be providing a top-class facility to hundreds and giving local schools the potential access to a surface that could support their playing of hockey and other team sports.</p> <p>Please consider this excellent proposal positively so that many boys, girls, men and women, from Berkhamsted and the surrounding towns, will be able to continue to play hockey together and develop this family-centric club.</p> <p>'This application should be approved as it will significantly add to the sporting facilities in the area, an area already lacking in such amenities and facing a significant rise in population. Floodlighting is key to allow community access during winter months and modern lighting technologies and techniques will ensure that the impact on the environment and on local residents will be minimal.'</p> <p>to grow both sports and community facilities a</p> <p>I enthusiastically support the development of an Astroturf at Cow Roast. As a hockey player myself, having been introduced to the sport by my 2 daughters who are also players coach at BHHHC , I believe this development is greatly need to support the sport of</p>

	<p>hockey.</p> <p>Hockey is a family sport. At Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey club, there are large numbers of male, female and youth hockey players who for years have been under-served. 5 mens' teams and 4 ladies' teams play every week during the season (a large membership) and mixed hockey is played throughout the summer with the youngsters.</p> <p>Huge efforts are made to encourage young players into the sport, and we do our best but the facilities are desperate and hockey is providing an environment for children to grow in confidence build a different environment to football and rugby . There is sufficient appetite for hockey in Berkhamsted alone to warrant the building of such an astroturf. Look further afield and we would be providing a top-class facility to hundreds and giving local schools the potential access to a surface that could support their playing of hockey and other team sports.</p> <p>Please consider this excellent proposal positively so that many boys, girls, men and women, from Berkhamsted and the surrounding towns, will be able to continue to play hockey together and develop this family-centric club.</p> <p>And</p> <p>'This application should be approved as it will significantly add to the sporting facilities in the area, an area already lacking in such amenities and facing a significant rise in population. Floodlighting is key to allow community access during winter months and modern lighting technologies and techniques will ensure that the impact on the environment and on local residents will be minimal.'</p>
<p>Tanglewood Shootersway Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3NN</p>	<p>I strongly support this application.</p> <p>One of the main recommendations of the Dacorum Borough's Playing Pitch Strategy Action Plan (published June 2019) is that DBC needs to deliver a second AGP to satisfy the demand generated by Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club and Tring Hockey Club, as well as needing to reinvest in the Tring School AGP.</p> <p>The Action Plan states that there is insufficient supply of hockey pitches to accommodate current and future demand for both training and fixtures. That Action Plan also recognises that the future of the AGP at Halton is uncertain.</p> <p>As Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club (BHHHC) has no artificial pitch of its own, its teams have to travel to one of three venues for home games (Tring School, RAF Halton & Aylesbury Meadowcroft). Sport England state that this type of displaced demand can lead to clubs having to relocate or close.</p>

DBC's 'Active Dacorum: A Physical Activity and Sport Strategy 2019-2024' recognises the huge positive impact that sport and physical activity can have on individuals and local communities and its foreword states:

"The Council is committed to creating accessible opportunities for residents to be as active as possible. We want to create an environment that encourages an active lifestyle, allows aspiring athletes to perform at the highest level as well as motivating beginners to take up a new sport or activity....and make Dacorum the most active district in Hertfordshire".

By approving this planning application, DBC will be able to demonstrate that it is proactively working to implement its Physical Activity and Sport Strategy as well as acting on a recommendation in its Playing Pitch Strategy Action Plan.

Hockey is a sport that spans all age groups and BHHHC's membership ranges from under 10 years old to over 70 years old. Approving this application will allow this wide range of age groups to keep physically active and also a new generation of Dacorum residents to get involved in sport and improve their health. Having this facility locally will attract more children in Dacorum into hockey as parents will not have to travel far.

BHHHC supports the use of other sports and activities, such as rugby and dance, on its premises. The lack of an artificial pitch and the resulting 'displaced demand' effect may threaten the future viability of BHHHC in the future. If BHHHC ceased to be viable, this could adversely impact participation of Dacorum residents in these other physical activities as well as in hockey.

With an AGP at the hockey club, BHHHC members will have (potentially significantly) less distance to travel to and from home games. By approving this planning application, DBC will be supporting its residents to reduce their carbon emissions and impact on the environment. The clubhouse location is more accessible by bus, bike and walking than the 'home' venues currently used.

The documentation submitted by BHHHC demonstrates its commitment to minimise the impact of the AGP on local surroundings. My view is that the impact on the AGP on local wildlife will be insignificant compared to that of the A41.

From the UK Government's flood warning information service web pages, the proposed location of the AGP looks like it is in an area categorised as being at very low risk of flood risk from surface water.

strongly support this application.

One of the main recommendations of the Dacorum Borough's Playing Pitch Strategy Action Plan (published June 2019) is that DBC needs to deliver a second AGP to satisfy the demand generated by Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club and Tring Hockey Club, as well as needing to reinvest in the Tring School AGP.

The Action Plan states that there is insufficient supply of hockey pitches to accommodate current and future demand for both training and fixtures. That Action Plan also recognises that the future of the AGP at Halton is uncertain.

As Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club (BHHHC) has no artificial pitch of its own, its teams have to travel to one of three venues for home games (Tring School, RAF Halton & Aylesbury Meadowcroft). Sport England state that this type of displaced demand can lead to clubs having to relocate or close.

DBC's 'Active Dacorum: A Physical Activity and Sport Strategy 2019-2024' recognises the huge positive impact that sport and physical activity can have on individuals and local communities and its foreword states:

"The Council is committed to creating accessible opportunities for residents to be as active as possible. We want to create an environment that encourages an active lifestyle, allows aspiring athletes to perform at the highest level as well as motivating beginners to take up a new sport or activity....and make Dacorum the most active district in Hertfordshire".

By approving this planning application, DBC will be able to demonstrate that it is proactively working to implement its Physical Activity and Sport Strategy as well as acting on a recommendation in its Playing Pitch Strategy Action Plan.

Hockey is a sport that spans all age groups and BHHHC's membership ranges from under 10 years old to over 70 years old. Approving this application will allow this wide range of age groups to keep physically active and also a new generation of Dacorum residents to get involved in sport and improve their health. Having this facility locally will attract more children in Dacorum into hockey as parents will not have to travel far.

BHHHC supports the use of other sports and activities, such as rugby and dance, on its premises. The lack of an artificial pitch and the resulting 'displaced demand' effect may threaten the future viability of BHHHC in the future. If BHHHC ceased to be viable, this could adversely impact participation of Dacorum residents in these other physical activities as well as in hockey.

	<p>With an AGP at the hockey club, BHHHC members will have (potentially significantly) less distance to travel to and from home games. By approving this planning application, DBC will be supporting its residents to reduce their carbon emissions and impact on the environment. The clubhouse location is more accessible by bus, bike and walking than the 'home' venues currently used.</p> <p>The documentation submitted by BHHHC demonstrates its commitment to minimise the impact of the AGP on local surroundings. My view is that the impact on the AGP on local wildlife will be insignificant compared to that of the A41.</p> <p>From the UK Government's flood warning information service web pages, the proposed location of the AGP looks like it is in an area categorised as being at very low risk of flood risk from surface water.</p>
<p>Shootersway Farm Shootersway Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3TY</p>	<p>There are an enormous range of positives for the club and the community, with no adverse impact on the environment in which it is located. It can be seen from the numerous positive responses the wide community are in favour of the development which would have a very positive impact on the local population..</p> <p>It will :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide a top-class facility to club members, the wider local population and local schools for hockey and other team sports. - Encourage physical and mental benefits of playing team sports in many generations, of both children, men and women, and will build a new community in the club and other users by locating the clubhouse in the same location as the pitch. - Provide the required AstroTurf as a playing surface as required by England hockey rules to allow the viability of the club. <p>There will be little effect from the essential floodlighting as modern technology is proposed during limited evening hours. There are few residential properties that could be affected and secluded the location is well back from the main road which contains in contrast a very brightly light large car showroom.</p> <p>The AstroTurf pitches will not cover all the current grass playing fields and a balance in disturbing any wildlife appears considerate. There has been much work to minimise any effect on the AONB, it has been appropriately considered. There have been some comments about the access, but the lane has several car passing points, plenty of space for pedestrians, and there is no objection to access from the A4251 from the Highways Agency.</p>

<p>Highway Upper Icknield Way Bulbourne Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QF</p>	<p>My father played hockey for Berkhamsted and in 1976 took me to junior training at the Cow Roast . 44 years later I am still playing there together with my wife , daughter and son (both of whom represent Hertfordshire at county level) . Hockey is one of the very few if not only team sports that is open to all members of the family with most clubs having a mens and ladies section .</p> <p>In the 1980's and early 90's hockey was played on grass with the club regularly hosting 6 home games - that's at least 144 players and umpires all playing at 2 p.m. on a Saturday afternoon . The lane to the club coped with this level of traffic and to the best of my knowledge there were no accidents at the junction with the A4251 even though it was a national speed limit through Cow Roast then.</p> <p>The 90's saw the arrival of all weather pitches and it is now a league requirement for most teams to play on artificial pitches. this has massively affected the club with home games being at either Tring School ,RAF Halton (Bucks) or Meadowcroft in Aylesbury (Bucks) . The Tring pitch is in poor condition and there is no guarantee that it will be relaid with a surface suitable for hockey. RAF Halton is closing and their pitch's future is uncertain . This could potentially leave Meadowcroft in Aylesbury 9 30 min. drive on a Saturday) as our home pitch , this would have to be shared with Aylesbury HC and Tring HC . This scenario could well spell the end of a club with over 100 years of history . Even the loss of one of either Tring or Halton would also be catastrophic. It will be too late to act once these pitches have gone .</p>
<p>10 Murray Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1JD</p>	<p>Having played most of my youth hockey at BHHHC, I felt that the lack of pitch at the clubhouse grounds impacted young players' desire to join the club. Training late in the evening and travelling a long distance to matches would discourage new players from joining the club. If the hockey club was to have a pitch at the clubhouse, which is ideally located between Tring and Berkhamsted, it would not only motivate new members with a smaller distance to travel, but would improve the community feeling of the club as players would be more likely to stay and socialise after training, or watch other teams in training or matches. Overall this new pitch would provide a much more appealing club to join as well as providing other sports clubs in the community a more local area to use.</p>
<p>44 normandy road St. Albans Al3 5pw</p>	<p>This would be a massive improvement for the sporting community in Berkhamstead and outer areas such as St. Albans.</p> <p>Berko hockey club already hosts positive community building and fund raising events such as the summer tour and summer league.</p> <p>A home pitch would be a welcome addition for the club as this</p>

	<p>would encourage many to stay in the area as they could join the club without having to travel for a home match.</p> <p>I really do hope this is approved as it is a fantastic idea with great potential to inject new life into sports in Berko.</p>
<p>306 Hatfield Road St Albans AL1 4un</p>	<p>Much needed faculty for the area.</p>
<p>80-82 High Street Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2BW</p>	<p>A very popular local club, and social hub, in Berkhamsted that is only missing one thing - a local pitch!</p>
<p>The Long Barn Home Farm Nettleden Road Little Gaddesden Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1PN</p>	<p>Having an artificial pitch at Berkhamsted Hockey is really important for the local community. There are already insufficient artificial pitches for the numerous football teams in the area, and hockey does not have one at all. The junior section of the club is growing quickly at the moment. All the teams that the juniors play against have access to artificial pitches and given the space available at Cow Roast, it seems an ideal location for Berkhamsted to have their own. For future generations of hockey players it is really important this project is given the go ahead. We fully support it.</p>
<p>62 Abingdon Road Oxford OX1 4PE</p>	<p>This is an important project which will help to support and promote outdoor time, physical exercise, and community building in the local area. I have had the good fortune of participating in events run by the Berkhamstead Hockey club before, and loved the positive, inclusive atmosphere they foster. Without this project, there would be no modern astroturf pitch in the local area, spelling the end of hockey in Dacorum at a time when we need to be supporting and promoting local community activities and healthy, outdoor, sporting activities. I am aware of objections to the project on the basis of the floodlights, but am assured by the fact that high-spec LED lamps will be used, and that the lights will be lower than adjacent trees. Although the pitch is technically in an AONB, the location is within 300m of the A41, and the development would not compromise the beauty of the area in my opinion. This strikes me as being an important, positive project, and I hope that planning permission is granted for it to go ahead.</p>
<p>1 Hythe Way Broughton Gate Milton Keynes MK107AW</p>	<p>Berkhamsted Hockey Club is and has always been a family club.</p> <p>Our members range from beginners, our youngest start at year two in the tigers, to the academy players from year five upwards. Many of our members are hockey playing families with the mums and dads also in the adult teams.</p> <p>To enable the club to continue to thrive the pitch is desperately needed given the lack of facilities in Dacorum for hockey.</p>

	<p>Since the women's Olympic gold medal win in 2016 there has been huge interest in the game. The club already has great links with the local schools and colleges, the pitch would allow this to continue and attract more people and families into the game.</p> <p>With regards of the location of the pitch, its is proposed to be positioned as far as possible away from the houses located on the old A41. It will also be obscured by a long tree line which has been measured at 18m high. The proposal will require six lighting poles 15m high.</p> <p>The lighting from the pitch and effect on local housing will be very minimal when compared with the existing A41 Commercials Garage, which is in direct site line of many of the houses on old A41 which has also flood lighting for its forecourt .</p>
<p>11 Cowper Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3DE</p>	<p>I have been a member of BHHHC for over twenty years. I learnt to play the game with adults on the grass pitches at Cow Roast (now considered too dangerous for league hockey). Were I a junior now, I would benefit from professional coaching, though still play on inadequate facilities. This artificial pitch is vital for the long-term health of the club and the youth and senior members and the local population who would have access.</p> <p>As the junior coordinator at neighbouring Northchurch Cricket Club, I meet a lot of children in our partner schools who are desperate for sport but do not have access to good coaching and facilities. My assessment is that there is a desperate need for a facility like this.</p> <p>Environmental concerns are valid but perhaps do not consider that players on the nine senior teams currently play all 'home' matches up to seven miles from the club, then return after games to shower and socialise. Having the facility to play hockey at the hockey club would not only mean the ground is used for the purpose that it is designated but also eliminate thousands of road miles every year. This would surely offset any adverse environmental impact of the facility, especially considering the net-zero CO2 emission plans.</p> <p>Concerns about light pollution are unfounded, as the modern flood lights will leak very little, especially in contract to the light already emitted from the neighbouring BMW and Esso garages.</p> <p>As a lover of the outdoors and walking my dog in the local area, I was pleased to see that the pitch would be sensitively located adjacent to the A41 and surrounded by the tallest trees in the ground. The visual impact on the area will be minimal.</p>

	<p>Overall, I wholeheartedly support the plans and dearly hope that they will be approved.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>6 Vicarage Gardens Potten End Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2RL</p>	<p>I enthusiastically support the development of an Astroturf at Cow Roast. I believe this development is long overdue and its absence has threatened the sport of hockey over the last few years. Hockey is a family sport. At Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey club, there are large numbers of male, female and youth hockey players who for years have been under-served. 5 mens' teams and 4 ladies' teams play every week during the season (a large membership) and mixed hockey is played throughout the summer with the youngsters.</p> <p>Huge efforts are made to encourage young players into the sport, and we do our best training our youth at small and tired neighbouring astroturfs but all other facilities in the surrounding area are not usable for hockey, with the exception of Tring, which is in need of replacement and Halton, which may not exist in a few months' time. There is sufficient appetite for hockey in Berkhamsted alone to warrant the building of such an astroturf. Look further afield and we would be providing a top-class facility to hundreds and giving local schools the potential access to a surface that could support their playing of hockey and other team sports.</p> <p>Please consider this excellent proposal positively so that many boys, girls, men and women, from Berkhamsted and the surrounding towns, will be able to continue to play hockey together and develop this family-centric club.</p>
<p>10 Murray Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1JD</p>	<p>Having played hockey for close to 40 years, it has been fantastic to see how the game has changed and in some parts of the Country and County, how Clubs have been able to develop too. However it is high time Berkhamsted were permitted to build an Astro as part of both development of the sport (remember the London Olympics legacy?), development of a community facility and help support the well being and health of our children for generations to come. Hockey has to be one of the most inclusive of sports with the opportunity for Fathers to play alongside Sons, Mothers with Daughters as well as in Mixed competitions, everyone of all ages and abilities.</p> <p>I therefore wholeheartedly support this development given the huge benefits it will bring to the community and the club and to this part of the County.</p>
<p>Larkspur 3 Glovers Lane Tring Hertfordshire</p>	<p>I wholeheartedly support this application</p> <p>There are few sports where players both male and female can and do continue to actively participate playing competitive physical sport from childhood until well into retirement. Hockey is</p>

<p>HP23 4AL</p>	<p>however one of those sports. Berkhamsted Hockey Club who make this application presently struggle to provide adequate playing and training facilities for all sections of their large membership from young school children to pensioners. There are simply not sufficient hockey suitable artificial pitches in Dacorum. There is only one at Tring School which is in urgent need of refurbishment and where its future for hockey its uncertain. The club is forced to play matches at RAF Halton where once again the future of the pitch is uncertain and Aylesbury. One season I recall having to play "home " matches as far away as Dunstable I am a playing member of Berkhamsted Hockey Club and have been for almost 50 years When I first joined the club there was no such thing as astro turf and all games were played on grass there were 4 grass pitches increasing to 6 by 1979 all in use each Saturday for competitive matches .Those grass pitches can no longer be used for anything other than noncompetitive hockey and other sports the club must therefore hire pitches each week not only for games but for training and youth hockey coaching which is stifling further development and bringing even more people into the sport By allowing this application you will be creating the opportunity for the sport for all ages to continue to flourish in Dacorum.</p>
<p>90B Branksome Road Brixton London SW2 5Ja</p>	<p>I fully support BHHHC in their application to get a floodlit Astro. This club has had a huge impact on my life and I would love to see it grow and succeed. The benefits of hockey go far beyond improved physical health, it has given me life skills such as showing me what commitment is, the benefits of team work and leadership skills to name a few. All have these have helped me enter the working world with confidence. With this Astro, I can see the club growing and being able to support many more people in a similar manner. There are many committed members of this club, including a hugely supportive committee, who would not let such a fantastic facility go to waste. So many people of all ages would benefit. I am definitely in support of this Astro to give BHHHC the home it deserves, and needs, in order to achieve its potential as a club.</p>
<p>53 Longfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DF</p>	<p>This is a needed plan of action for BHHHC! They have no home hockey astro which makes it very difficult and confusing to new players and opposition. It would be a great addition to the club and a well used astro</p>
<p>31 Bridgewater Road</p>	<p>The projected residential growth set out in the Local Plan should</p>

<p>Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1HN</p>	<p>be supported by a commensurate increase in leisure and sporting facilities, not least given the associated impact on physical and mental health in the community. Whilst astro facilities for football are available locally, facilities for hockey (requiring a different pitch surface) are disproportionately limited (see Sports Provisioning Report). I am not a hockey player but I know this to be a welcoming club serving around 250 members - men, women and children - and growing fast (for example from a handful of junior members there years ago to around 100 now). The reach of the club extends from Tring through Berkhamsted, to Hemel Hempstead and the surrounding areas, such that this facility could benefit a range of communities. Access to astros at Halton is under threat and, in any event, that is quite some distance from the Hemel side of the club base. The proposed site location allows an astro to be tucked away from residentially dense areas as well as providing main road access. An astro is vital to host matches and permit training at the club's site in wet weather. There is a clear need for hockey facilities in this part of Dacorum and I fully support this application.</p>
<p>80 High St Girton cb3 0ql</p>	<p>I regularly come to play at the Berkhamsted Hockey club, and have found it to be a thriving and popular club. Nevertheless, the hockey club is confronted by the lack of guaranteed availability of pitches, or guaranteed quality of surface of the pitches because of the variable weather conditions. Having the artificial surface will be a significant improvement to the club and all the people associated. In fact I think I am right in saying that this will be only the second artificial surface in the area. It will be important to have the floodlights to ensure optimal usage of the pitch throughout the season, as we have done recently in Cambridge, and this has been a huge success, allowing the use of the pitch throughout the week. The location of the pitch, close to a major road and garages, means that there will be only a minimal visible impact in the AONB. The planning application also ensures that the height of the floodlights (15m) is unlikely to cause light issues to neighbours if the surrounding trees are 18m high</p>
<p>4 Jacobs Villas Gossoms End Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1DD</p>	<p>I strongly support this application. The hockey club does not currently have its own Astro and this is vital to ensure its long term survival. It will also bring many benefits to the local community of all ages.</p>
<p>83 Deaconsfield Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 9JA</p>	<p>this would be a great opportunity to offer a playing area/ space that is currently lacking in the community.</p>
<p>1 The Orchards Tring Hertfordshire</p>	<p>The hockey club is a community run club to benefit the direct community. As a primary school teacher in the local community I can acknowledge the need for facilities such as this to support the</p>

HP23 4DZ	<p>development of extra curricular sport as well as core physical education in schools. The club has offered extensive support to schools in the community and will be able to extend the offer with this new facility. With its members living in the close community they understand and appreciate the potential issues and will always strive to mitigate them to the best of their ability. Especially now having been through a period of national lockdown the development of sporting facilities in the community like this are becoming even more important. The club is committed to its youth development, an area in need of support post-covid. Fitness and sports have been identified as a key factor in the mental health of young children and a significant rise in the mental health needs is expected post-covid. This is a project the club have been working towards for a long time and is a positive to bring the club and community out of a terrible few months.</p>
<p>Ashlyns School Chesham Road Berkhamsted HP4 3AH</p>	<p>Supporting comment from Ashlyns School: I am writing to support BHHHC's application for planning permission for a new floodlit AGP at their site in Cow Roast. In addition to providing vital pitches for hockey teams, this site currently provides space for rugby and football teams in the surrounding areas. We are aware of the critical lack of playing field space in Dacorum (most recently highlighted in DBC's Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report).</p> <p>Ashlyns School is a secondary school in Berkhamsted with over 1300 students on roll. Participation in sport is a vital part of our school's vision. Participation in team sports is extremely high, with students representing the school and many other local clubs. We make our school's excellent facilities available to as many local clubs as possible, but we are only too aware that the local demand outstrips the supply. This will surely be exacerbated by the extensive development planned in the borough.</p> <p>The proposed new local facility would offer essential space and opportunities which will benefit our students now and will help to future-proof our community's engagement with sport.</p>
<p>The Wolds Station Road Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QU</p>	<p>Securing another local astro is an existential issue for hockey in the area: If we lost access to either Tring or Halton it would be impossible to sustain the many teams of men, women and children currently enjoying the game. Halton is going to be redeveloped and the new development may not include a hockey astro. Tring is a terrible surface that will need to be replaced in the near future.</p>
<p>31 Kings Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire</p>	<p>I strongly support this application. Berkhamsted Hockey Club would thrive with an artificial pitch and as there are so few facilities in the area it is essential that Dacorum invests and</p>

HP4 3BH	supports improved facilities. This will not only encourage improved hockey but will also encourage community sport and outdoor fitness for a variety of people. It is a long overdue facility!!
10 Liberty Close Hertford SG13 8JY	<p>As chair of another Hockey Club in the County I understand the difficulties in ensuring clubs have appropriate playing surfaces.</p> <p>I fully support this development, not just for the club but also for Hockey in general. We need more clubs to have their own facilities</p>
39 Kitsbury Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3EA	<p>I'd like to voice strong support for this initiative. The BHHHC sports ground has an ideal setup for playing hockey, however unfortunately the nature of this sport is no longer grass based in a competitive context, and yet grass fields are the only facilities available at this club. This means players have to travel to neighbouring towns to use paid facilities elsewhere, reducing sporting participation from less avid players than myself, and making the BHHHC club harder to run as a family operation as players are spread across multiple venues. Introducing an astro in Cow Roast would improve the county's strength and performance in Hockey generally, and as the BHHHC club runs hockey for all ages from youth through to walking hockey for older generations, beginners or injury rehabilitators, I'd welcome the impact this has on our towns and their populations.</p>
18 Montague Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3DS	<p>I started to play hockey as a child at Thomas Bourne and Ashlyns Schools in Berkhamsted, I am now 56 and I still play. I play for the love of the game, fitness, competitive fun and for the pleasure of being part of a team. My current team is made up of girls as young as 13 up to the oldest player of 61. Sport often provides a unique opportunity to participate and socialise with people of a range of age and background, with benefits to all the different individuals. BHHHC is particularly good for girls because it allows players of all ability to take part and for that time there is complete freedom from the social pressure to adhere to a certain look (no one looks 'good' in a gum shield and shin pads) and the game encourages girls to be fit, bold, strong and determined.</p> <p>I regret that my children did not get to try hockey at Ashlyns School because of a lack of facilities for their generation. As a result my sons play other sports, but my daughter at age 25 doesn't play any team sports. Facilities for hockey are known to be poor and therefore access is poor to just try out the sport or indeed for us to play regularly. One of our 'home' pitches is in Aylesbury and the one in Tring is in a dilapidated state. The old, very rigid surface is harsh on joints and the sand on the top causes nasty abrasions on contact. Training is also difficult as we are often left with slots that don't really suit the players due to</p>

	<p>other bookings of the astro.</p> <p>So I really do support this application. Firstly because we should be doing everything possible to encourage activity for health and fitness in this current age of ill health as a result of sedentary lifestyle and obesity. But also because facilities and resources for sports traditionally directed at boys eg football, cricket and rugby outstrip those more directed at girls. New astros built in the area in the past have been ones only suitable for football and not hockey.</p> <p>BHHHC is a mixed club in ability, age and importantly gender. We definitely need to do more to encourage participation of girls in team sports so they may have an opportunity to derive the benefits I have experienced over my lifetime.</p>
<p>23 Millfield Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2PB</p>	<p>Would be hugely beneficial to the community and the development of sport.</p> <p>I have played for the club on an ad hoc basis but have been put off playing more regularly because the distance to train and play. Having a local pitch would enable me and my family to okay more regularly and help the community side of the club, as the club house would become part of the playing experience. I strongly support the proposal.</p>
<p>6 Barberry Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1SD</p>	<p>I support the application for Artificial Games Pitch/ Multi Use Games Area with Fencing and floodlighting at Berkhamsted Hockey Club Tring Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RF. The building of a hockey club astro is essential to the survival of the club as league games must be played on this surface.</p>
<p>154 Bridgewater Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1EE</p>	<p>I enthusiastically support the development of an AGP facility at Cow Roast. As a hockey player myself of many years standing, I believe this development is long overdue and its absence has threatened the sport of hockey in this area.</p> <p>Hockey is a family sport and can be played at almost any age and thus it can provide the exercise and social integration that many feel are being lost in our society.</p> <p>At Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey club, there are large numbers of male, female and youth hockey players who for years have been under-served. 5 mens' teams and 4 ladies' teams play every week during the season (a large membership) as well as youth coaching and fixtures, normally on Sundays. Mixed hockey is played throughout the summer with all ages and genders playing.</p> <p>Huge efforts are made to encourage young players into the sport, and the club does its best to train the youth members at a small odd-shaped neighbouring artificial pitch. The other facilities in the surrounding area are not usable for hockey, with the exception of Tring, which is in need of replacement and Halton, which may not</p>

	<p>exist in a few months' time, and, in any event, have to be shared with other clubs. It should be noted that the hockey governing bodies only permits competitive hockey to be played on an AGP, not on grass. There is sufficient appetite for hockey in Berkhamsted alone to warrant the building of such an astroturf. In addition the club would be providing a top-class facility for hundreds and giving local schools the potential access to a surface that could support their playing of hockey and other team sports.</p> <p>I consider this to be an excellent proposal that will enable many adults and children from Berkhamsted and the surrounding towns to continue to play hockey together thus helping the health and well-being of the community as well as developing this family-centric club.</p>
<p>2 Harkness Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5GX</p>	<p>I play rugby for Berkhamstead Rugby Club. We are based at the hockey club. We train and have all of our home games at Lockhart field. The hockey club play their games and train off site which is madness. An astroturf pitch would be outstanding not just for the club now but for all those local dacorum residents that will utilise the space. It will essentially be an all weather all round sports facility for the community.</p> <p>It will not affect drainage. Trust me I have played rugby on that field for 7 years and the pitch has never flooded. It is the only pitch that was playable in Hertfordshire 3 years ago when everywhere and I mean everywhere was flooded.</p> <p>The land is managed with the environment in mind and always will be by the clubs based there.</p> <p>Flood lighting is so well deloped these days that its light pollution would be minimal and Im sure the club will have a lights off policy so as not to interrupt.</p> <p>In these times we need as many oeole as possible to keeo fit and healthy. This facility will help that cause.</p>
<p>9 - 10 Akeman Street Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6AA</p>	<p>Sporting activities make a vital contribution to the wellbeing of communities. This well thought out and sustainable scheme should be permitted.</p>
<p>43 Hillfield Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 4AB</p>	<p>Two generations and several members of our family have been extremely fortunate to have had the opportunity to play hockey with BHHHC for the last 25 years. I wholeheartedly support the development of an Astroturf Pitch at Cow Roast. This development is long overdue and the club's lack of access to a fit for purpose astroturf pitch is detrimental to the development and demands of a growing club, its members and the evolution of hockey as an all inclusive sport for children, ladies and men of all ages. The addition of an astroturf pitch on site with essential</p>

	<p>floodlighting will allow all year round community access including during the winter months. The main league hockey season spans September to April. Modern low level lighting technologies will ensure that the impact on the environment and on local residents will be minimal.</p> <p>Having a state of the art astroturf pitch in the Dacorum area will not only ensure that BHHHC can compete with neighbouring modern hockey clubs but also service the current and future demand from the Berkhamsted, Hemel Hempstead and Tring area.</p>
<p>29 Park Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6BN</p>	<p>Having lived and coached hockey in this area for 20 years this development would have huge benefits not just for the hockey club but also for the local community. It will help reduce the carbon footprint by cutting travelling time to external venues, increase child participation in exercise and can be sub-letted out to support local charities and the like in the area.</p> <p>Personally, having coached boys and girls in Berkhamsted over the last 20 years this pitch is also well needed. I work at Berkhamsted School and although the Club do use our 'L' shaped astro it is not fit for purpose anymore as the interest and numbers of those playing hockey in the area has grown. We have had to travel 'away' to matches in all my time at school and the local pitch at RAF Halton looks like it will disappear soon as well.</p> <p>It isn't just hockey that would benefit as well. Youth obesity rates are on the rise and to have another 'outdoor' space for the local community to use is of paramount importance. Such facilities can promote exercise and not just hockey.</p> <p>Having been part of the Club for a number of years this would also leave a brilliant foundation for the future. The recent Covid 19 outbreak has left a number of sports clubs on their knees but this small but well supported Club can leave a legacy for the near future and continue to support many a generation of family in the future.</p>
<p>6 Ashlyns Court Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3BU</p>	<p>As a member of Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club since 1979 (when hockey was played on grass!), I strongly support the proposals for an artificial playing surface at the club's Cow Roast site.</p> <p>It would be an important landmark in the long history of the hockey club and crucial for its future development, particularly its' burgeoning youth section. It would also be a much needed asset for Dacorum and the surrounding area.</p> <p>The club has always enjoyed a good relationship with the local community and has made every effort to minimize the impact by</p>

	<p>positioning the pitch as far away as possible from residents and planning to use the most up-to-date lighting systems.</p> <p>I trust you can see the benefits of this proposal to very many people and hope you will look upon it positively.</p>
<p>87 Cross Oak Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3HZ</p>	<p>I strongly support this application and think it would be so beneficial for the community. We have no astro for anything else other than football and for those children that don't like football they miss out terribly as there aren't the facilities locally.</p> <p>My Son has been part of The Berkhamsted Hockey Club for 2 years now and I joined last October as it's a real family club. I can wholeheartedly say it's been amazing, We are able to travel to training on Monday but for many children this is not possible and if we had a local pitch it would make it much more accessible.</p> <p>Hockey is a great family sport, the coaches and club mix young and old, experienced and inexperienced and it's been brilliant at supporting our son and giving him a positive experience of sport. It's been so beneficial for his confidence - kept him fit - made him realise that he did like sport as the only thing on offer was football.</p> <p>It would be an amazing thing to have locally and would benefit the whole community. Please do allow this artificial pitch.</p> <p>Thanks very much Emma Ayres</p>
<p>7 Ryder Close Bovingdon Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0HZ</p>	<p>This will be a great asset to the community and area, which in turn will generate more income to better the facilities at the club.</p>
<p>The Dairy 4 Hastoe Farm Barns Gadmore Lane Hastoe Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6QS</p>	<p>I would like to register my support for this fantastic scheme which will clearly promote the growth and sustainability of BHHHC with significant additional benefits to the wider community of schools and sports clubs who will use these facilities.</p> <p>The conversion to all weather, mixed use artificial grass pitches will provide year round access to a fantastic surface and will promote sports and other activities at all levels within Dacorum and the surrounding areas. Indeed, the sheer number of local school, sports and community institutions that have registered their clear support is testament to the considerable and widespread benefit these facilities will create.</p> <p>As always, however, there is a balance that needs to be</p>

	<p>considered between protecting an AONB and the the inevitable needs of the wider community.</p> <p>The pitches are already utilised for hockey and whilst usage will undoubtedly increase (that's the point) precedent exists in terms of traffic, lighting and the like.</p> <p>The site itself is located between the main road and the A41 (the proposed pitches are about 200m from the bypass), behind a derelict pub and across the road from 2 car dealerships and the railway line. It seems unlikely, therefore, that these facilities will substantially increase the existing noise and light pollution in the immediate area or irreparably damage the aesthetic of the surrounding area.</p> <p>The proposed AGPs appear to have been located as remotely as they can within the club's grounds as to minimise any potential impact on the locality although, in reality, the site is extremely remote anyway.</p> <p>On balance, these appear to be thoughtfully created plans that will add significant benefit to the wider area with minimal impact on the existing area and population and I would urge the council to approve this application as soon as possible.</p>
<p>5 Grosvenor Terrace Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1QJ</p>	<p>I have been a member of Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club for 29 years and have been waiting for the development of the AstroTurf on our grounds. This will be an amazing local facility for sport and it will help people of all ages become active in such glorious grounds. The planning has thoroughly been thought through for many years and I now think it is a necessity. There is clearly a lack of sport provision and suitable hockey pitches reported in Dacorum. The local Astro in Tring is worn out and needs much maintenance and the other Astro in Halton is due to be sold to another developer.</p> <p>I can't stress enough the importance of the club providing this amazing opportunity. Please think clearly about supporting the planning for this to go ahead.</p>
<p>9 siskin grove Leighton buzzard Lu7 4dq</p>	<p>We have used the facilities for a number of community activities offered by Berkhamsted and Hemel Hockey Club. It is a fantastic community, offering wonderful and competitive opportunities for our children and we feel an astro will only enhance the community services already offered by the club. We are passionate about hockey and feel this club is so focussed and dedicated to the development and general well-being of children with the variety of sports and activities offered. We are concerned that without an astro, we are running out of pitch access within the area and no where to play hockey. It is an all-inclusive sport</p>

	<p>that we are all able to participate in as a family. Hockey has given us a family far from our families and a caring and active community to be part of.</p> <p>I am in full support. It unites communities and families. My whole family has been part of this wonderful club for 7 years now where we can participate in sport and social events as a family. The club is so inclusive with access to fantastic coaches and dedicated members. However, the lack of suitable facilities to play is threatening progression and the future of hockey in our community. My daughter plays for the youth section and has made wonderful friends. I am concerned that as she develops, we would have to consider surrounding clubs in other boroughs as access to suitable playing pitches for training and tournaments are just essential in progression to more competitive levels.</p> <p>I am perplexed as to why this has not happened as yet, considering the positive impact Berkhamsted and Hemel Hockey Club has had in the local community. Please do not delay this process any longer and support the progression of sports and community activities for our children.</p>
<p>Wardscoombe Main Road North BERKHAMSTED HP4 1RE</p>	<p>The lack of a full-sized, local hockey pitch has been a major disadvantage for hockey in the Berkhamsted area. The school and club would both benefit massively and help broaden the appeal of hockey to the wider community. The popularity of hockey is not replicated around Berkhamsted due to the lack of facilities, a new astro will help to change this and encourage more local people to participate.</p>
<p>156A harpenden road St Albans AL3 6bz</p>	<p>I very much support the building of this facility, artificial surfaces like these are essential in providing all year round sport and exercise to local communities and all age groups. Travelling long distance should not be required to access this capability, its imperative young people have easy access to develop into a healthy life long passion of competitive and community sport, often travel can block this. Berkhamsted hockey club has a long history of providing community based competitive sport, with a strong emphasis on enjoyment and building relationships, this would provide a wonderful opportunity to expand on this giving greater access to the larger community. I played at Berkhamsted hockey from the age of 5 to 17, and still have long lasting memories of the people that influenced by life.</p>
<p>107 Sheldon Way Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1FG</p>	<p>Berkhamsted Hockey Club would benefit significantly from an astro turf on their grounds at the Cow Roast. The club has been running for over 100 years and needs to be able to accommodate modern day hockey. There are very few astro turfs in the area and Halton will not be around for very much longer - it would benefit the community and be a future asset for many sports as there are football and rugby teams and junior hockey all likely to benefit. The local team need</p>

	to be able to play hockey in their local area.
27 Hall Park Gate Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2NL	I am a huge supporter of these plans. There are insufficient publicly accessible facilities in the local area and these facilities massively enrich the lives of a wide proportion of the community. I can't comment positively enough - these plans should definitely be approved!
31 North Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3DU	<p>In a town full of playing fields belonging to Berkhamsted School, this would be a tremendous asset to the people of Berkhamsted who currently have no access to such great facilities. I believe the intention is to allow local schools access to both the Astro and hockey training if built. Unfortunately the days of grass hockey are pretty much over with our school saying they wanted to teach hockey but can't as "we don't have access to an Astro pitch".</p> <p>If there are any concerns about the pitch being built in the proposed location then I would like to highlight that Berkhamsted School has been permitted to build and develop both within the local conservation area and at their Haresfoot site which is on green belt land.</p> <p>My daughter has played with the youth hockey side for 18 months and had found some amazing friends and a sport she adores. Not granting permission would mean the club must continue paying to rent facilities elsewhere - including Tring - meaning it's hardly local!</p>
3 Bury Hill Close Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1SS	<p>I feel an astro pitch for BHHHC is very overdue and is vital for the survival of the club. Personally I left the club a few years ago as the travel to 'home' games in Aylesbury and training in RAF Halton was unworkable with a busy job and young family. I know other people have been in the same situation too.</p> <p>Asto pitches are in higher and higher demand now so this would be an excellent contribution to the community as a whole, as well as just the club. It seems to me the distance from, and protecting tree line in between, would screen the houses from the majority of the lights. Also the traffic should remain fairly similar as home games would travel back to the clubhouse after the matches anyway.</p> <p>Change is not always a good thing but when it's for the better, it surely cannot be obstructed. The future of a community club that has served the local people for many, many years depends upon it.</p>
The Cottage Cross Oak Road	I Strongly support the development of the Artificial sports pitch with floodlights at Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey

<p>Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3NA</p>	<p>Club. The Dacorum Sports report highlighted that there are insufficient facilities for hockey in the local area, and none of the them are owned by a Hockey Club.</p> <p>The nearest artificial pitch is at Tring, which is used by 2 hockey clubs and desperately needs re-carpeting and the next one is out of County and shared by 3 hockey clubs.</p> <p>It is Imperative that we support a greater access to a wider variety of sports that people of all ages can play and with the GB women defending their gold medal at the Olympics next year the need for a pitch to support the development of our younger players is more important than ever.</p>
<p>6 Crossways Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3NH</p>	<p>As an ex Divisional, County and National League player, when my top level career ended at the age of 33, I joined BHHHC. During the subsequent years I had th epleasure of playing for one of the best and most respected clubs in the South East. The only thing that really held the club back was the lack of its own facilities, and typically the best young players that BHHHC had developed, or had moved to the area, went to the likes of St Albans or Southgate to continue their careers.</p> <p>Whilst playing for Slough I had seen the likes or Reading, Canterbury, Cannock and Surbiton all rise to the top becuae they had the facilities and infrastructure to attract the best players and creates the most rubust and sustainable sports environment.</p> <p>Conversely, whilst at Slough the hockey, cricket and bowls club had the opportunity to sell their grass pitches close to the town centre, and the hockey section could and would have had enough money (£2m in 1992!) to build their own club with two water based astroturf pitches. It didn't happen as the bowls club lacked the vision and blocked the sale for another 6 years by which time the land was worth 10% or its previous value. Slough continue to share a poor quality municipal pitch, the key players left and Slough went from being Eurpean Champions to a lower level club.</p> <p>If BHHHC were to have it's own high quality astorturf, with the ownership of the land, the great central location and catchment area for local schools (including Berkhamsted School which I understand has removed hockey form its curriculum as it doesn't have an astroturf pitch on which to play) and the strong management team in place, I have no doubt that it would become a force to reckon with.</p> <p>Perfectly placed between London and the strong teams in the midlands, there is no doubt the club would attract some great talent and coaches, and soon be pushing for National League status - as well as catering to the strong existing base of up to 8 teams each weekend.</p> <p>I urge anyone considering this application to focus on the huge range of positives for the community, with no adverse impact on the beautiful natural sporting environment in which it is located.</p>

<p>Dunedin Chesham Road Wigginton Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6JE</p>	<p>It's fantastic that Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club have requested planning permission for a new floodlit Artificial Grass Pitch.</p> <p>This pitch will fundamentally improve the provision of leisure facilities in the borough for generations to come, offering an inclusive environment, benefiting our citizens, and enhancing the community.</p> <p>I encourage the council to support this application.</p>
<p>250 Kingston Road Teddington Teddington TW11 9JF</p>	<p>I am responsible for running Teddington Hockey Club, the oldest hockey club in the world, based in South West London.</p> <p>The issue facing all hockey clubs is access to pitches especially on weekday evenings to allow for training for weekend matches. Without lighting pitches are of limited value to clubs as hockey is a winter sport and many members work elsewhere and need to travel after work to training.</p> <p>Flood lights have a bad reputation due to the poor quality of many of the existing lighting installations. Modern lighting is completely different being highly directional and producing limited glare.</p> <p>Hockey Clubs are unusual in that they provide a sports environment open to both junior boys and girls and adult men and women. Sports clubs promote health and wellbeing and encourage people to look after themselves and be active. With hockey this is possible well into middle age - at our club three of our adult ladies teams are based around 'back-to-hockey' mums. Development of lights on this site will allow people to do more for longer and allow Berkhamsted Hockey Club to play an even bigger part in the local community.</p> <p>I therefore fully support this application.</p> <p>Tim Malthouse Club Captain Teddington Hockey Club</p>
<p>1 The Oaks Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3JN</p>	<p>We support the application as this will be an important improved amenity for young people's sporting activities and support healthy exercise and team working.</p>
<p>15 Charles Street Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3DG</p>	<p>This is an extremely sensible initiative and has by full support and backing. It would allow the Hockey Club all year round use of this important training and sporting facility. The improvement to the pitch quality will help promote healthy activity in the community, enhancing the opportunity to develop sporting skills and sporting</p>

	<p>teamwork all year round. The reduced upkeep and durability of the artificial surface will ensure a good quality and safe surface for a variety of different initiatives.</p>
<p>98 Western Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4BJ</p>	<p>I thoroughly support this application. As a family of four that all enjoy team/ social sports I think this application is fantastic.</p> <p>In this area the facilities to play hockey have declined in the last few years dramatically, with the removal or redevelopment of most of the hockey pitches, hockey can not be played on football astros as some people seem to think.</p> <p>The proposed sight is far from the houses within the area, so any impact will not realistically change.</p> <p>The benefits of a pitch that can be used all year will be huge and have a very positive effect on the local and wider community. It will support and promote health and fitness. It will encourage people of all ages to play a sport and be part of a club, things that have a very positive effect on our wellbeing both physically and mentally.</p> <p>The site has good access and plenty of land to support this development. It has been thoroughly thought out with much consideration to its impact on the environment and surrounding properties.</p> <p>The proposed development would provide an impressive sports legacy for many generations to come, a flagship development to be proud of within the borough.</p>
<p>Felden Meadow Longcroft Lane Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0BN</p>	<p>Much need local facility which will improve the facilities offered to children in the area and active members of the community. Appropriate use of the land and full supportive of the well thought through planning application.</p> <p>Much needed local facility from a community minded club. Huge benefit to local children and those looking to continue with this hugely popular sport. I am supportive of this well thought through proposal.</p>
<p>Hatherley 16 Meadway Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2PN</p>	<p>It is important that this application be granted to ensure the future of the hockey club that has a history of providing sporting facilities for more than 100 years. In recent years this has been dependent on third party astroturf pitch providers and hence the ability of the club to field its teams each year is precariously poised on the availability of these pitches. The future of the pitches that are currently used is uncertain and so therefore is the future of the club. This application will enable the club to continue to operate and also extend its ability to attract and engage more youngsters in the sport (at the same time helping the Local Authority discharge its obligations to ensure sporting facility provision). As many others have commented, the club makes a great contribution to the community and to regional hockey and having its own astroturf pitch will ensure that it can continue to do so into the future and also expand that positive community impact even</p>

	<p>more widely.</p>
<p>Sherwood Drive Tring Bletchley MK3 6EB</p>	<p>I fully support the application for an Astro turf at Cow Roast. When assessing the opportunities for hokcey in the local area there is a clear need for a facility that can support the current and future demand of a growing hokcey club, which BHHHC clearly is. Having played hockey in a number of countries, I'm of the opinion that there is no room for growth with the current quality, location and amount of pitches in the the area surrounding Cow Roast.</p> <p>Looking at the wider trend in the UK, we see that obesity and lack of outside excercise is becoming a growing problem, not only amongst our ageing population, but moreover with the younger brackets. A multifunctional Astro turf can support a wide variety of needs, and floodlighting will allow for this to continue year-round, allowing for all age groups to participate in the sport of hockey, and counter these negative trends.</p> <p>My feeling therefore is that the current proposal will support the growth and health of the local population, and should therefore by accepted rather sooner than later.</p> <p>I fully support the application for an Astro turf at Cow Roast. When assessing the opportunities for hokcey in the local area there is a clear need for a facility that can support the current and future demand of a growing hokcey club, which BHHHC clearly is. Having played hockey in a number of countries, I'm of the opinion that there is no room for growth with the current quality, location and amount of pitches in the the area surrounding Cow Roast.</p> <p>Looking at the wider trend in the UK, we see that obesity and lack of outside excercise is becoming a growing problem, not only amongst our ageing population, but moreover with the younger brackets. A multifunctional Astro turf can support a wide variety of needs, and floodlighting will allow for this to continue year-round, allowing for all age groups to participate in the sport of hockey, and counter these negative trends.</p> <p>My feeling therefore is that the current proposal will support the growth and health of the local population, and should therefore by accepted rather sooner than later.</p> <p>I fully support the application for an Astro turf at Cow Roast. When assessing the opportunities for hokcey in the local area there is a clear need for a facility that can support the current and future demand of a growing hokcey club, which BHHHC clearly is. Having played hockey in a number of countries, I'm of the opinion that there is no room for growth with the current quality, location and amount of pitches in the the area surrounding Cow Roast.</p>

	<p>Looking at the wider trend in the UK, we see that obesity and lack of outside exercise is becoming a growing problem, not only amongst our ageing population, but moreover with the younger brackets. A multifunctional Astroturf can support a wide variety of needs, and floodlighting will allow for this to continue year-round, allowing for all age groups to participate in the sport of hockey, and counter these negative trends.</p> <p>My feeling therefore is that the current proposal will support the growth and health of the local population, and should therefore be accepted rather sooner than later.</p>
<p>Vaucluse Gravel Path Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2PF</p>	<p>Berkhamsted Hockey Club has been established for around 100 years and successfully provided facilities for a number of teams at the Cow Roast for many years. The club now runs nine teams every Saturday through the season and also provides training for children of all ages from 7 up. Developments in hockey in recent years especially since the London Olympics require virtually all matches to be played on Astroturf instead of grass and there is a woeful lack of such pitches in Dacorum, just one pitch at Tring School which is far past its best. Berkhamsted Hockey Club share this pitch with Tring Hockey Club and also have to travel to shared pitches in Halton and Aylesbury for their home games. I believe the club provides a valuable service to the residents of Dacorum to improve health and social activities and should be supported in providing an essential facility for hockey within the borough.</p>
<p>66A Western Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4BB</p>	<p>Berko hockey club currently doesn't have an Astro. Without one hockey in herts will surely perish within the next few years when they close down the Halton pitch (as the Tring Astro isn't good enough to support high level teams). The club has been desperate for one ever since I joined.</p>
<p>Mulberry House Stablebridge Road Aston Clinton HP22 5ND</p>	<p>This application should be approved as it will significantly add to the sporting facilities in an area lacking in such amenities and facing a significant rise in population. Floodlighting is key to allow community access during winter months and modern lighting technologies and techniques will ensure that the impact on the environment and on local residents will be minimal.</p> <p>The only current nearby facilities are at Tring School and Halton. The Halton facility is due to close in the next few years. This would become a perfect replacement.</p> <p>The Club is going from strength to strength and has been at Cow Roast for many years. It has its club house there and shares the pitches with the rugby club. Hockey has moved on from the grass</p>

	<p>game to all matches being played on artificial pitches. The recent successes of the mens and womens GB teams alongside indoor hockey have meant the number of people playing has risen.</p> <p>This Club should be supported and this proposed facility will enable winter evening training and weekend games for Men, Women and Junior hockey teams. HP23 5RF</p> <p>This application should be approved as it will significantly add to the sporting facilities in an area lacking in such amenities and facing a significant rise in population. Floodlighting is key to allow community access during winter months and modern lighting technologies and techniques will ensure that the impact on the environment and on local residents will be minimal.</p> <p>The only current nearby facilities are at Tring School and Halton. The Halton facility is due to close in the next few years. This would become a perfect replacement.</p> <p>The Club is going from strength to strength and has been at Cow Roast for many years. It has it's club house there and shares the pitches with the rugby club. Hockey has moved on from the grass game to all matches being played on artificial pitches. The recent successes of the mens and womens GB teams alongside indoor hockey have meant the number of people playing has risen.</p> <p>This Club should be supported and this proposed facility will enable winter evening training and weekend games for Men, Women and Junior hockey teams.</p>
<p>11 Nettlecroft Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1PQ</p>	<p>11 Nettlecroft Boxmoor Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1PQ (Supports) Comment submitted date: Wed 10 Jun 2020</p> <p>I am in full support of this planning application.</p> <p>I have played Hockey & participated in many of BHHHC's activities over the last 16 years. The size of the membership & the number of players can only show how well the Hockey Club is run. The Facility is used by a wide range of sports that would all greatly benefit from the improvement a new AGP would bring.</p> <p>Because of the poor state & busy schedule of the AGP at Tring School, the probability of the use of the pitch at RAF Halton coming to an end & the next nearest available facility of this kind being Meadowcroft in Aylesbury, I would like to support this planning application.</p> <p>Unfortunately to satisfy demand most AGP's are within Schools.</p>

	<p>The latest trend is for new pitches to be 4G or 5G small pitch size to accommodate Junior Football & Funding. These new style AGP's cannot accommodate Hockey due to size & surface.</p> <p>When I look back at the previous planning documents covering artificial pitches in Dacorum a severe lack of funding has halted the building of facilities, this is not going to improve especially with the economy hit caused by COVID19.</p> <p>The AGP at Tring School has been deemed inadequate for the level of hockey BHHHC participate at. This will have a long term detrimental effect on developing the players & club, a new AGP will enhance the efforts of the "Active Dacorum" incentive, and support the wider govt. initiative to increase sports participation to support local physical & mental wellbeing.</p> <p>This development would also allow DBC to retain & grow sports participation directly within Dacorum, rather than in neighboring counties.</p> <p>The BHHHC has agreed to engage a lighting company who will act to minimize the glare and reach of the lights.</p> <p>The Lighting will be more discreet than the A4251 / petrol station / BMW garage.</p> <p>I believe the positive benefits to the Berkhamsted, Tring, and Hemel Hempstead and surrounding neighborhoods in terms of physical and mental wellbeing, community engagement and local sport participation should far outweigh any objections. I fully support the well overdue need for a new sports pitch.</p>
<p>62 London Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2NF</p>	<p>As a hockey fan and parent of two children who are growing to love the game with the Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club, an astroturf pitch is a necessity for this large and growing club.</p> <p>The BHHHC is a family friendly club striving to make the sport accessible to all ages. It has a fantastic team of coaches from whom my children and many others are learning valuable life lessons in sport. The new pitch would enhance the club community with training sessions no longer be scattered around other locations such as Tring and Aylesbury.</p> <p>Please support the application.</p>
<p>9 Greenes Court Berkhamsted Hertfordshire</p>	<p>The club is central to the sporting, social and community of the town and area, and has provided generations in my family with opportunity and enjoyment The lack of astroturf and floodlight</p>

<p>HP4 2JU</p>	<p>facilities has been putting the club at risk for too long, as other clubs and towns continue to develop with the support of their councils.</p> <p>The other pitches in the area (Tring and RAF Halton) are not adequate, and this provides the town and club with an opportunity to shine and grow. The youth section of the club is flourishing and this should be expanded upon through the availability of first class facilities, rather than pushing young players away to rival clubs, who have already seen these kinds of investment.</p> <p>Concerns around the state of the single lane entrance to the club and traffic are trivial in comparison to the vast benefits this would bring to the community.</p> <p>This development should be whole-heartedly supported by the local council, for the benefit of those who would reap the rewards of it now, and for the future.</p>
<p>20 Drummond Ride Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5DE</p>	<p>I strongly support this development in the dacorum area.</p> <p>As a teacher the access to sporting facilities for hockey in Dacorum is very low with only one pitch in the Tring, berkhamstead and Hemel Hempstead area.</p> <p>The BHHHC has a track record of using it s land to develop community sports and leisure activities with dog training, rugby, dance and of course hockey contributing to the health of the local community and the community cohesion.</p> <p>Currently the club has to travel to Buckinghamshire for its next nearest pitches increasing traffic and pollution.</p> <p>This pitch would have the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) providing facilities for both Tring and BHH hockey clubs, dacorum clubs who have to play in Bucks. b) increasing leisure facilities for the local community c) providing sustainable income for the club to invest in improved community facilities d) increasing the activity levels of young people (over 100 junior members)
<p>52 Faircross Way St Albans AL1 4SB</p>	
<p>1 Bath Lane</p>	<p>Multi Use Artificial pitches with LED lighting are a great local</p>

<p>BUCKINGHAM MK18 1DX</p>	<p>amenity to have providing exercise opportunities to the whole community. LED lighting produces far less light pollution (a pitch local to me recently upgraded and you immediately notice the difference). Hockey provides playing opportunities from the age of 4 to over 80 for both men and women and is a very diverse sport. Hockey will use the pitch the most but will need floodlights to be able to function with midweek training and afternoon games in the winter. Provision of the pitch will encourage more people to take up sport.</p>
<p>42 Wilstone Drive 42 wilstone drive St. Albans AL4 9TT</p>	<p>They are a great club, who will support and make a positive impact on the community. There are no locally own clubs in that area meaning many will lose out on a fantastic experience and a long established club might struggle/fold. This is a huge opportunity to bring sport to a large group of people and I know that the club members will be respectful of residents.</p>
<p>37 Varney Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LW</p>	<p>I fully support the development of an astro pitch at Berkhamstead hockey club. A home pitch based at a club house is an integral part of any club and develops a sense of community. Every Saturday it will bring in groups of individuals and families together to support a common goal of health, wellbeing, enjoyment and a sense of belonging. Not having been a member of the club for long, I have been welcomed in with open arms and treated as one of the family and this will only grow stronger for all if we can grow the club. Having been a member of other very big clubs previously, having your own astro at your club house helps the club grow so much.</p> <p>It will also enable the business of the club to thrive, it will bring employment and will enable other sports/clubs to bond with the club.</p> <p>The development of our own pitch will mean so much for all the members of the clubs and future generations.</p>
<p>2a The Elms Hemel Hempstead HP3 8LJ</p>	<p>This is very long awaited and so richly deserved for a club that gives the community - and in particular the community's youth - so much opportunity.</p>
<p>The Copse Ivy House Lane Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2PP</p>	<p>I am strongly supportive of this application by BHHHC as I think it is a facility that will greatly support the local area and its people. Hockey is a very popular sport, catering for all ages and both genders, and there is a real lack of quality pitches in the area. The club itself is thriving and has a real community atmosphere with multiple generations from the same families playing through the teams. The club really needs this type of facility to be able to train and play to the standards expected in the modern game. I do not</p>

	believe that there will be a detrimental impact from this development, as the club have worked hard on all aspects of the proposal. The upside of this development will benefit many local residents and enable this community club to continue to thrive
The Old Barn 5 Little Heath Lane Little Heath Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2RT	
Holmedene 14 Anglefield Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3JA	Great way of keeping local people of all ages involved in sport. Very sociable club that needs an Astro close by for home matches.
7 Beechwood Way Aston Clinton HP22 5JW	<p>I strongly support this application, it should have been built when permission was granted 15 years ago.</p> <p>Hockey has been played at Lockharts field since 1903. It is part of our history, and should be allowed to continue into the future. Dacorum Council have already acknowledged that there is a lack of facilities for hockey, and was highlighted in 2006 and in 2014, in the 'Dacorum Sport & Recreation Study Outdoor Sports Facilities Assessment Report' carried out by Knight, Kavanagh and Page.</p> <p>All competitive hockey has to be played on an AGP, with the dacorum converting other facilities to 4G pitches for football. It has left the district at a distinct disadvantage to offering the community a broad spectrum of sports.</p> <p>There will be a minimal increase in traffic, as all home games that are played at Tring School, RAF Halton or Meadowcroft Open Space in Aylesbury, return to the club post game for refreshments as per league rules.</p> <p>With modern technology in flood lighting there is minimal pollution given off and with the potential to adjust lighting levels for the specific level of training or matches.</p> <p>I have played at the club, for 15 years, and have played at the top end of the club for most of those years, the pitches available to the club, have been of poor quality. The lack of facilities available have also meant, that we have lost good young players to other clubs who are able to train more often and at more acceptable times, not finishing at 2215-2230 on a midweek night.</p> <p>I strongly support this application, it should have been built when permission was granted 15 years ago.</p> <p>Hockey has been played at Lockharts field since 1903. It is part of our history, and should be allowed to continue into the future. Dacorum Council have already acknowledged that there is a lack</p>

	<p>of facilities for hockey, and was highlighted in 2006 and in 2014, in the 'Dacorum Sport & Recreation Study Outdoor Sports Facilities Assessment Report' carried out by Knight, Kavanagh and Page.</p> <p>All competitive hockey has to be played on an AGP, with the dacorum converting other facilities to 4G pitches for football. It has left the district at a distinct disadvantage to offering the community a broad spectrum of sports.</p> <p>There will be a minimal increase in traffic, as all home games that are played at Tring School, RAF Halton or Meadowcroft Open Space in Aylesbury, return to the club post game for refreshments as per league rules.</p> <p>With modern technology in flood lighting there is minimal pollution given off and with the potential to adjust lighting levels for the specific level of training or matches.</p> <p>I have played at the club, for 15 years, and have played at the top end of the club for most of those years, the pitches available to the club, have been of poor quality. The lack of facilities available have also meant, that we have lost good young players to other clubs who are able to train more often and at more acceptable times, not finishing at 2215-2230 on a midweek night.</p>
<p>4 Blenkin Close St Albans St. Albans AL3 6EB</p>	<p>There is a need for an artificial pitch for hockey and other sports in this area. Hockey clubs provide coaching for many local children and offer a great opportunity for them to participate in team sport. All hockey matches are now played on Astro turf pitches.</p>
<p>31 Rodeheath Luton Lu49xb</p>	
<p>21 Hunting Gate Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 6NX</p>	<p>As the Hertfordshire County Councillor for the area i support this proposal.</p>
<p>28 Grove Park Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JS</p>	<p>Hockey is at risk in the local area of being diminished unless this application is approved. There is a severe lack of suitable astro pitches in the area with only the pitch at Tring School (which is tired) and the ongoing uncertainty of use of the RAF Halton pitch. Having been part of the hockey community for over 25 years it is a fantastic team sport that encompasses fitness, skill, and discipline, which in turn all supports mental well being. Something which we are all acutely aware of in the current climate. Hockey is diverse and welcomes many players both male and female from as young as 5 to those over 50 years hence why is it widely seen as a great environment for families as well. Since the London Olympics in 2012, the exposure of hockey has been increased and many more youngsters are keen to try and sample the sport. Therefore, better provision for local training and playing is</p>

	<p>needed in order to maintain the ease of access and commitment for those wanting to play and to continue attracting new players in the area. Pitch lighting is also crucial to enable training and matches to take place after dark given that the main season runs during the winter months.</p> <p>The granting of this application will provide Berkhamsted and Hemel Hockey Club with a stepping stone to elevate itself further into a fantastic club facility that has been long overdue in the local area. It is a well established and very welcoming club, with its members at the heart of it.</p>
<p>17 Regent Rd Aylesbury HP21 7AB</p>	<p>I support the artificial turfed hockey pitch at Cow Roast. Alison Mahony</p>
<p>Croptorne Cottage Gravel Path Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2PH</p>	<p>I strongly support this application for a much needed AGP at Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club (BHHHC).</p> <p>BHHHC is a fantastic community club that provides opportunities for whole families to get involved in sport.</p> <p>There is a significant lack of pitches in the local area and as a result home games and training are located a considerable distance away or played on pitches in poor condition. Building a pitch next to the clubhouse will benefit the club and community through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduced pollution due to fewer miles travelled to home games and back to the club for teas, - improved club community as members will be able to support and watch matches before or after their games, - more accessible training times for all members of the club, - opportunity for the youth/junior section of the club to host tournaments and progress from playing on smaller pitches to a full sized pitch, - more training slots available to enable smaller groups to train together (currently one of our training slots is one pitch shared by the whole club), - attracting more members of the local community to play for the club and to improve their mental and physical health through playing a team sport, - local schools and sports clubs will benefit from the use the facilities (Bridgewater school has already expressed an interest in another supporting comment), - prevent loss of players to other clubs in the county that have access to better facilities.
<p>40 Station Road Ivinghoe LEIGHTON BUZZARD</p>	<p>This is a really good idea as it would be an asset to the local community and would not cause disruption to neighbours as there is a high tree line.</p>

LU7 9EB	
<p>1 Little Hoo Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4HU</p>	<p>Dacorum needs facilities like this. This is an ideal opportunity to increase the sporting facilities available to Dacorum residents.</p> <p>We have seen during lockdown, that getting exercise is important for people's mental well-being as well as their physical, that well-being is enhanced further when you feel part of a team or a club with the social interaction that brings. Adding an artificial pitch to where the clubhouse is located will increase the likelihood of that interaction & the benefits that will bring, particularly to the more isolated in our community.</p> <p>Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey club is already an important part of Dacorum's community, the inclusiveness of the club & importantly its focus on youth development, will only be enhanced by a facility such as this. We will be able to cater for more youngsters, there will be, hopefully, enhanced relationships with schools & clubs who would use the facility, there will be a facility for the less mobile to partake in walking hockey. There is no age limit to hockey, many who love competitive sport, but feel games like rugby & football no longer accommodate their levels of fitness, come to hockey, I know, I am one of them.</p> <p>We play at a few newly developed artificial pitches & the technologies around lighting and fencing is improving constantly, the environmental impacts are so far reduced compared to just a few years ago. We are quite uniquely placed, that if you consider our position is right next to the A41, with the light & noise that brings, the pitch will be less impacting than if it were in the middle of a residential area.</p> <p>I would encourage you to pass this application, the benefits of it are considerable to your community, surely you would not want to deny the people of Dacorum a brand-new sporting facility.</p>
<p>27 King Street Tring Hp236bj</p>	<p>I fully support this application. The area around Berkhamsted and Tring definitely needs a full size Astro pitch. People of all ages need a first class exercise area.</p> <p>The hockey club is growing in size and attracts a significant youth section. These young people need a suitable facility other wise they will stop playing. At a time when exercise is so important a new Astro pitch would serve all the schools and youth groups brilliantly.</p> <p>It is disappointing that such an affluent area as Berkhamsted does not have one pitch.</p> <p>I feel that if we want team sports such as hockey to exist in the future and entice young people away from computer games and</p>

	<p>learn the fine arts of playing in a team, we need a top quality resource!</p> <p>The hockey club has seven grass pitches, none of which are suitable because they aren't Astro!</p> <p>With an Astro the game will grow even more quickly in this area as schools will be able to use it. It would be a wonderful and much much needed addition to the sporting environment in this area!</p> <p>To have to travel to Tring, Halton or Aylesbury to play hockey for our home games is very disappointing especially when the clubhouse is surrounded by so many playing areas, all of which are grass!</p> <p>I just think the planning committee can show how far sighted and forward looking they are, by agreeing to allow this area to have a top quality sporting faculty fit for another 50 years! It would be so exciting for many thousands of people!</p>
<p>34 Lukes lea Marsworth Hp23 4nh</p>	<p>This development would ensure the survival of the sport in the area. This a family oriented club that provides a sport that ensureS the health and wellbeing of all its juniors as well as senior members. The area currently struggles to provide a suitable pitch that is suitable for quality hockey. Tring facilities are dated and is dire need of repair. However it likely to be converted to a football 3D pitch unsuitable for hockey as The school will find funding from the wealth of football resources. We have already lost any suitable pitches in Hemel or Berkhamsted to the same scenario. Having the pitch near the club house improves on the club community and self sufficiency for the future. giving the next generation a chance to enjoy the sport that we as a country are so good at and can only continue to be so, if we continue to develop grass roots facilities such as this.</p>
<p>Highway Upper Icknield Way Bulbourne Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QF</p>	<p>Hockey is one of the few sports that can be truly played by men and women together and often those who play do so their whole life into their 60s and 70s. Nearly all clubs have men's, ladies and youth sections for both boys and girls. My husband, myself and our daughter and son all play at the same club. We can train together and play friendly competitions together. I cannot think of another team sport like this. As well as the physical health benefits there are mental health benefits, a key focus area for young people. Hockey plays an important role in encouraging women to continue with exercise and team sports after they finish school also.</p> <p>I came to live in Dacorum in 1988 and joined my local hockey club, Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club. Then we were lucky enough to have our own grass pitches. Since the 1990s hockey has changed dramatically and matches began to be played on an artificial surface. Now, all games are played on artificial surface. Unfortunately, the artificial surface used for football (3G) is not suitable for hockey as the "grass" is too long.</p>

Initially, Dacorum had good facilities, having a hockey grade surface at both Tring School and Cavendish School (now Laureate) and to start with, only the higher teams in a club played on the artificial surface, everyone else still played on grass. As their use gradually increased, many more hockey artificial pitches were built which kept pace with demand - at least in the towns around Dacorum: St Albans now has 5, Watford 3, Aylesbury 3. In Dacorum, this has not happened - in fact, Cavendish School was re-laid as a 3G pitch many years ago. More recently, Ashlyns School built a new 3G pitch, not hockey as was hoped. Whether you agree with this or not, this is now how the sport is played and we have no option. Now the 2 hockey clubs that are in Dacorum share Tring School, and also use RAF Halton, and 2 other pitches on the far side of Aylesbury. RAF Halton is soon to close. If Tring School were to decide to re-surface their pitch with 3G then it is highly likely both hockey clubs would have to close. Berkhamsted Hockey Club has been in existence for over 100 years, and currently runs 5 men's and 4 ladies' teams, plus a thriving youth section. It still maintains its grass pitches for other sports - archery, lacrosse, cricket, rugby, football and youth football have all been played there, and the clubhouse has a dance school using its facilities 6 days a week (after school and evenings in the week). Even with an artificial surface, there would be grass pitches still available to these sports. If the club was to close, these pitches would be lost.

It is acknowledged that the hockey facilities in Dacorum are poor. This application if approved would address this issue but importantly, at no public cost. At the present time, a lot of hockey players living in Dacorum play their hockey outside of Dacorum at nearby clubs such as St Albans and West Herts which have better facilities. This represents a loss of sport and leisure income to Dacorum as well as impacting on the ability of the 2 hockey clubs to grow, improve, attract more members, provide sport and physical activity for more residents, and so on.

Whilst I understand that there concerns that the location of this facility is in an AONB, the hockey club is extremely well hidden from view - you cannot see it from the A41 bypass, built since I came to live here straight through the AONB. This pitch will be hard to see from any direction. With regard to potential light pollution, there are now lighting systems which have no overspill - in other words, the light remains within the pitch and does not go beyond the fencing either to the sides or over the top. This would address concerns of local residents and also minimise the impact on local wildlife.

I truly hope that the planning committee decide that the potential benefits to the people of the borough outweigh the disadvantages and show that they are committed to supporting hockey for all. Since the success of 2012 Olympics, hockey is a growing sport and BHHHC has run several initiatives aimed at bringing the sport we love and are passionate about, to more people. The

	<p>latest initiative this season was walking hockey, aimed at the older generation, played on? An artificial surface of course.</p>
<p>47 Albert Street Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6AU</p>	<p>I am fully supporting this application for an all weather surface and lighting at Berkhamsted Hockey Club.</p> <p>The provision of an additional all weather pitch suitable for hockey has consistently been identified as an area of need within Dacorum by Sport England, England Hockey Council and Dacorum Councils own Sports Strategy. This planning application gives the Council a fantastic opportunity to meet this need and secure the long term prospects for hockey and sport within the Borough.</p> <p>Our hockey club face considerable problems in accessing suitable pitches for our 9 teams to play hockey. Shared' access with the Tring Astroturf on Saturdays means several of our nine teams have to play league games at RAF Halton, Aylesbury and Watford. The pitch at Tring is in poor condition and is no longer suitable to play the league games of our ladies and men's since they were promoted. The future of the pitch at RAF Halton is also in doubt as the RAF review what to do with the station and land.</p> <p>The club faces its very existence being under threat due to the lack of facilities and we are at a point where it is likely that without this development hockey will disappear from Dacorum and the local community.</p> <p>The provision of the astroturf pitch at the Cow Roast fields will enable the council to meet objectives set within its Corporate Plan to "build strong and vibrant communities" and to ensure "economic growth and prosperity". The building of this facility will tangibly contribute to the physical and mental wellbeing of the local community.</p> <p>The club has a viable business plan and we are able to support many other community based sports and activities through the Cow Roast facilities. This includes Berkhamsted Bowmen, Berkhamsted Rugby Club, Raiders Football Club, All Stars dance school and Chiltern Dog School. This development secures the future for these associated clubs as well as the hockey club.</p> <p>We have invested in the locality and training programmes to bring people back to hockey in Dacorum. Our success in community based programmes has shown a positive increase in young women coming into the sport and a developing cohort of older people returning to hockey. Our club has been part of the Dacorum community for over 100 years and now needs to grow and develop through the provision of this astroturf base facility.</p>

I have read through the comments made to the application and while the vast majority are supportive my further comments on the application address the concerns expressed and how we have considered these in this application.

Impact on an AoNB

I feel that the presence of the A41 and the industrial estate that houses BMW and the other garages have already lessened the AoNB at this location.

The development of the AGP will guarantee the presence of a sports club at the site which will protect the area from other development and enable the continuation of sport at this venue and all the associated leisure and recreational activities at the site.

It should also be noted that we have reviewed the publicly available flood risk information and can confirm the pitch has a zero percent chance of flooding in the location selected. In addition the proposed location avoids interfering or presenting a barrier to any of the foot paths in the area with these going around the pitch.

Potential light pollution

While we are sympathetic to the residents in the area, The facility is 425 metres away from the residents of the Cow Roast and situated 260 metres from Orchard Cottage. Indeed, given the extent of the brush and woodland, we do not believe that the residents of Tinkers Lodge will see any light pollution.

We have carefully considered the potential glare or light pollution to local residents and we will be using appropriate lighting which minimises spill light above the horizontal and so minimise glare while keeping the lighting close to the area to be lit.

Please see the video below as illustration of the minimal impact of the lighting proposals.

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/5pc5grrhj0ctmwa/Lancing%20College%2012.09.18.MOV?dl=0>

We believe the local properties will not be able to see the light source or illuminated surface of the AGP. Due to the oblique arrangement of the woodland in respect to the houses, we believe that winter conditions will not be significantly different to summer conditions as there is sufficient wood (branches, trunks and hedgerow) in the line of site between the properties on the A4351 and the pitch.

Please note: For the lighting, we have specified six lighting poles 15.2m high which would not exceed the height of the surrounding

woodland which is 18m high.
Some concerns have been raised about the impact of the proposed AGP and lighting will have on the local wildlife. Our plans for lighting follow the latest BS5489 guidance notes that a colour temperature of 3000K reduces the effect of lighting on bats. Hockey requires high levels of illumination at pitch level to allow the sport to be played safely.

Where the facility is being used by other sports, the lighting levels will be reduced to reflect the need of those sports. LG4 (2006) published by the Society of Light and Lighting indicate that association football and rugby requires 200lux (Class II) while hockey requires 300Lux (ClassII). Rugby only requires 100lux for training.

Our plans have been developed to be sustainable and meet the environmental needs of the site. For example, the club is developing its net carbon zero strategy in accordance with the UKGBC guidelines. As part of that process we are looking to change to a green tariff so in essence there should be no additional carbon emitted by the floodlights.

We are also conscious of the need to ensure a sustainable infrastructure for utilities to the site and for local residents. We will take guidance from the statutory consultees on any changes or upgrades that may be required for any additional load on the infrastructure and utilities for the area but we believe this is not a material factor and sufficient provision is in place for electrical supply.

Overall we believe that the proposed AGP will have negligible effect on local wildlife especially given the proximity of the A41.

Potential for increased noise and traffic

The club has been in use for over 100 years and for the last 30 years has always had a level of traffic associated with 6 grass hockey pitches being used consistently.

It is my view that there will not be any increased traffic density as a result of the development it will effectively switch one pitch of grass with 22 players per game of hockey for an astroturf pitch with 22 players per game. Teams currently return to the club house after their matches that have been played at Tring, Aylesbury, Watford and Halton and the addition of an astroturf pitch at the site will have create no significant difference in carbon emissions or traffic movements.

The additional carbon emissions associated with training are more than offset by the reduction in travel to the Astroturf in

	<p>Aylesbury and RAF Halton. Additional parking facilities may be needed on Sunday when there is cross over with the existing football players and hockey training.</p> <p>We have reviewed the information publically available and can only find 4 minor road traffic accidents in the surrounding areas and non of these associated with the BOAT (Byway Open all Traffic) or entrance and exit to the Cow Roast site.</p> <p>It should also be noted that Hertfordshire Highways had no objection to the previous planning application that was granted for an astroturf at the Cow Roast.</p>
<p>52 knaves hill linlade leighton buzzard lu7 2ud</p>	<p>This pitch would be a fantastic asset to a brilliant hockey club. They are a friendly and welcoming group for the whole community.. There is a shortage of pitches in the area, and the with pitches that club currently uses facing an uncertain future, their own pitch would ensure the future of the club for future generations.</p> <p>These facilities can only be a benefit the hockey club and the other groups which use the field and clubhouse, and provide a way for the local community to keep fit and healthy as well as developing talent.</p>
<p>28 Coppins Close Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3NZ</p>	<p>In response to the objections:</p> <p>The planned siting of the pitch minimises any light spill from the Astro to the surrounding properties and modern lights have virtually no spill anyway. In addition, there is a line of tall trees that should obscure the pitch from those houses.</p> <p>I am a huge supporter of maintaining areas of AONB but to question this development on that basis makes no sense to me. On one side of this are unsightly garages with lots of lighting and lots of parking and on the other you are right next to the noisy A41 bypass.</p> <p>The objections concerning safety at the end of the access road surprise me. When the pub was open and cars were regularly pulling off the road park and pulling on again, I was not aware of any problems. Surely that is the same for any pub on a main road? At the present time, with the garages and the petrol station in constant use, there are no problems beyond normal road use. The clubhouse usage will undoubtedly increase somewhat on match days - indeed it deserves to - leading to more cars but I don't believe this will cause major issues with traffic flow and won't be any more detrimental than for any ordinary pub car park, for example.</p>

	<p>I see no reason why this planning application should not be supported and accepted. I can understand why local residents would look to conserve the status quo - it is the same the World over - but in this case there are so many keen sports men, women and children who will be supported in their endeavours for a family-centric, health-giving, sociable sporting pursuit, that the development has to go ahead, in my opinion.</p> <p>I enthusiastically support the development of an Astroturf at Cow Roast. As a hockey player myself, coach of youth hockey at BHHHC and coach of hockey at Berkhamsted School, I believe this development is long overdue and its absence has threatened the sport of hockey over the lasts few years in my experience.</p> <p>Hockey is a family sport. At Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey club, there are large numbers of male, female and youth hockey players who for years have been under-served. 5 mens' teams and 4 ladies' teams play every week during the season (a large membership) and mixed hockey is played throughout the summer with the youngsters.</p> <p>Huge efforts are made to encourage young players into the sport, and we do our best training our youth at small and tired neighbouring astroturfs but all other facilities in the surrounding area are not usable for hockey, with the exception of Tring, which is in need of replacement and Halton, which may not exist in a few months' time. There is sufficient appetite for hockey in Berkhamsted alone to warrant the building of such an astroturf. Look further afield and we would be providing a top-class facility to hundreds and giving local schools the potential access to a surface that could support their playing of hockey and other team sports.</p> <p>Please consider this excellent proposal positively so that many boys, girls, men and women, from Berkhamsted and the surrounding towns, will be able to continue to play hockey together and develop this family-centric club.</p>
<p>Wilson House Berkhamsted School</p> <p>Castle Street Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2BE</p>	<p>I strongly support this plan. Hockey amenities are poor in this area and the hockey club needs the support of the local authority to continue to provide high quality sport and recreation facilities to local people. Without such amenities, hockey in West Herts cannot continue to flourish.</p>
<p>14 Glenview Gardens</p> <p>Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire</p>	

HP1 1TF	
<p>West Leith Barn West Leith Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6JR</p>	<p>Berkhamsted Hockey Club is an organisation that continues to offer access to sport, community and activities for young people's in the local area.</p> <p>It has managed to survive despite having no pitch suitable for the modern game of hockey to be played on. This would be unthinkable to a tennis, football or rugby club, but due to the incredible spirit of the club's organisers, the club has managed to stay afloat through a raft of far from ideal measures that the members supported as the only means they could to continue playing.</p> <p>Playing on pitches that are either outdated, an hours round trip away or oversubscribed by other clubs and sports means that it is a miracle that this club has been able to survive in the way it has. It is critical that local children should be able to play for their local club without having to rely on someone travelling far out of their way to get them to the pitch.</p> <p>The boost to the community, sport and local economy of the town that would occur with the construction of this multifunctional pitch tucked away at the back of the hockey club would be huge, and the council could credit itself for enabling the modernisation and survival of a cherished club at the heart of its community.</p>
<p>3 Fulmar Crescent Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1SG</p>	<p>I enthusiastically support the development of an Astro turf at the Cow Roast. This development is well overdue and the club's lack of access to a fit for purpose astro turf pitch is detrimental to the development and demands of a growing club, its members and the evolution of hockey as a sport. The addition of an astro turf pitch on site with the essential requirement of floodlighting is key to allow the community to access during the winter months and modern lighting technologies and techniques will ensure that the impact on the environment and on local residents will be minimal.</p> <p>Having a state of the art astro turf pitch in the Dacorum area will not only ensure that BHHHC can compete with neighbouring modern hockey clubs but also service the current and future demand from the Berkhamsted, Hemel Hempstead and Tring area.</p>
<p>4 East Street Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5BN</p>	<p>I wholeheartedly support the creation of an artificial pitch at the home of Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club. The Club has been so important to members of my family over the years and the fact that it does not have access to suitable playing surfaces locally means there is a threat to it's medium and longer term existence.</p>

	<p>Hockey is a family sport and the Club has this at its heart. Hockey provides countless opportunities to men and women - young and old. Not only are there five mens' teams and four ladies' teams who play week in, week out through the season - there is a substantial and ever-growing youth section that enables Dacorum's young people to access hockey, opportunities for which are reducing drastically in schools.</p> <p>In addition, the Club has been instrumental in encouraging the community to get 'back to hockey' - with introductory sessions for those wishing to give the sport a try and even offering walking hockey to those members of the community who prefer a slower pace of game.</p> <p>The Club offers something to everyone; however, the lack of suitable playing facilities in the area is seriously compromising the future of the sport in Dacorum. The pitch at Tring is rapidly becoming unusable and the facility at RAF Halton is unlikely to exist in the near future.</p> <p>Please consider this proposal positively so that all age groups in and around Dacorum will be able to continue to play hockey together.</p>
<p>1 Chiltern Way Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JX</p>	<p>I strongly support the planning application for an AstroTurf . Berkhamsted Hockey Club has been at this location for many years and is an asset to the local community. Having their own AstroTurf will enhance the club meaning the members and their visiting opposition will not need to travel every weekend just to play 'home' games. The AstroTurf will be situated at the far end of a large field which will not interfere with the surrounding area. I am a local dog walker and do not think this planning permission will in any way affect my enjoyment of the area.</p>
<p>2 Fieldway Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2NX</p>	<p>I support the proposition of the a hockey astro pitch at the Cow Roast site. Currently the provision of suitable quality hockey pitches is poor - the nearest alternative is at Tring and unfortunately the quality is only just about sufficient and needs a major revamp in my experience (playing/training there on a regular basis). Whilst hockey is not a premier sport such as football, rugby or cricket which seem to have numerous facilities dedicated to them, hockey as a minority support is poorly served. Hockey is a game that cuts across genders and ages and suitable and played by all demographics and therefore should be encourage with suitable facilities being made available. Without an appropriate facility nearby the hockey clubs of Tring and Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead would see a gradual decline in membership and sporting participation as in my experience the further people need to travel for their sport (training/playing home matches) the more likely they are to give up or drift away from the</p>

	<p>sport. This is particularly true for Under 18s who are important breeding ground for sports participation (the health of the nation) and for hockey's development in the future. Therefore a suitable facility (at Cow Roast) within the Tring, Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead nexus is a priority. Hockey as a sport is very poorly financially supported and whilst does not have the glitz and glamour of the major sports is an important gateway for youth and adults alike to take part in sport and be health - therefore it requires suitable facilities. Sadly many of the schools in the area have removed hockey from their sporting curriculum as they do not have the facilities to play, this needs to be addressed and Cow Roast could offer a playing facility nearby for numerous schools to bring hockey back on board and encourage the next generation of hockey players. So in conclusion I support the application and would like to see a quality hockey facility at Cow Roast.</p>
<p>6 Ashlyns Court Berkhamsted HP4 3BU</p>	<p>Sport is a fantastic vehicle for change. It can unite a community and provide fantastic opportunities for people of all ages. Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club is an historic hockey club with great ties to the local community. In the last 10 years, the club has made huge strides in developing it's youth section - developing partnerships with local schools and encouraging children to take up a new sport.</p> <p>There is demand for hockey, and sport more generally, in the local area. In Berkhamsted, there is only one full size artificial pitch and that is a 4G surface more suitable for football. BHHHC's junior sessions are confined to Berkhamsted School's small astro which is now too small for the growing demand. Also, the Men's and Ladies' sections are currently travelling to Tring School and RAF Halton to use their pitches for matches and training. Both these pitches are outdated and don't have adequate lighting which is essential for hockey as it's predominantly a winter sport.</p> <p>Having this artificial games pitch and floodlights by the clubhouse would provide unparalleled opportunities for the club in attracting more children, adults and families to take part in sport. It would also enhance the social aspects of the club and the sport more generally - an absolutely fundamental part of the game. BHHHC is proud to be a family-orientated club and this new development would be the biggest moment in its history. A development which would unite a community. Hockey is a fast-developing sport and the Women's Gold Medal at the 2016 Rio Olympics saw a huge surge in children, mainly girls, taking up hockey. In Berkhamsted, and surrounding towns in Hertfordshire, hockey has gathered pace but its development has been severely restricted by the lack of good, local facilities. With these plans in place, I am extremely excited at the prospect of the sport's growth but also the growth of</p>

	<p>other sports which can be used by local schools and people.</p> <p>I am a huge advocate of sport and have lived in Berkhamsted my whole life. Since Ashlyns School built their 4G artificial surface, I have witnessed first hand the benefits this has had in the local community and it has been a positive step in promoting sport in the area. I am under no illusions that these plans for a new artificial surface would have a similar, if not bigger, impact for all schools and people to use an all-weather pitch all year round for hockey and other sports too.</p>
<p>9 Birtchnell Close Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1FE</p>	<p>If permission was granted it would be an amazing asset to our local community. Offering all year round availability for various sports. Furthering the health and well being of all age groups from young children to seniors. It will bring together families through the wonderful team spirit of hockey. It will also hopefully allow children easier access to hockey from all local primary and secondary schools in the surrounding area which currently isn't the case.</p>
<p>South Lodge, Manor Drive, Shurlock Row Reading RG10 0PX</p>	<p>While I am not directly from the area I have seen the benefit of artificial pitches for the community in many other regions and was shocked to hear that Dacorum only has one and that is nearing the end of its life.</p> <p>I help to organise Thames Valley Mini Hockey and as part of this, on one Sunday every month, we have around 800 children between the ages of 7 and 12 playing and enjoying hockey in a safe friendly environment all on artificial pitches. In a relative small region across Berkshire and Oxfordshire hockey clubs we have access to 10 different locations and facilities with all clubs hosting different tournaments.</p> <p>This helps to re-iterate how important these types of pitches are for both local children and adults that have a keen interest in staying healthy and active. Being able to use the facilities in the evening for training and other activities (as well as making it safe to play on short dark winter days) is crucial to make them a success.</p> <p>In addition, with the flexibility these pitches offer, matches and activities get spread throughout the day and typically cause a lot less traffic build up than other team sports where all the activity will be concentrated over a short period of time and cause more congestion and traffic issues.</p> <p>I fully support this application and wish Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club all the best on their future with an artificial pitch - without which I can see their long term viability in doubt.</p>

<p>Croptorne Cottage Gravel Path Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2PH</p>	<p>Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club provides a wonderful sporting environment for local youth. My daughter has been a member of the club for about 10 years and has had a very positive experience. As parents, we have been lucky enough to be able to take her to all hockey matches, but are aware that this is not a privilege all parents enjoy. Without an artificial playing surface available at the club home in Cow Roast, 'Home' matches are sometimes located further afield than 'Away' matches! This may have put people off joining the club.</p> <p>There are insufficient (and reducing) artificial surfaces available for field hockey in the local area, making organising training times and match play increasingly challenging. There has long been a country wide ambition to improve the health of our nation and the provision of facilities to facilitate this should be supported.</p> <p>BHHHC has always worked hard to engender a strong club community but the lack of a playable surface on site has made this objective more challenging to achieve. We should be encouraging our youth to become more involved in sport and through their clubs, have greater involvement in the wider community. Staying at the clubhouse following their home matches assists build the club community.</p>
<p>6 Station Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2EY</p>	<p>I am writing to support the application as although not a hockey player myself I have played sport to a high level and feel strongly that sport in this country should be encouraged more and be more easily accessible, which our weather and seasons sometimes make so hard. Investment into such facilities like this should be encouraged where it will extend the practice and playing time for participants. Having this all year round facility will greatly enhance the local area sporting facilities and help further nurture the local sporting talent and enthusiasm, at which BHHHC is so good already.</p> <p>Whilst it is always of utmost importance to preserve the AONB that we are lucky to live in, sometimes we have to strike a balance in these areas the best we can. Keeping as much tree screening and natural habitat around the site and the use of an efficient directed lighting system goes a long way towards this. Additionally as it is being sited nearer the A41 (with applicable safety considerations in place) rather than in the middle of a field I imagine a cluster of "manmade" infrastructure will less disturb the local wildlife than if it was on virgin territory. The use of focused beams onto the pitch and reduction in light glare and trespass should help the local wildlife assimilate.</p> <p>Lastly these facilities are proposed to be made available to many of the local sporting clubs which has to be of great wider</p>

	community benefit. Keeping fit and healthy is a cornerstone of a healthy society and having facilities that can be used all year round by many will play its part in this.
11 Hall Park Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2NU	There is general lack of artificial sports pitches in Dacorum, but particularly for hockey. Only one pitch is available in Dacorum, at Tring School - and this is in poor state. Hockey is a sport for all ages and deserves to have provision for play close to where people live.
Shootersway Farm Shootersway Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3TY	<p>I support this project on the basis that very few artificial sports surfaces exist in the general area, something I know is much in need. With the possible loss of the facility at Halton, makes this even more important. The surface must be able to be used as much as possible and by as many groups as possible throughout the year, day and evening.</p> <p>Will encourage more youngsters and others of all ages into sport, something which has been established as very beneficial both physically and mentally. Although no-doubt a large investment by the club, will bring long term income which will keep a valuable part of the community going for many a year.</p> <p>Regards</p>
43 The Warren Chesham HP5 2RX	I totally support this application for AstroTurf at the Hockey Club. It will benefit the club and all who are members and everyone who use the facility. Much needed for the Club and for the community as a whole.
82 Cell Barnes Lane St Albans AL1 5QJ	<p>I believe approving the build of a hockey pitch in Berkhamstead would enrichen the local community in multiple ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) facilitates community social cohesion and diversity 2) contributes to positive mental health through collective enjoyment 3) teaches people young and old the principles of team work, respect, commitment and responsibility 4) encourages an active lifestyle; reducing health problems in the area
St Osyth, Chesham Road Ashley Green Chesham HP5 3PJ	This application should be approved as it will significantly add to the sporting facilities in the area, an area already lacking in such amenities and facing a significant rise in population. Floodlighting is key to allow community access during winter months and modern lighting technologies and techniques will ensure that the impact on the environment and on local residents will be minimal.
38A Beaconsfield Road Tring	I am now in my 5th decade of playing hockey and it has been one of my greatest pleasures being part of such an amazing fraternity of people. My entire family plays and we are in our third

<p>Hertfordshire HP23 4DW</p>	<p>generation of hockey players! I have the great joy of coaching both youngsters (boys and girls) and also adults who are starting to play or even returning after a long period of absence.</p> <p>The local facilities are heavily overused by a number of different schools and clubs and yet the demand in our local area is astonishing. This means that people have to drive considerable distances to be able to play the game. The great sadness is there are people being turned off the sport due to these constraints.</p> <p>There are very few sports, if any, where men/boys/women/girls can all play in the same team at a good level. It promotes a warm and genuine community spirit across both genders and also across age ranges.</p> <p>At the heart of good hockey club is an astro-turf facility, which can then be shared with other users in the community, such as local schools, youth clubs and perhaps even businesses (with team-building opportunities). This active promotion of exercise, team spirit and all the benefits of playing sport are essential to one's wider health and well-being.</p> <p>I wholly support this application, as you can see, and think that the wider benefits to the club and local community would be extremely far-reaching.</p>
<p>31 Kings Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3BH</p>	<p>I am writing to strongly support the application for an astro turf pitch at Cow Roast for Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club.</p> <p>Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club is an active and enthusiastic local club which caters for players from young to old.</p> <p>The development of hockey in the area relies on high quality playing and training facilities and at the moment there is a lack of these, as defined in the DBC 'Playing Pitch strategy Assessment Report', April 2019. At present the club play at either RAF Halton or Tring School. The astro pitch at Halton is possibly to be closed due to development and apart from it being a distant to travel, this is in Bucks, not Herts. This only leaves the school pitch at Tring School but with increased demand the carpet is becoming worn and it is obviously a facility used by the school so that the club have to work around their commitments. Having one facility in the area is not sufficient and is not meeting the demand, and future demand for this sport and the growing community. Dacorum Borough is providing inadequate facilities for hockey and this proposed plan is essential for moving the borough forward. I</p>

	strongly hope that the council support this proposal.
5 Thorntree Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4JE	Hi As per the recent Dacorum Sports Provisioning report, Hertfordshire (specifically west) has a fundamental lack of full-size astro turf pitches for public, local club and school use. This means there is a genuine lack of access to astro-turfs resulting in the need for more to be built so that sports such as hockey which is a growing national sport can be accessible to the wider public, without having to travel great distances, wasting greater resources. I support this plan to build an astro-turf in Cow Roast as it is well placed between Berkhamsted, Hemel Hempstead and Tring.
25 Meadway Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2PN	I support the building of an astroturf pitch at Cow Roast. There is a distinct lack of this type of facility in the Berkhamsted area. In order to support year round usage, it is key that use of flood lighting is approved for the pitch as well.
4 Hickman Street Aylesbury HP19 7GJ	This application should be supported for the following reasons. The hockey club itself is a long-standing and vital source of sporting and social activity to the local area, whose benefits include, but are not restricted to the playing of hockey alone. At a time when there is much talk of the benefits of healthy exercise for all, the club provides the opportunity for this to happen in a supportive, communal and safe environment for young and old alike. The lack of proper artificial pitch facilities in the area have resulted in a great deal of unnecessary travel, loss of club togetherness and unsociable playing times that militate against the spirit of communal endeavour that a community needs so much to bring it together and to engender pride in belonging to a local club. This sort of facility would benefit the young in particular as it is the dearth of such facilities that will prevent the area's youth from taking up such a worthwhile sport and becoming involved in the club ethos. With the eventual disappearance of artificial areas currently used for training and playing in the area, the likelihood of more youngsters becoming involved in sport will diminish. The building of new artificial surface will revitalise the opportunities open to a large segment of the local populace and will energise the efforts of such a positive force for good in the local community at a time when such endeavours are sorely needed. This application should be approved as it will harm no-one and benefit so many. The opportunity to enhance the lives of so many comes around only so often.
Flat 1 195 High Street Berkhamsted Hertfordshire	

HP4 1AD	
The Granary 8 Stocks Farm Barns Aldbury Tring Stocks Rd HP23 5RX	Great plan and approval long overdue. It will serve countless children in future decades to keep fit and healthy.
81 Charles Street Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3DJ	As Chair of Berkhamsted Chamber of Commerce I support this application as it provides a needed amenity for Berkhamsted in particular catering for the welfare and health of Town residents. It will also encourage younger people to take up hockey and give them an sport to enjoy and a hobby that they can participate in for many years. The facilities at the ticket ground are very good and the area itself is secluded. Hopefully with this addition more local people will commit to using them. Pete Elsworth
17 Ashlyns Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3BN	I would like to offer my support to the proposal for building a new astro-turf located in Cow Roast - as I feel that it would immedeiatly benefit the local coummunities of Tring & Berkhamsted and also the wider community as a whole. As an avid sportsman myself, I would love to see a full sized astro-turf pitch locally, that can be used for a multitude of sports, not only Hockey. I send my 7yr old daughter to hockey training on weekends, which is great and clearly popular with the other school kids in the area - based on the number of kids attending. I do however feel concerned that when she gets to the age of play competitive hockey we may need to look further afield from our local club to find a club that has a pitch located at their club grounds. I feel it is an important part of the game and part of the family orientated culture of hockey that she can gain the full experience of being involved with a club that has a 'home'. Having access to a resource like this will also aid in supporting the local schools to get involved in more sport as they would also have access to these services. I think it would be a great shameif this application was not approved. Regards, Stephan Fasher
7 Sandpit Hill Cottages Cholesbury	There is a huge local community of players of all ages but this is serviced by an insufficient number of astros, especially of a decent quality, in the area. As urban development continues

<p>HP23 6NF</p>	<p>locally, better facilities for sports are needed as green spaces reduce. Hockey can be played by all ages and genders and the pitch could be a valuable resource for other sports too. With an excellent club house available for hire it seems unbelievable that there isn't a pitch there already. Cow Roast already has large retail/ industrial units and this would benefit so many, I cannot see why it would not be purely beneficial.</p>
<p>Brownlow Farm Fields End Lane Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2SF</p>	<p>I fully support this proposed development within Dacorum that would provide a vital facility for a thriving community sports club that provides fantastic sporting opportunity for people of all ages.</p> <p>It is well documented that provision for hockey facilities within the borough, is already poor and likely to get worse with the potential redevelopment of Tring School and the closure of RAF Halton.</p> <p>Please don't assume that this club can just go and find a more suitable location for a pitch elsewhere. I've spent 12 years as part of a group that has explored all options for possible sites, including collaborating with house builders on large housing developments, local schools and other sports clubs. This proposal for an AGP at Lockhart's Field is the only option for this club (and actually this Borough).</p> <p>Car Movements.... Don't assume match day traffic will be increased. The club currently plays their 'home' games at RAF Halton, Tring School and at Meadowcroft Aylesbury. Our teams play their matches at these sites and then return to the clubhouse at the Cowroast with their opposition team and their support where they consume 'post match teas' and socialise at the bar. So the number of car movements won't increase, it's just the carbon footprint will be reduced (and our club will have a true home).</p> <p>Pitch Lighting.... Please look at some examples of how modern pitch lighting has improved even in the last year. The technology is awesome and the lack of light spillage needs to be seen to be believed.</p> <p>I own and occupy property directly adjacent to the proposed site for the AGP including ownership of part of the B.O.A.T that serves as access to this site and I fully support this development proposal</p> <p>There's a heap of individuals at this club that dedicate themselves and their time on a voluntary basis. Lets back them up and allow them the chance of a facility that allows them to</p>

	continue to make our community a better place.
<p>Oakwood Graemesdyke Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3LX</p>	<p>To really encourage and increase participation in sport in Dacorum, opportunities to play sports need to be diverse. Hockey has many unique qualities that make it particularly well suited to support to goal of increasing participation and should therefore be supported.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hockey is truly mixed - the men's and women's game have equal standing and participation - and is therefore more likely to encourage women and girls to take up sport or return to a sport they played at school. 2. People can continue to play sport for longer as hockey is less onerous on the body than sports like rugby and football. In fact, over 70s continue to play in the leagues. 3. Hockey is a great family sport: The whole family can play together and parents can play alongside their children in competitive leagues. <p>These attributes mean that the hockey community is open welcoming and inclusive, with something for everyone.</p> <p>There is only one full sized (and not even very good) astro in Dacorum that is suitable for hockey. This limits the number of games and training that can take place and makes it difficult to broaden the opportunities to play and participation in hockey in the local area.</p> <p>I strongly support this application, as a new hockey astro is the only way to ensure hockey remains part of a diverse sports offering in Dacorum but also that it has the best opportunity to increase participation in sport, with all the health and wellbeing benefits that brings.</p>
<p>26 Boswick Lane Dudswell Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3TE</p>	<p>This would be a welcome addition to a thriving hockey club. It would also give an opportunity for local kids to actively participate in an organised sport.</p> <p>this hockey club is a family based, which is in desperate need of the Astro in order to survive as a family club. Local astros are in danger of being lost, resulting in the decline of this wonderful family club.</p> <p>This club caters for ladies and men's hockey, with a thriving junior section. With players starting as young as 6, to well into their 70s, hockey is a game for life.</p> <p>Hockey started as a grass based game, the local club having, at one time six grass pitches. The game has moved on to a wonderful game on AstroTurf. For the club to survive with a growing membership, an Astro at the ground is essential. Currently the grass pitches are being used for local football and rugby teams.</p> <p>There is adequate space to keep these teams thriving along side the Astro.</p>

	<p>This is a wonderful opportunity to enhance the facility for this, and future generations.</p>
<p>17 Woollerton Crescent Wendover Aylesbury HP22 6HT</p>	<p>I write in support of the application for an astro at the BHHHC in Cow Roast, which is much needed for the club and for the local area.</p> <p>BHHHC is a family friendly club encouraging people of all ages and abilities to come together, keep fit and play hockey, with all the physical, mental and social benefits that come with staying active and being part of a community.</p> <p>A home pitch on site is needed for the club to grow and thrive, as well as being a valuable resource for other local teams, schools and organisations.</p>
<p>4 Park Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6AT</p>	<p>Although we would like to be able to support the Hockey Club's proposal for more sporting facilities, I am objecting on behalf of the Chiltern Society. The area in question is Chilterns AONB, where any development detrimental to the appearance and character of the area should be refused. Any structure must enhance the area.</p> <p>This is certainly not the case with the very high floodlights, which would be higher than the surrounding trees. The trees are on two sides of the pitch, the clubhouse on one side, and the wonderful Chiltern views open out on the remaining side. The trees will give very little cover from the floodlights in winter. The light from the floodlights will always look the same, and will be unnatural and severely detrimental to the appearance of the area as a whole, and to the wildlife due to disturbance and the loss of dark skies.</p> <p>The local residents and wildlife would also be greatly disturbed by the increase and noise of cars and people, supporting the matches.</p> <p>Footpath NC28 runs across the top of the proposed new pitch, and of course this must be safeguarded. Walkers are bound to be disturbed by the activities of the Hockey Club.</p> <p>The entrance from the A4251 is totally inadequate even at the present time, without the proposed increased activity. This Restricted Byway WG10, which leads towards the Hockey Club, is the Chiltern Way and is constantly used by walkers. It is a single lane track, and traffic going to and from the A4251, particularly between matches, causes dangerous confrontations and queues on the main road at the junction.</p> <p>We could reluctantly accept the Astroturf as we realise that Hockey needs to be played on a level pitch. But the lighting is certainly not acceptable, nor is the fencing as this would affect the openness which is expected in the AONB.</p>

<p>16 Lukes Lane Gubblecote Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4QQ</p>	<p>I strongly agree to the development of the Astro at Berkhamsted and Hemel Hockey Club. Being an avid sports player within the local area it is clear to see that sporting venues are becoming less well maintained and less common.</p> <p>The need for an astro turf available for hockey is becoming more needed. Tring is not well maintained and is used by two different clubs, both with large numbers. You then need to cross the boarder into other counties to gain space on a pitch.</p> <p>Approving the development of the Astro will be enabling a sport to branch out further, offering fitness to a large area.</p>
<p>17 The Maltings Leighton Buzzard LU7 4BS</p>	<p>I think this is a fantastic idea! A much needed facility in this area. The pitch at Tring is worn with lots of patches. Halton my be going. Why can't we support a local sports club that represents the area. So many children play youth hockey and Berkhamsted & Hemel Hockey club pull out all the stops to help these children develop and get the right coaching. Would be so much better for the community if they had their own pitch to do this.</p>
<p>Herts and Middx Wildlife Trust, Grebe House St Michael's Street St Albans AL3 4SN</p>	<p>This application has the potential to have a significant negative impact on biodiversity, particularly nocturnal wildlife and more specifically bats. This is acknowledged in the lighting strategy document. ODPM circular 06/05 states:</p> <p>'It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision.'</p> <p>In order to demonstrate compliance with this circular, an ecological survey should be submitted which shows how the development will not negatively impact nocturnal wildlife and specifically bat populations. If negative impacts are predicted, appropriate mitigation, which may include operational curfews, must be put forward. All statements of mitigation or compensation in the ecological report must be definitively stated (in accordance with BS 42020) so that they can be enforced.</p>
<p>2 Gade Close Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 3LH</p>	<p>Having moved to Hertfordshire last year, with little to no knowledge of the area and knowing very few people one of the first things I did was join the local hockey club, Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead.</p> <p>Having played at many clubs before this across the country I was keen to get involved as much as possible in both playing and coaching. One thing that stood out to me was how the club was</p>

	<p>very much like a family and at the centre of the community, especially when it came to the youth development. Having a 'home' pitch built at Cow Roast will only further this engagement with the local community allowing the club to grow, both in terms of size but also in terms of quality as currently the club is having to hire pitches that are potentially not fit for purpose for the level the club plays at.</p> <p>Further to this, there is a severe lack of pitches (3G) in the local area that are suitable for hockey to be played on. RAF Halton which is currently being used by the club has question marks over its future and our League's body has said Tring School's pitch cannot be used by the Men's and Women's 1's for competitive matches given its condition.</p> <p>The addition of a pitch would not only be a benefit for the Hockey Club but for all other sports and clubs who utilise the ground currently including, Rugby. The site would allow for the potential of additional revenue for the area with other sports being able to hire it.</p> <p>To conclude, approving this astroturf offers an endless list of benefits to both the Hockey Club and local community. Having moved to Hertfordshire last year, with little to no knowledge of the area and knowing very few people one of the first things I did was join the local hockey club, Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead.</p> <p>Having played at many clubs before this across the country I was keen to get involved as much as possible in both playing and coaching. One thing that stood out to me was how the club was very much like a family and at the centre of the community, especially when it came to the youth development. Having a 'home' pitch built at Cow Roast will only further this engagement with the local community allowing the club to grow, both in terms of size but also in terms of quality as currently the club is having to hire pitches that are potentially not fit for purpose for the level the club plays at.</p>
<p>13 Charles Street Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3DG</p>	<p>I am delighted to hear that Berkhamsted & Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club are requesting planning permission for a new floodlit Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) at Cow Roast. A new AGP at BHC would be a much-needed facility for the community and I would very much like to express my support for the application.</p> <p>The club already provide a much-valued venue for local sport but if permission is granted the facility will be transformed and the local community will undoubtedly benefit.</p>

	<p>It would also be great to see the hockey club teams be able to train and play home matches on astro turf at Cow Roast rather than have to play them in Tring or Berkhamsted.</p>
<p>Holmedene 14 Anglefield Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3JA</p>	<p>Berkhamsted state school children have no access to an Astro turf suitable for playing hockey. I have had to drive 2 children to Aylesbury Tring or Halton, this is not good for the environment or traffic levels.</p> <p>We need to encourage more people into sport and especially children to play sports they may enjoy until they are old. We have an embarrassing obesity crisis in the UK which is one of the reasons why we have a high covid death rate we must ensure there are enough facilities locally for the club to grow and attract new members.</p>
<p>112 Windmill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 4BW</p>	<p>I strongly support this development because I believe that it will have a positive impact on the mental health and well-being of the local community.</p> <p>At the moment, there is a distinct shortage of good quality sports pitches available to hire, especially those specifically for hockey purposes.</p> <p>As a result, currently club activities can not be made accessible to all with limited training opportunities for members particularly those who are in the younger age groups.</p> <p>A pitch at Cow Roast will ensure that there are plenty of exercise opportunities for people of all ages who would like to enhance their physical and mental wellbeing through exercise.</p> <p>Having organised activities here should mean that people are able to loose weight in a fun way or to spend time with other these health benefits will help to cut down the strain on local NHS services. Also it will give young people a purpose and will mean that they have an outlet of something productive to do rather than hanging out on the street.</p> <p>The facilities will also be an asset to the community because they could be hired out for a variety of reasons, but they could also attract summer camps or activity days for children some of which are run by Great Britain Hockey players or veteran players. This will improve awareness of the area and give people progression routes in to sport. People also travel reasonable distances for these events so it would bring people to the local area, visiting coffee shops, restaurants museums ect.</p> <p>Overall I think this will be a great asset to the local area ensuring that a large amount of people from a huge variety of backgrounds and ages will be able to enjoy the benefits of group exercise on</p>

	both their physical and mental health.
63 Crossfell Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8RQ	I am fully in support of this application. The proposed facility will provide a major boost to the sporting infrastructure of the area and will be of benefit to future generations of aspiring players.
Ewe Cottage Wigginton Bottom Wigginton Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6HW	<p>I strongly support this application. The area is in dire need of an AstroTurf pitch for hockey and other sports, particularly given that there are no such pitches in Hemel Hempsted or Berkhamsted. Further afield, the pitch in Tring school is in poor condition, leads to unnecessary traffic on quiet residential roads when in use and does not have space for non-school facilities. The Cow Roast area is in need of investment and new sports facilities would help to promote this.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempsted Hockey Club is ideally situated to provide facilities that are close to both Berkhamstead and Tring, and provide easy access from the A41, without travelling through built-up residential areas.</p>
8 Chestnut Close Aston Clinton Aylesbury Hp22 5Qr	I fully support this application
35 Eight Acres Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5DD	<p>Access to an Astro Turf is a huge asset to the community, for keeping fit and healthy. Many clubs and sports use Astro Turfs for training and competition. The future of the facilities at both Tring School and Halton are uncertain, we are at risk of losing any local grounds; having to travel further out of Dacorum to take part in their activities.</p> <p>The provision for flood lighting is necessary to enable full use of the Astro. I fully support this application to provide new and desperately needed facilities in our local area.</p>
125 Common Road Kensworth LU6 2PJ	<p>There are no facilities for hockey in Berkhamstead / Tring / Hemel, the existing asstroturf pitches are either worn out or about to be sold off. There should be facilities available to hockey payers, the proposal appears to have no negative impact on the surrounding area, but will provide a superb local resource, one which can be used not only for hockey, but for a wide variety of sports.</p> <p>Please support this application.</p>
1 Chiltern Way Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JX	I support this 100%, it would be a great thing for the club and the local community. I have played for the hockey club for years and the one thing it is missing is it's own AstroTurf at the club house. Would very much love for this to happen.
The Great Barn Castle Hill	For the benefit of promoting a local, healthy, outdoor and all-year-round sporting facility for all ages, I wholeheartedly

Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1HH	support the planning for an artificial games pitch at Cow Roast. The alternatives are becoming increasingly untenable.
15 lycrome lane chesham hp5 3jy	Great opportunity to attract more children to play and take up Hockey and sports
22 Tring Road Wilstone Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4PB	<p>What a fantastic opportunity for this local club to develop and grow. I don't see any reason why a club like this should be held back, when they have so much potential. They provide such good opportunities for Junior - Adult players to be involved in the growing sport, and a facility like this would take this club to the next level, which can only benefit the local community.</p> <p>Best of luck BHHHC!</p>
5 Rosehill Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3EW	<p>I am writing in vehement support of the application to provide an astroturf at the Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club site at Cow Roast.</p> <p>The club has been established on this site for many years, holding prominent positions in local and regional leagues across adult and youth hockey. Yet it differs from the competition in not having a pitch onsite - club members and opposition have to travel to a different county (at RAF Halton, Ayelsebury) for many games, with an alternative pitch in Tring being very poor quality. This is unfortunate as it impacts the team morale and club feel, as it difficult for supporters to rally behind teams on match day with disparate locations (and no where to get a cup of tea from - hockey is a winter sport after all). An astro pitch at the site with the current club house would further bind together an already enthusiastic club, building relationships and connections for the local community.</p> <p>With a large number of private schools in the area, many privately educated children have access to high quality hockey facilities. This isn't mirrored by public resource for comprehensive school children. Despite this, BHC has a thriving youth section - something which would be further developed by the club house having a pitch. I speak as someone who has benefited from excellent youth coaching (Sheffield Hallam Hockey Club, South Yorkshire County). Hockey has been a large part of my life for almost 25 years (I am 29 1/2) and the youth of the local area deserve an opportunity to develop sports skills that a full sized, adequately serviced pitch will provide, as well as the social skills and relationships playing team sports supports.</p> <p>Additionally, the astro pitch could be used by the local community, for 5-a-side, lacrosse, as well as other kids clubs and games, etc. With the current situation with coronavirus, we're</p>

	<p>even more aware of the benefits of outdoor exercise and improved overall fitness for health and well being. The relationships we cherish are built and reinforced through shared activities like sport - which are being sorely missed in the current situation. Providing an astro at Cow Roast will be a silver lining to an otherwise dismal year.</p> <p>I would implore the committee to approve this application in support of sport, community, physical and mental well being. There are always concerns with such projects around traffic, noise and light pollution, the environment. But I would argue that these can be overcome by discussion and informed design. BHHC is surviving with the current set-up, but a pitch at Cow Roast would enable the club to thrive and further benefit the local community as well as its membership in the process.</p> <p>Many thanks for considering my comments.</p>
<p>The Village Hall Chesham Road, Wigginton Tring HP23 6HJ</p>	<p>Wigginton Parish Council objects to this planning application due to light pollution and flag lightning.</p>
<p>The Chilterns Conservation Board The Lodge Station Road Chinnor OX39 4HA</p>	<p>24th August 2020</p> <p>By planning portal upload only to Dacorum BC My Ref.: F:Applications</p> <p>Artificial Games Pitch/ Multi Use Games Area with Fencing and floodlighting Berkhamsted Hockey Club Tring Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RF</p> <p>20/01235/MFA</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB). We have read the supporting papers and we note the body of support in the correspondence submitted. CCB as a body with statutory powers, must adhere to our defined core purpose.</p> <p>From the standpoint of a nationally protected AONB landscape and one deemed 'highly valued' in the Landscape Institute's guidance (GLVIA 3rd edition guidance) floodlighting in the open landscape of the AONB must be deemed harmful in this location. The NPPF at 172 requires that 'great weight' is given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. As the starting point here must be a consideration of the special qualities of the AONB, then we would revert to the Herts Landscape Character Assessment, which deals with the sweeping views of the Upper Bulborne Valley, as includes and</p>

surrounds the site.

The Chiltern Way footpath is a part of the restricted bridleway that passes the site. Walkers, in the early evening /dusk period, notably in the winter months, will find the presence of such lighting to be discordant with the open landscape, no matter how sensitively designed.

To assist in this application we would propose that the floodlighting is deleted.

Legislation and Policy Background

Section 85 of the CROW Act 2000 rightly sets a very high test which places an explicit duty on relevant authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of an AONB when exercising or performing any function in relation to or so as to affect an AONB. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF and in the Development Plan (especially The Development Plan in Core Strategy CS1 (AONB within rural character) and Local Plan saved policy 97 (AONB policy) also apply and reinforce these duties. Section 85 of the Chilterns AONB protects the special qualities of the AONB. These special qualities are numerous and include ' a unique offering of ancient woodland, chalk streams, farmland, chalk downland and cultural heritage shaped not just by natural processes but also generations of human activity'. (2019-2024 Management Plan).

Site Specific Issues

This site is located within Herts Landscape Character Assessment - Upper Bulborne Valley (area 117) and this area is acknowledged for its sweeping views.

Such development cannot be deemed to conserve and enhance the AONB, as would be required by policy and in the discharge of the duty in s 85 of the CROW Act. From that standpoint CCB is also aware that the applicant places weight on sport, recreation and public benefits provided. We accept these points but they must be balanced against the harm to the AONB and great weight must be attributed to the protection of the AONB landscape.

The Chilterns Conservation Board was established by Parliamentary Order in 2004 and has two statutory purposes to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB and to increase the understanding and enjoyment of its special qualities. In fulfilling these purposes, the CCB has a duty to foster the

economic and social wellbeing of local communities. Should a conflict exist, then the CCB must give greater weight to the conservation and enhancement of the special qualities of the AONB. That must apply in this case, when weighting up matters of social wellbeing as provided by sport and recreation. The National Planning Policy Framework at 172 is clear that 'great weight' must be given to such a core land-use objective. In the balancing of issues, therefore, greater weight must be given to AONB matters over other material considerations and in the discharge of other statutory duties.

CCB, therefore, has to raise objection to the floodlighting. The technical report accepts the sensitivities of this location but cannot overcome the intrinsically dark sky environment that must be engendered and promoted within such an open landscape. It may be that a design solution exists but it is not immediately apparent. CCB does not oppose the principle of sports use. The area of archaeological significance is sufficient to justify non designated heritage assets of archaeological significance and the NPPF at 194 will also apply.

A nationally protected landscape is, by definition, highly valued in any landscape character assessment. Any development must therefore satisfy the legal and policy tests that conserve and enhance the special qualities of the AONB. This application harms those qualities by materially eroding the host landscape. Following the duties that govern the responsibilities of a Conservation Board (i.e. the CROW Act at section 87) the CCB concludes that the application for retention is harmful and does not satisfy national or local policy that protects the AONB, most notably DP8 of the AONB Management Plan (see below).

The new Chilterns AONB Management Plan 2019-2024 was adopted in February 2019 and may be a material consideration when assessing planning applications (as set out in Government's PPG para 040 on the Natural Environment). The planning objectives in the Management Plan are

- DO1 Ensure planning decisions put the conservation and enhancement of the AONB first.
- DO2 Ensure that where development happens, it leaves the AONB better than it was before - richer in wildlife, quieter, darker at night, designed to have a low impact on the environment, and beautiful to look at and enjoy.
- DO3 Embrace opportunities to restore natural beauty on sites currently degraded by unsympathetic development, infrastructure or dereliction.

A number of detailed Chilterns AONB Management Plan policies deal with key principles that may apply to Development

proposals.

DP1 Ensure planning decisions take full account of the importance of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB and the great weight given to its protection in the NPPF.

DP2 Reject development in the AONB unless it meets the following criteria:

- æ it is a use appropriate to its location,
- æ it is appropriate to local landscape character,
- æ it supports local distinctiveness,
- æ it respects heritage and historic landscapes,
- æ it enhances natural beauty,
- æ ecological and environmental impacts are acceptable,
- æ there are no detrimental impacts on chalk streams,
- æ there is no harm to tranquillity through the generation of noise, motion and light that spoil quiet enjoyment or disturb wildlife, and

- æ there are no negative cumulative effects, including when considered with other plans and proposals.

DP7 Only support development that is of the highest standards of design that respects the natural beauty of the Chilterns, the traditional character of Chilterns vernacular buildings, and reinforces a sense of place and local distinctiveness. Require a Design and Access Statement to accompany every application, explaining how it complies with the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide
www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planningdevelopment/buildings-design-guidance

DP8 Keep skies dark at night by only using light where and when needed. All new lighting should be the minimum required and meet or exceed guidance for intrinsically dark zones. Avoid architectural designs that spill light out of large areas of glazing.

The Chilterns AONB is nationally protected as one of the finest areas of countryside in the UK. Public bodies and statutory undertakers have a statutory duty of regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB (Section 85 of CroW Act).

The Chilterns Conservation Board is a body that represents the interests of all those people that live in and enjoy the Chilterns AONB.

Should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

<p>Northchurch Parish Council : Chair</p>	<p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board</p> <p>I am the Chair of Northchurch Parish Council (NPC). I strongly support this application.</p> <p>In reaching my decision, I have considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), February 2019; 2. Dacorum Borough Council's (DBC) Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report, April 2019; 3. The Government's Guidance for the public on the mental health and wellbeing aspects of coronavirus (COVID-19); 4. Northchurch Parish Council's (NPC) desire to promote the health and welfare of local residents, green spaces and biodiversity. <p>1. <u>National Planning Policy Framework</u></p> <p>The NPPF requires planning authorities to draw a balance between conserving the natural environment and promoting healthy communities. Although the application is in Green Belt and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (CAONB), the need to promote healthy activity in Northchurch significantly outweighs the impact of floodlights on the natural environment.</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 180 relates to the impact of light pollution:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">180. Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should: c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.</p> <p>Portable floodlights have been used at this site for many years. The low height and old-fashioned design mean the light spillage is far greater than a modern directional and shielded system. Therefore, the impact on the natural environment of the new lights would be low.</p> <p>NPPF paragraphs 91 and 96 relate to promoting healthy communities and recreation:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">91. Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve</p>
--	---

healthy, inclusive and safe places which: c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs – for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.

96. Access to a network of high-quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate.

Hockey matches can only be played on artificial turf. Without floodlights, an artificial turf pitch at this site is not financially viable. Without an artificial turf, the Hockey Club has nowhere to play and the scarcity of alternative pitches means that that the club is unlikely to survive. The Hockey Club provides a social venue with a bar and function room, two football pitches, a rugby pitch and a venue for other activities such as archery. If the club folds, all these sports are at risk of closure. The threat to these “opportunities for sport and physical activity” vastly outweighs the small impact that modern lights would have on the natural environment.

2. Dacorum Borough Council's (DBC) Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report

In line with NPPF paragraph 96, Dacorum Borough Council's (DBC) Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report April 2019 provides a “robust and up-to-date assessment of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision.”

Part 6 of DBC's Assessment Report relates to hockey and concludes: “There is an insufficient supply of hockey pitches within Dacorum to accommodate current and future demand for both training and fixtures. There is one full size hockey AGP in Dacorum, located at Tring Sports Centre [...] but it is acknowledged it is nearer its end of life expectancy and will

require resurfacing in the next few years”.

NPPF paragraph 96 states that “Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate.” This planning application accommodates the need for a sport and recreational provision identified by DBC’s assessment.

3.The Government’s Guidance for the public on the mental health and wellbeing aspects of coronavirus (COVID-19);

This guidance states that “maintaining relationships with people you trust is important for your mental wellbeing” and recommends exercising and using, “outdoor sports courts or facilities, such as a tennis or basketball court or golf course.”

Hockey, football, rugby etc. are outdoor activities that allow Dacorum residents to exercise in relative safety. The Hockey Club provides a vital outlet in terms of physical and mental wellbeing.

Players, supporters and spectators not only enjoy sport, but they also experience the beauty of the surrounding countryside. The NPPF paragraph 141 requires local planning authorities, having defined the Green Belt, “to look for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity”. This planning application, by securing the future of sport at this site, contributes strongly to the requirement to provide access to the Green Belt.

3.Northchurch Parish Council’s (NPC) desire to promote the health and welfare of local residents, green spaces and biodiversity

Recent actions by NPC demonstrate that council is committed not only to the health and welfare of local residents, but also to preserving and enhancing green spaces and biodiversity

- Plans to introduce a wildflower verge between Dudswell and the Cow Roast;
- Discussions with St Marys School to replace a tarmac playground with a garden;
- Strongly objecting to proposals to build a large care home on Green Belt and supporting the golf driving range which promotes physical and mental wellbeing;
- Strongly objecting to plans to cut down six acres of willow trees on the edge of Dudswell Conservation Area.

If this application is not approved, the threat to the Hockey Club

and consequent loss of such important recreational facilities far outweighs a very small increase in light pollution.

Conclusion

The Hockey Club cannot survive without an artificial turf pitch. Without floodlights, the artificial turf pitch is not financially viable. If floodlights are not approved, Dacorum may lose a major sporting facility affecting not only hockey but football, rugby and a range of other outdoor activities. These activities enable local people to see and experience the countryside. The importance of providing for physical and mental wellbeing has never been so important. These modern lights will have minimal impact on the environment but the loss of these sporting facilities would be have a huge detrimental impact on the health and welfare of local people.

Neighbours

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 4:38 PM on 05 Oct 2020 from Prof Elizabeth Daniel.

Application Summary

Address: Berkhamsted Hockey Club Tring Road Tring
Hertfordshire HP23 5RF

Proposal: Artificial Games Pitch/ Multi Use Games Area with
Fencing and floodlighting

Case Officer: Nigel Gibbs

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Prof Elizabeth Daniel

Email: E.M.Daniel@open.ac.uk

Address: Chiltern House, Tring Road, Tring, Hertfordshire H
5RF

	<p>Comments Details</p> <p>Commenter Type: Neighbour</p> <p>Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application</p> <p>Reasons for comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Affect local ecology - Inadequate access - Out of keeping with character of area - Traffic or Highways <p>Comments: Planning Application DBC 20/01235/MFA Installation of Artificial Grass Pitch and Lighting Cow Roast by Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead Hockey Club (BHHHC)</p> <p>I provided comments on the above application in June 2020. On 22nd September, I received a letter asking for comments on the same application. An explanation of changes or why we were being asked to comment again was provided. I have contacted the planning officer, Mr Gibbs, on many occasions for an explanation but he has not returned my calls.</p> <p>My comments remain the same as they were in June 2020 (shown below).</p> <p>Additional comments - October 2020</p> <p>I notice that Hertfordshire Highways commented on the proposal on June 17th 2020. While they have made a statement about the existence of a junction with Tring Road (it is usually called London Road) they have made no mention of the nature of this junction and have made no comment on the safety of a fast road/single track intersection. I am concerned that they have not visited the site and do not have local knowledge. As I set out in my June 2020 comments, the junction is approached via a blind corner. Traffic is travelling at 40mph or more higher and will not be able to see stationary traffic waiting to pull into the single track road to the side. A few years ago a car crashed through a residential fence at this very spot because of the high speed it was travelling around the blind corner. Further</p>
--	--

accidents will occur at this spot - and they may well involve children being taken to play hockey on the proposed pitch. I would ask the planners and the hockey club to demonstrate attention to the safety of children and others using this planned pitch and other road users - and clearly understand and address the very serious road safety concerns this application raises.

Comments submitted in June 2020

We would like to object to the above application on the following grounds

1. Inappropriate and damaging development in an AONB. The proposed development would damage the natural beauty of the area which should be protected due to its AONB status. The size of the fencing and light poles means it will be visible from the land and footpaths around the area. The sweeping views are a key part of the beauty of the area and due to the rolling nature of the landscape some of the near-by footpaths are on high ground and will have clear sight of the fencing and poles. Walking and enjoying the AONB is a recreational pastime and this development would reduce this important amenity for large numbers of people. A large number of letters of support have been provided for the application but I am concerned that the applicants did not explain to these organisations that this is an AONB.

2. Extensive light pollution and light disturbance. The strong lighting and the long hours of operation will result in extensive light pollution which will be damaging to wildlife. We have bats and red kites living in the area which will be significantly disturbed. The poles described in the application are higher than the trees that only partially surround the proposed pitch. Also, these trees will not act as a screen in the winter as they will lose their leaves. Light is multi directional and hence, direct line of sight is not the relevant criteria for disturbance. As residents we will have strong light disturbance for up to 6.5 hours per day from the proposed development. It is disingenuous for the applicants to claim that trees will screen the lights and only direct vision is important.

3. Dangerous exit and entry junction with the

	<p>A4251. The documents estimate up to 90 cars arriving at the new development via the single lane BOAT. The planning application failed to mention the approximately 40 cars parked every weekday and some on Saturdays on the BOAT by Stratstone Garage. Hence well over 100 cars per day could be arriving and leaving from the single lane entrance/exit to the BOAT. The end of one match and start of the next will see a lot of cars leave at the same time while others are arriving, which already happens with the football matches held at Cow Roast. This causes traffic to back up on the A4251 outside the pub, waiting for cars to exit the BOAT before others can turn in. This is a blind corner. Despite a 40mph speed restriction traffic regularly comes round this corner and through Cow Roast in excess of 60mph including emergency vehicles. Speed measurements were made by Hertfordshire CC about 10 years ago when the residents asked for traffic calming measures. The CC acknowledged these excessive speeds but said that they were 'expected on a road of this type' and refused any calming. Traffic standing at the blind corner would present a significant danger to life. Even without standing traffic, pulling out from the BOAT is very dangerous because of the lack of sight due to the blind corner. It is not safe to increase the amount of cars pulling out from this junction to over 100 per day. The stretch of road through Cow Roast has seen multiple accidents and standing traffic waiting to turn into the BOAT or more cars pulling out on the blind corner will result in serious accidents. If and when the pub reopens or this building is redeveloped there will be two adjacent exit/entry points with no priority markings further complicating and slowing this dangerous section of road.</p> <p>4. Under estimation of car parking levels. As noted above, Stratstone Garage use the BOAT as part of their commercial operations to store cars arriving for servicing. Normal days see about 40 cars parked from 8am to 6pm. Since they have been stopped from parking on the car park that was built in collaboration with BHHHC and, we understand without planning permission, they park the length of the BOAT. Hence the levels and locations of car parking included in the planning application are</p>
--	--

inadequate as they ignore this. This parking on the BOAT restricts its width and will exacerbate the entry and exit problems discussed in point 2 above.

Additional comment - October 2020

The photo below shows the cars from Stratstone parked at Cow Roast at 8am on Friday 2nd October. There is no one using the field at this time - all of this is the commercial parking from Stratstone which continues to use both the grass verge of the BOAT and the car park that was built without planning permission.

(picture supplied to planning officer and available on request)

We would ask Dacorum Borough Council to consider these points when considering this application.

Supporting sporting activities are important but this is the wrong location for such an intrusive and highly used facility.

Agenda Item 5b

ITEM NUMBER: 5b

20/01866/FUL	Demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of five dwellings	
Site Address:	16 Park Road, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr R Added	
Case Officer:	Robert Freeman	
Parish/Ward:	N/a	Boxmoor
Referral to Committee:	The application has been referred to the Development Management Committee at the request of Councillor Uttley. Councillor Uttley is of the opinion that the application should be rejected on the given its harm to the street scene, loss of amenity for residents and lack of amenity space for future occupants. Councillor Uttley's comments are reported in full within Appendix A	

1. **RECOMMENDATION** – That planning permission be **GRANTED**.

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 The proposals are considered to result in a high quality residential scheme for the site and would make a valuable contribution to the overall supply of new homes in accordance with Policies CS11, CS12 and CS17 of the Core Strategy.
- 2.2 The proposals are not considered to be harmful to the appearance of the area in which they would be located nor would they result in significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. As such the proposals would be in broad accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011
- 2.3 The proposals would incorporate sufficient, safe and convenient measures for access in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

- 3.1 The site is located within the urban area of Hemel Hempstead. It is located at the corner of Park Road and Vicarage Close and comprises a large detached dwelling and its curtilage. The application site also extends to a semi-circular area of hard standing immediately to the rear of the residential curtilage.
- 3.2 The majority of Vicarage Close comprises terraced properties with the exception of numbers 2, 4 and 6 on the northern side. These properties are generally constructed of brick featuring tile hanging or cladding at first floor level. The existing house, 16 Park Road comprise a four bedroom detached dwelling. The property and off-street parking are located at the eastern end of the application site, with access from Park Road.
- 3.3 The site is sloping up from the eastern side (Park Road) towards the rear and west of the site (Vicarage Close) resulting in a level change of approximately 3.9m

4. PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The proposals involve the demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of 4 x 2 bedroom units and 1 x 3 bedroom. These houses are designed as a contemporary terrace of small two storey houses stepped up the hill at Vicarage Close.
- 4.2 The dwellings would be constructed from red brickwork with the first floor and roofs proposed in a red clay tile. First floor terraces would be sited above carports and between units to increase amenity space within the scheme. These will be set behind timber or tile clad sections at 1.5m in height and continuing the materiality of cladding at first floor level to the individual properties.
- 4.3 Each new property would be provided with a single parking space except for the larger replacement dwelling at the junction of Park Road and Vicarage Close which would have two parking spaces accessible from Park Road.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

- 5.1 The proposals have been subject to two pre-application requests (4/02122/19/PRE and 19/03164/PRED) and has been reduced in scale from six units to the five under consideration.
- 5.2 The second pre-application on the site has been evolved and is reflected in this application. The applicants have engaged positively with officers in the development of this scheme.

6. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

- 6.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

- 6.2 These are reproduced in full in Appendix B

7. KEY PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)
Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS2 – Selection of Development Sites
CS4 – The Towns and Large Villages
CS8 – Sustainable Transport
CS11 – Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS13 – Quality of Public Realm

CS17 – New Housing
CS18 – Mix of Housing
CS29 – Sustainable Design and Construction
CS31 – Water Management
CS32 – Air, Soil and Water Quality
CS35 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.

Local Plan

Policy 10 – Optimising the Use of Urban Land
Policy 13 – Planning Conditions and Planning Obligation
Policy 18 – The Size of New Dwellings
Policy 51 – Development and Transport Impacts
Policy 54 – Highway Design

8. CONSIDERATIONS

Policy and Principle

- 8.1 The site is located within a residential area of Hemel Hempstead where in accordance with Policies NP1, CS1, CS2 and CS4 of the Core Strategy the provision of new dwellings would be encouraged.
- 8.2 These dwellings would make a valuable contribution to the supply of new homes in accordance with Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy
- 8.3 The evidence emerging in relation to the Single Local Plan (SLP) indicates that there is a high demand for small 1 and 2 bedroom houses. The proposed scheme would provide five high quality 2 bed homes providing an improving the housing mix within the locality in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.4 Housing needs to be designed to a high standard and delivered at the optimum densities for the site in accordance with Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 10 and Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011. Under Policy CS10 the Council will promote higher densities and more dwellings in and around town and local centres. The design of new dwellings is expected to respect adjoining properties in terms of site layout, coverage, scale, height, bulk, materials and landscaping.
- 8.5 All new development will also be expected to be constructed to the highest environmental and sustainability standards in accordance with Policies CS28, CS29, CS31 and CS32 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.6 The Council will secure contributions to off-set the impact of new development upon the local and strategic infrastructure necessary to support growth under Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy.

Layout and Design

- 8.7 The proposed development has been carefully designed to make the best use of this site and provide appropriate residential development in accordance with Policies CS10 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.8 In doing so, the applicants have responded to the challenging issues of amenity and neighbouring impact to ensure that a satisfactory approach to the provision of new dwellings is achieved in this scheme.

- 8.9 The proposals seek to establish a terrace of residential units stepping up Vicarage Close and reflecting the terraced form and limited separation between units in the Cotterells, Heath Brow, Park Road and Vicarage Close in the wider neighbourhood to the site. In view of its terraced form the scheme will significantly increase the overall density of development upon the application site to approximately 83 dwellings per hectare. Although this is more than the 57 dwellings per hectare for the terraced units in 1-19 (odd) Vicarage Close, it presents a similar number of dwellings to the street for the extent of street frontage.
- 8.10 The form of the terrace provides continuous accommodation at first floor level with the incorporation of additional walled amenity spaces above car ports and seeks to reflect the treatment of terraced and detached units in Vicarage Close through the choice of materials and detailing.
- 8.11 The design of the terrace incorporates strategically placed amenity areas at first floor level reducing the overall bulk and massing of the development and recessed from the rear elevations to provide both visual relief and allow light to neighbouring properties in Park Road.
- 8.12 The resulting terrace is considered to be appropriate in terms of its design, bulk, scale and use of materials and as such is considered to be an acceptable form of residential development in accordance with Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011
- 8.13 In terms of site coverage and layout, the scheme is set back sufficient distance from the edge of the highway to allow sufficient space to allow vehicles to enter car ports and parking spaces between residential units. It utilises the area above these car ports to facilitate the provision of alternative amenity spaces which, in the case of a single unit (Unit 1) at the western end of the site, is accessed from the main living areas to the property. Given that the site is limited in depth, the footprint of the dwellings is prioritised however a range of amenity spaces are cleverly created at both first floor and roof level to ensure a high level of external amenity for future occupants. The scheme is not considered to be cramped and given its terraced form, design and detailing would not appear incongruous nor harmful to the overall character and appearance of the area.
- 8.14 Given concerns with the impact of the property on the visual amenity of the area, Unit 1 has been reduced in scale and given a more conventional appearance through amendments to its design. The internal layout has been flipped to provide bedrooms at ground level and additional low level landscaping around the property will be provided to soften the appearance of the dwelling and in the interests of visual amenity.
- 8.15 Bin stores are provided to the front of each residential unit to ensure that residential waste is not intrusive or unsightly.

Residential Amenity of Proposed Homes

- 8.16 The dwellings have been designed to provide high quality and adaptable living spaces. These are considered to provide a reasonable and appropriate level of internal space in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 18 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.
- 8.17 Four dwellings would have access to private amenity space at ground floor level which although limited in length would be south facing and provide a well-proportioned and desirable amenity space for the size of the dwelling. The other residential unit (Unit 1) has

its floorplan flipped to provide direct access from its main living room area onto a private terrace at first floor level commensurate with its footprint. Two units fronting Vicarage Close would also benefit from private amenity spaces located above proposed car ports in addition to the rear gardens, whilst Unit 2 would also benefit from a private roof terrace. These amenity spaces provide private spaces of varied character and appearance.

- 8.18 In addition to the external amenity space provided within the scheme, the units are a short walk from the Water Gardens and town centre with its variety of open spaces and play activities for children.

Impact on Residential Amenity

1-7 Vicarage Close

- 8.19 Unit 1 at the western end of the application site would be sited some 12.6m from the ground floor to Nos.1-7 Vicarage Close and 14.4m from first floor accommodation. This unit would not result in any significant loss in daylight or sunlight to the main habitable rooms to these properties given its location to the north of the terrace, its limited height and juxtaposition. Given that the distance between the rear elevation of Unit 1 and the front elevation of the terrace would fall below the recommended 23m distance in Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan, there would be no windows at first floor level facing the neighbouring units in the interests of maintaining privacy thereto. The associated roof terrace would also be enclosed to prevent overlooking of neighbouring land. I am also satisfied that the appearance of the building would not be unduly overbearing to these properties, albeit that the outlook would be changed from the view of an open area of hardstanding to the rear elevation to this property. The mass of this elevation is broken by the use of tile hanging.

2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close

- 8.20 The proposed dwellings would be located opposite the properties at 2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close. There would be a separation distance of between 15-16.8m between frontages. There are no specific requirements for the separation of frontages to residential properties within the adopted Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011. The distance is sufficient to ensure that there is no loss in either daylight or sunlight to these neighbouring units as a result of development. The front elevations of 2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close are already in public view and are at an elevated position to the application site. In view of the separation and acknowledging that the arrangement is typical of front to front relationships between dwellings, it is considered that there is no significant adverse impact upon the privacy of these properties.

18 Vicarage Close

- 8.21 The flank elevation of the proposed dwelling at the western end of the site would be located between 15-16.8m from the front elevation of 18 Vicarage Close. Given that this property would be located on higher ground and the distance involved, there are no concerns with regards to the impact of development upon the residential amenities of this unit.

18 Park Road

- 8.22 The most significant impact on neighbouring property will be that to 18 Park Road. The proposals have been carefully designed to address concerns with the impact that development might have upon this property and with a view to addressing concerns raised at the pre-application stage.

- 8.23 The primary concerns are with the impact of development upon the daylight to the property and the impact of the proposals upon privacy. In addition it is also important to consider whether the proposals might be overbearing to this property. 18 Park Road is located to the south of the application site and as such would not suffer any loss of sunlight.
- 8.24 Units 2 and 3 of the scheme have been carefully considered to ensure the protection of the amenities of this unit. This is reflected in the low eaves level and tall velux windows within the vaulted bedrooms serving units 2 and 3 that have specifically been incorporated to avoid views over the property in the interests of privacy.
- 8.25 In terms of daylight careful consideration has been given to the application of 25 degree and 45 degree rules, but more so to the overall massing and site placement of properties. The eaves height of units 2 and 3 is low and the properties located significantly distant from the openings. The terrace is located to provide a gap between properties and allow light to permeate to the main windows. Due to the amount of open sky enjoyed by the property it is unlikely that daylight factors will be significantly affected by the proposals. The BRE suggests that a method for measuring diffuse daylight such as a Vertical Sky Component (VSC) be used to accurately analyse the impact. This involves taking a VSC at the centre point of each affected window and distance/height of any obstructions within 180 degrees. It is evident that there are no obstructions to the window to the west or south.

Impact on Highway Safety

- 8.26 The proposed scheme has been amended to address the concerns within the response of Hertfordshire County Council as highway authority.
- 8.27 In terms of off-street parking provision, the site is located within designated Accessibility Zone 3 where Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan 1991-2011 requires a maximum parking provision of 1.5 parking spaces per 2 bed unit and 2.25 spaces per 3 bed property. This would result in an overall shortfall of 2.25 spaces. The shortfall in each property correlates with an expectation for visitor parking provision.
- 8.28 It is however noted that KD Plaza is located within Accessibility Zone 2 and is arguably a comparable walk from the town centre to the application site. The proposal would exceed the parking requirements for a property in Zone 2 by 0.5 spaces (1.5 spaces being the requirement for a three bed unit). The application site also falls within a CPZ where the provision of on-street parking is strictly controlled.
- 8.29 The provision of a single space per 2 bedroom property and 2 spaces for the 3 bedroom property is considered to be sufficient off-street parking given the close proximity of the development to the town centre and in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy. Given on-street parking restrictions and the accessibility of the site for visitors and occupants alike, this is not considered to result in an unreasonable or significantly adverse impact on highway conditions.
- 8.30 The proposed works are also not considered to be significantly harmful to pedestrian safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy given the limited number and extent of new crossovers to the pavement at the southern side of Vicarage Close and given relative few units served. Pedestrian visibility splays have been included and will be secured by condition.

Sustainability

- 8.31 Policy CS29 requires all development embrace the principles of sustainable construction. The new buildings will be expected to be constructed to a Building Regulation requirements in relation to Part L and with a high level of thermal efficiency. Fixtures and fitting will be required to conserve energy and water. Further details of sustainable construction measures will be secured by condition.
- 8.32 In terms of securing improvements in the biodiversity value of the site, the proposals are subject to a landscaping condition under which such matters will be considered further in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy.

CIL

- 8.33 All new residential developments are expected to contribute towards the on-site, local and strategic infrastructure needs required as a result of development and in accordance with Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy. The Council has adopted a CIL Charging Schedule to secure contributions towards the cost of infrastructure. The site is located in Charging Zone 3 and in accordance with the Schedule new residential development will be charged accordingly.

Representations

Procedural Matters

- 8.34 The application does not require a site notice to be displayed in view of its location and scale. All relevant neighbours have been consulted in accordance with our Statement of Community Involvement and it is evident from the large response to the consultation exercise that all residents within the locality of the application site are aware of the scale and nature of the proposals. As such they have not been prejudiced by a lack of any formal site notice being displayed at the site.
- 8.35 I am also satisfied that the plans submitted are accurate and a sound basis on which to make a planning decision.

Loss of Amenity Area/Play Area

- 8.36 A number of residents have expressed concern with regards to the loss of a tarmacked area at the western end of the site, both in terms of its visual impact and amenity. On occasions this is referred to as a play area despite not providing any formal play function or activity. The land in question appears to have been transferred into the ownership of the applicant albeit it still forms part of and has rights relating to its use as a public highway. The hard standing does not have a formal dropped kerb and as such its use for parking is unauthorised.
- 8.37 Given its limited function as part of the highway and potential enclosure by the applicant, its amenity value to the wider area is considered to be negligible and its loss as a public space cannot be regarded as grounds for refusal of a planning application.
- 8.38 The area will need to have its formal rights as a highway extinguished through a Stopping - Up Order. Stopping-Up Orders can be made under either the Highway Act 1980 or under the Town and Country Planning Act and are subject to separate application considered by the highway network management team. This processes is separate to the planning application process and is thus not material to the consideration of this proposal.

Protected Species

- 8.39 A number of residents have also indicated the presence of protected species at the site including nesting birds and bats. It is unlikely that bats would be utilising the building proposed for demolition; particularly given its age and structure. This need not prevent the development of the site subject to appropriate licencing and in the event of evidence of use being found at the site. It is suggested that advice is incorporated in relation to such matters via an informative to the planning permission.

Construction Noise

- 8.40 In addition there are concerns from residents regarding noise and pollution as a result of development. The construction of the dwellings will result in some temporary disturbance to residents within Vicarage Close, but this in its own right does not justify the refusal of planning permission, All activities relating to construction and noise nuisance will be controlled by the Environmental Health team under their Regulations. Further details of construction management are required to be submitted by condition.

Human Rights

- 8.41 The development has been assessed against the provisions of the Human Rights Act and in particular Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 of the Act itself. The Act gives further effect to the rights including in the European Convention on Human Rights. In arriving at this recommendation, due regards has been had to the applicants reasonable development rights and expectations which have been balanced and weighed against the wider community interest as expressed through third parties, the Development Plan and Government Guidance.

9 RECOMMENDATION

- 9.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following planning conditions:

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

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

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

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

P268_SP_01 (Proposed Site Plan)

P288_GA_01 Revision P01 (Proposed Ground Floor Layouts)

P268_GA_02 Revision P01 (Proposed First Floor Layout)

P268_GA_03 Revision P01 (Roof Plan)

P268_GA_04 Revision P01 (Proposed Elevations)

P268_GA_05 Revision P01 (Proposed Elevations)

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

- 3. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These**

materials shall be made available for inspection at the application site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

- 4. No development shall take place until details of the boundary treatment to the first floor terraces and the cladding at first floor level shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the terrace enclosure shall thereafter be retained in perpetuity.**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to protect the residential amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

- 5. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the proposed access and parking areas have been provided in accordance with drawing No P268 GA01 Revision P.01**

Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of the parking area, in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policy 54 and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004).

- 6. A 2mx2m pedestrian visibility sight splay, free from obstruction between a height of 600mm and 2.0m and relative to the back of the footway shall be provided on both sides of vehicular access prior to the operational use and thereafter**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of the development in the interest of highway safety

- 7. No construction of the superstructure shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:**

- all hard surfaces within the site;
- other surfacing materials;
- means of enclosure,
- soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs;
- existing and proposed ground levels and
- the location of services

The planting must be carried out within one planting season of completing the development.

- 8. Any tree or shrub which forms part of the approved landscaping scheme which within a period of 5 years from planting fails to become established, becomes seriously damaged or diseased, dies or for any reason is removed shall be replaced in the next planting season by a tree or shrub of a similar species, size and maturity.**

Reason: To improve the appearance of the development and its contribution to biodiversity and the local environment, as required by saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS12 (e) of the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 170 (b & d) of the NPPF (2019).

9. **The proposed bin storage facilities shall be provided prior to the occupation of the dwellings hereby approved and shall thereafter be retained in perpetuity.**

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy

10. **Prior to the commencement of the site works the applicant shall submit a construction management plan setting out details on any demolition works, removal of materials from site, parking for all contractors, sub-contractors, visitors and delivery vehicles, storage of materials to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority and that area shall be maintained available for use at all times during the period of site works.**

Reason: To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

11. **Notwithstanding the details provided, no construction of the buildings hereby approved shall take place until full details of the measures for sustainable construction have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall address the requirements under Policy CS29 of the Core Strategy. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure that the development takes full account of Policy CS29, CS31 and CS32 in the interests of sustainable construction

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

A, B and E

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development in the interests of safeguarding the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy (2013). Also, to enable the Local Authority to retain control of the development to safeguard the outdoor amenity space of the development and safeguard against spatial pressure to the retained trees on site in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policy 99 of the Local Plan (2004)

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant both before and during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.
2. Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or

partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website: <http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047

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

The Highway Authority requires the alterations to or the construction of the vehicle crossovers to be undertaken such that the works are carried out to their specification and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.), the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. The applicant may need to apply to Highways (Telephone 0300 1234047) to arrange this, or use link: <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/droppedkerbs/>

3. 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.

Any external lighting scheme should be designed to minimise light spill, in particular directing light away from the boundary vegetation to ensure dark corridors remain for use by wildlife as well as directing lighting away from potential roost - nesting sites.

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.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments

<p>Councillor Uttley Boxmoor Ward</p>	<p>I have had a look at the proposals and having visited the site at Vicarage Close on Friday, I have attached some photos for your perusal. I recommend that you go if you can manage it, as I think the photos I have taken do not do justice to the pleasant open aspect of the close.</p> <p>Nevertheless, I hope you can see from the panorama, the close has a very open feel, with every single home on it having a front garden and/or driveway area. On top of this, the semi-circular area which is currently unbuilt upon, and has previously been a shared amenity area for all residents, is over 10m wide, (and longer than 10m from the fence of 16 Park Road) and this adds to the open nature of the cul-de-sac.</p> <p>The semi-circular area was originally built with paving slabs, intended as an amenity area, not for parking, as can be seen in this old photograph (untitled 26 from 1979). I understand that the council concreted it over at some point, possibly to save on upkeep (although as I understand it, this was not the Councils responsibility). I have also attached a photo of the original plans for the close (Untitled 25), and you can see that the houses 16, 18 and 20 Park Road were part of this development. Every house on the close has a front and back garden.</p> <p>It is my view that the proposal as it stands should be rejected on three main grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Street Scene – The close was all built at the same time, along with the house at 16 Park Road. It was designed to be open and friendly, with each house being set back from the road, with front gardens and/or driveways as well as back gardens. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. CS 11 b) and CS 12 f) this development does not preserve or integrate with the attractive streetscape. The new houses do not have any front gardens, bar a bin storage space, and otherwise front directly onto the pavement. This is directly in conflict with the current attractive streetscene. b. CS12 c) this development would be a visual intrusion to all that live on the Close. House 1 would jut out into the centre of the close, with no front gardens, and be overbearing on the close as a whole. In particular, it would limit daylight and sunlight to front of the house 1 (and to a lesser extent 2) Vicarage Close, which would be looking out directly on the rear of house 1. The road is less than 5m width at this point, and these two houses would become confined into a small space in the corner of this development. 2) Loss of amenity by current residents. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. CS12 g) viii) This proposal does not respect adjoining properties in terms of amenity space. By building on this semi-circular area, which until very recently was a
---	--

	<p>shared amenity area, and is still used as such, the development is directly responsible for loss of amenity, contrary to NPPF 127f).</p> <p>b. CS12 c) Loss of privacy for Nr 18 Park Road. the houses 2 & 3 will be looking over the garden of Nr 18 Park Road, with bedroom windows looking out over the short gardens for their own house onto the garden of Nr18 (these are velux so it isn't 100% clear how much overlooking there would be). There is potentially some cover from trees, although one of these is not yet planted so unlikely to provide any cover for a while. Also, without TPOs I imagine these trees would not last long, since the gardens they are in are so small.</p> <p>c. CS12 c) this development would limit daylight and sunlight to the garden/house at Nr 18 Park Road.</p> <p>3) Lack of amenity space for future occupants.</p> <p>a. Amenity space for future occupants. The houses all have very small gardens, especially number 1, which has two miniscule areas. The garden space for these residents is contrary to NPPF 127 f).</p> <p>As well as the above, there are also the usual parking issues, with each 2 bed house having only 1 space, and the 3 bed having only 2 spaces. However, I am aware that parking doesn't normally hold much weight as an issue alone, but perhaps this is indicative that there has been an attempt here to fit too many houses into too small a plot.</p>
Hertfordshire Highways	<p><u>Original Comments</u></p> <p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:</p> <p><u>Planning Application:</u></p> <p>The proposals is to replace an existing larger house, garden and hard standing with 5 new smaller dwellings, consisting of 4 smaller 1-2 bedroom dwellings and one 3 bedroom dwelling, with new pedestrian and vehicular access from Vicarage Close and Park Road with car parking from existing 2 parking to 6 car parking spaces.</p> <p><u>Application site and Local Road Network.</u></p> <p>The development site is located on 16 Park Road in Hemel Hempstead. The property No 16 is an existing house at the front of the site with off-street parking and a garden. The site is generally sloping towards the road. The existing garden is timber fenced with a Holly tree, an elm tree and a Fir tree to the south west corner of the site.</p> <p>A tarmacked semi-circular area to the west also forms part of the application site. This semi-circular tarmacked area is identified as</p>

highway land which is within the highways boundary, but in the application form this land is declared as in control of the applicant. It is possible the land may be owned by the applicant with highway rights.

In terms of highway response, the land ownership is not a material consideration unless there are access issues. This response is based on the assumption that if the planning permission is granted the applicant will secure the land via stopping up order to remove highway rights and if this fails then the applicant will have an un-implementable planning permission.

The existing house and off-street parking is positioned in the east part of the site, with access from Park Road. Park Road is an unclassified local access road some 414m in length linking St Johns Road and Charles Street. Vicarage Close forms a "T" Junction with Park Road. Vicarage Close is a cul-de-sac some 55m in length providing access to 3 detached properties (2, 4 and 6) and 2 lines of 9 and 7 terraced properties. All these properties in Vicarage Close are with integral garages and 2 parking spaces.

There is double yellow line parking restriction at Vicarage Close junction with Park Road, and single yellow line along Vicarage Close adjacent to the application site. Vicarage Close is approximately 5.5m wide. There are no on-street parking restrictions in front of the existing detached properties opposite to the application site.

Accessibility

The application site is surrounded by residential properties and the proposed development is to replace an existing dwelling. However, the application site is in easy access to Hemel Hempstead train station and near town centre and Riverside shopping centre, and as such benefits from good public transport links.

Planning History

The applicant submitted two pre-applications to Dacorum regarding this scheme, the first in August 2019 proposed the demolition of the existing house and six new dwellings on the site. This was followed up in December 2019 with the secondary pre application for a smaller scheme of five new dwellings. The scheme of five houses was put forward, allowing for larger plot with increased parking. From existing 2 spaces to 6 spaces.

Recommendation.

Highway Authority recommends the planning application to be refused for the following reason:

Reasons for refusal:

a) The application form indicates no alterations to vehicular access. There are no existing access or parking to the application site off Vicarage Close. The application proposal is for 4 parking spaces ie 2 x2 spaces car port. It is an offence to drive over footway without dropped kerb

1 Under Highway Act 1980 (section 184) make it an offence to drive a

vehicle across the footway or verge where there is no proper vehicle crossover.

2 For example, a standard dropped kerb a single driveway for two cars is 5.4m wide (4 x0.9 dropped kerb + 0.9 m flushed kerb on either side. The application is seeking full planning permission. The applicant should provide the full details of the vehicle crossover to scale and the parking layout to accommodate 4 cars.

3 The application site at the corner plot of junction between Park Road/ Vicarage Close. The vehicles from the car park are likely to reverse on to Vicarage Close. Adequate Visibility splays (both vehicle and pedestrian) should be provided for cars reversing from car port in the interest of highway safety.

4 The standard UK parking bays is 2.4m wide and 4.8m depth. This is under review by the parking authorities. Modern cars are generally longer and don't fit within parking space and they overhang. Cars overhanging in public car parks and supermarkets has limited effect. However, cars parked on site in residential parking should be within the curtilage of the application site and should not overhang over footpath.

5 It appears that the depth of the car ports for parking space 1 to 4 is 6m to the back of the footpath. The width of parking space is barely 2.4m wide. This parking arrangement should supported by swept path diagrams to demonstrate that a car can reverse adequately with another car parked in the car port.

6 Parking spaces 5 and 6 are from Park Road. The proposed parking spaces measures 5m to the back of footpath. The preferred parking bay depth is 5.5m Modern cars are generally longer and don't fit within parking space and they overhang. Cars parked on site should be within the curtilage of the application site and should not overhang over footpath. Adequate provisions should be made to intercept surface water discharging on to public highway.

7 There are number of street furniture including buried cables along the footpath adjacent to the application site. The applicant should take appropriate measures to contact the relevant authorities/utilities to move any street furniture at the applicant's cost.

8 NPPF. Promotes safe and secure layouts and identify the need to minimise conflicts between traffic and other road users. County Council's transport policies promotes design and layout to give priority to pedestrians, cyclists and other Non-vehicle users and provide for safe and convenient. The existing footpath as proposed stops at unit 2. There is no continuation of footpath around unit 1. This arrangement would result in inconvenience for pedestrians or people with sensory or mobility difficulties.

Amended Comments

Notice is given that the Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)

(England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority would not object to the development subject to the following conditions:

Condition 1 :

Prior to the commencement of the site works the applicant shall submit a construction management plan setting out details on any demolition works, removal of materials from site, parking for all contractors, sub-contractors, visitors and delivery vehicles, storage of materials to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority and that area shall be maintained available for use at all times during the period of site works.

Reason;- To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway

Condition 2

Before the first occupation of the approved development the access arrangement from Vicarage Close as shown in principle Proposed ground Floor layouts No P268 GA01 Revision P.01 shall be constructed and completed to the satisfaction of the Highway/Planning Authorities.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed access is designed and constructed to the current Highway Authority's specification as required by the Local Planning Authority.

Condition 3:

A 2mx2m pedestrian visibility sight splay, free from obstruction between a height of 600mm and 2.0m and relative to the back of the footway shall be provided on both sides of vehicular access prior to the operational use and thereafter

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of the development in the interest of highway safety

Advisory Note.

Informative:

I recommend inclusion of the following advisory note to ensure that any works within the highway are to be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the highway Act 1980.

New or amended crossover – construction standards

AN1) Construction standards for new/amended vehicle access: Where works are required within the public highway to facilitate the new or amended vehicular access, the Highway Authority require the construction of such works to be undertaken to their satisfaction and

specification, and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission, requirements and for the work to be carried out on the applicant's behalf. Further information is available via the website:

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/changes-to-your-road/dropped-kerbs/dropped-kerbs.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Storage of materials

AN2) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website

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

Obstruction of the highway

AN3) Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website

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

Mud on highway

AN4) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall always be taken to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website

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

Planning Application: (20/1866/FUL)

Planning application is to replace an existing larger house, garden and hard standing with 5 new smaller dwellings, consisting of 4 smaller 1-2 bedroom dwellings and one 3 bedroom dwelling, with new pedestrian and vehicular access from Vicarage Close and Park Road with car parking from existing 2 parking to 6 car parking spaces.

Planning History

The applicant submitted two pre-applications to Dacorum regarding this scheme, the first in August 2019 proposed the demolition of the existing house and six new dwellings on the site. This was followed up in December 2019 with the secondary pre application for a smaller scheme of five new dwellings. The scheme of five houses was put forward, allowing for larger plot with increased parking. From existing 2 spaces to 6 spaces.

Highway Authority was consulted on the above Planning Application and the Authority recommended refusal on inadequate details on vehicle crossover to parking layouts and the potential conflict between the vehicles and other road users. The applicant submitted an amended layout to the highway authority on 7th September. 2020. The highway Authority acknowledged the receipt of the plans. On 4th October, received an e mail from Planning Case Officer as a formal Consultation.

Application site and Local Road Network.

The development site is located on 16 Park Road in Hemel Hempstead. The property No 16 which is an existing house at the front of the site with off-street parking and a garden. The site is generally sloping towards the road. The existing garden is timber fenced with a Holly tree, an elm tree and a Fir tree to the south west corner of the site.

A tarmacked semi-circular area to the west also forms part of the application site. This semi-circular tarmacked area is identified as highway land, which is within the highway's boundary, but in the application form this land is declared as in control of the applicant. It is possible the land may be owned by the applicant with highway rights.

In terms of highway response, the land ownership is not a material consideration unless there are access issues. This response is based on the assumption that if the planning permission is granted the applicant will secure the land via stopping up order to remove highway rights and if this fails then the applicant will have an un-implementable planning permission.

The existing house and off-street parking are positioned in the east part of the site, with access from Park Road. Park Road is an unclassified local access road some 414m in length linking St Johns Road and Charles Street. Vicarage Close forms a "T" Junction with

Park Road. Vicarage Close is a cul-de-sac some 55m in length providing access to 3 detached properties (2, 4 and 6) and 2 lines of 9 and 7 terraced properties. All these properties in Vicarage Close are with integral garages and 2 parking spaces.

There is double yellow line parking restriction at Vicarage Close junction with Park Road, and single yellow line along Vicarage Close adjacent to the application site. Vicarage Close is approximately 5.5m wide. There are no on-street parking restrictions in front of the existing detached properties opposite to the application site.

Accessibility.

The application site is surrounded by residential properties and the proposed development is to replace an existing dwelling. However, the application site in easy access to Hemel Hempstead train station and near town centre and Riverside shopping centre, and as such benefits from good public transport links.

Access and Parking

The development proposal is for one 3 bed unit and 4 smaller units. The parking provision is 2 spaces for the 3 bed units to be accessed via Park Road (existing) and 1 space per smaller units (4 spaces) to be located in car port beneath the terrace and to be accessed via Vicarage Close. The existing parking provision on site is 2 spaces and the proposed parking provision is 6.

The application form still indicates that there are no alterations to the highway in relation to vehicular access. The application proposal is for 4 parking spaces ie 2 x2 spaces car port. It is an offence Under Highway Act 1980 (section 184) to drive over footway without dropped kerb. One of the key reasons for earlier refusal. The applicant's amended ground floor layouts drg no P268 GA 01, Rev P.01 now includes the need for vehicle crossovers.

Applicant should follow the instruction as on Advisory note AN1

New or amended crossover – construction standards.

I am pleased confirm that the proposed car ports are of adequate width and depth for cars to be parked within the curtilage of the application site.

There are number of street furniture including buried cables along the footpath adjacent to the application site. The applicant should take appropriate measures to contact the relevant authorities/utilities to move any street furniture at the applicant's cost.

Capacity and safety

The proposed development is an intensification on the use of existing site. However, the level of traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development is unlikely to have any significant impact on the local road network.

	<p>It is considered that there are no existing highways safety issues present in the local road network that need to be considered.</p> <p><u>Refuse</u></p> <p>I would recommend LPA to consult your refuse collection team.</p> <p><u>Fire Safety</u></p> <p>In terms of access to Fire Tender, the layout provides direct access via Park Road and Vicarage Close.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>In terms of capacity, safety and sustainability the proposed development complies with the policies set out in NPPF. The Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of consent subject to the above conditions and advisory notes</p>
--	--

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Address	Comments
2 Park Road	<p>We wish to object to the proposed development</p> <p>We fully support and endorse the submissions made by 17 Vicarage Close, 4 Park Road and 25 Park Road</p> <p>Specifically, we object on the grounds that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The development is not in keeping with other properties in either Vicarage Close or Park Road 2) There is inadequate parking provision for a development of this size - parking is already at a premium in the area and this would simply add to the problem in both Vicarage Close and Park Road 3) There is likely to be a resultant rise in noise and pollution 4) Increasing from one perfectly adequate property to five smaller 'boxes' is clearly over-development of the site
4 Park Road	<p>I object to the proposed demolition and proposed development of 5 houses (4 two bedroom, and and 1 three bedroom) on the site of one detached home.</p> <p>More details of the objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I object to the proposed demolition and construction of 5 new dwellings (to house up to 14 people in place of one house) as it would not be in keeping with the style of the existing properties on Park

Road/Vicarage Close. Park Road is mainly made up of 1930s housing, and bungalows, semi-detached and detached properties not a modern, tightly spaced terraced building as proposed. Consideration needs to be given to the transition from detached dwellings on that side of the road and I am not sure that the height and scale of the proposed buildings provides an appropriate transition between the detached homes in that part of the area.

2. I object to the proposed planning on the grounds of increased traffic and parking issues as there is inadequate provision for parking on the proposed site. There are already limited permit parking spaces that would be under increased demand from the residents and visitors to the proposed development. The 5 new properties only have spaces for 6 cars onsite whereas the existing home has its own contained parking for 3+ cars for one home. There is wholly inadequate provision for 14 extra cars plus their guests assuming 1 car per resident.

3. I object to the proposed development as it is proposed to replace a detached home with 5 separate and terraced dwellings, increasing the population 3-fold and there will be increased noise and disturbance from those new residents.

4. An important ground for objection is that bats and other wildlife including nesting birds are likely to be affected by this proposed development. I know that there are a number of bats in this area, I have seen bats flying around the eaves of these neighbouring properties at dusk and count at least 20-30 sightings both summer 2019, and in spring/summer 2020. I am concerned that the proposed development will affect their roosts and also their commute to their roosts as the proposed development is in the line of travel of the bats. I believe that such a survey will demonstrate that the proposed development is likely to affect bat foraging and/or their commuting habitat.

My understanding is that the planning authority has a legal obligation to consider whether bats are likely to be affected by a proposed development. If a survey has not already been undertaken to determine the potential for bats on site and/or the presence of bats, the planning authority should request that the developers commission an appropriate survey. PLEASE CONFIRM THIS HAS BEEN COMMISSIONED.

5. I object also on the grounds that I believe the proposed demolition and development will have an impact on the habitat and wildlife in my area, in particular birds. I also feel that the development could be made more sympathetic to the local environment, enhancing opportunities for biodiversity. The proposal does not include retention of existing wildlife features on the site such as the hedgerows and trees, nor do the proposals use native plants and trees in any landscaping designs. The planning application omits to mention the existing plants and trees and hedgerows on site. PLEASE CAN I HAVE SIGHT OF ANY TREE SURVEY CARRIED OUT AS PART OF THIS APPLICATION

6 I object to the plan as there are extremely small green

	spaces/amenities for each property. The drawings do not show that 2 parking spaces will be accessed from Park Road, and the other will mean additional vehicle movement on the narrow cul de sac Vicarage close.
8 Park Road	<p>I object to this planning application in the following grounds...</p> <p>That it is clearly an overdevelopment of one house to five houses Loss of parking and lack of adequate provision for parking Loss of what was a community area where the local children could safely play outside Increased traffic in what has been a pleasant And open area Wildlife habitats being squeezed yet further, disruption to bat colonies which fly regularly in the evenings in the area</p> <p>Additionally I feel very sorry for the direct neighbours surrounding the proposed properties because there will inevitably be loss of privacy, light and space, disrupting the community no end.</p> <p>I believe this is an application which has been proposed with no regard for the community and neighbours that are being left with the consequences.</p>
10 Park Road	<p>I oppose this proposal of converting the existing house into a block of flats.</p> <p>This proposed development is totally out of character for a street of residential houses and there is already very limited parking provisions on Vicarage/Park Road for visitors and residents that a development of this sort will add to the problem. This in turn will increase the flow of traffic on these quiet streets.</p>
13 Park Road	<p>This will create more traffic & Parking problems in a very busy road Not in keeping with current properties</p>
14 Park Road	<p>We have concerns re the proposed application 20/01866/FUL Development of land to replace existing house with 5 new dwellings. 16 Park Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1JS</p> <p>Density of building and occupation planned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plan proposes an increase from 1 property with 3 bedrooms to 5 properties with a total of 11 bedrooms which will increase the stress on the existing services, from utilities such as sewage to GP Practice Lists. - The increase in building and reduction in garden area will mean less soak away options during heavy rainfall and an increase in direct flow into the drainage system on Park Road. Currently during heavy rain there is a significant runoff of water from Vicarage Close into Park Road; any additional increase will impact on the drainage system in Park Road. <p>Adequacy of Parking/loading/turning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The application includes garage space for a car and cycles next to

	<p>the proposed buildings. However it is common for houses of more than one bedroom to have more than one car. If this is the case, it will create a parking and access problem. The entrance to Vicarage Close, a cul de sac, is narrow which means any parking on the road could create access difficulties for emergency services, bin lorries etc. Additional housing will increase the pressure for parking and the narrowness of the road could lead drivers, despite their best intentions to comply with the Highway Code, to park partly on the pavement. This would adversely affect disabled person's access including making it more difficult for those with sight impairments to navigate the pavement. Vicarage Close acts as a through-path for those coming from the station and going into town which adds to the normal pedestrian traffic in the Close.</p> <p>- Pressure on parking spaces could create an over-spill into Park Road. This would add to the existing parking pressures on Park Road which allows parking on one side of the road only.</p> <p>Traffic Generation</p> <p>- The proposed application of an increase from 1 household to 5 households with cars will generate an increase in traffic on both Vicarage Close and Park Road. The additional traffic will create an impact on the air quality for everyone and the road safety of pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
15 Park Road	<p>1.0 Application Form.</p> <p>1.1 There are some concerns with the application form and I would question some of the assertions made.</p> <p>1.2 Under 8 - there is a right of way that will be extinguished. The public have a right of way at the top of site on the semi-circular part of the plan.</p> <p>1.3 Under 9 - the application says that there are 2 parking spaces - the existing spaces could probably hold 3 cars. Also the property has rights to parking access see the drop kerb on Vicarage close. The owner demolished the garage and fenced it of. So there are probably 4 spaces rather than 2. The development will only increase off road parking by 2.</p> <p>1.4 Under 10 - there needs to be Tree Survey and it is likely that the roots of proposed replacement trees will damage properties and have to be cut down in a few years.</p> <p>1.5 Under 11 - the proposal will reduce lawn and so will add to the water running down the hill adding to overflow on the drains. The drains then run down Charles St to flood the Cotterells.</p> <p>1.6 Under 12. There are bats in this area. The applicant asserts that there are none on his property. The applicant should have a bat survey before asserting that there are none at number 16.</p> <p>2.0 The plan</p>

2.1 The demolition of a good quality detached family home with a garden is proposed to meet the Council's housing target in Policy CS17. The development will build 5 homes. The target is being achieved under existing buildings throughout the council area e.g. Charles St, Cotterells, Kodak, Town Centre etc. etc. So CS17 can be met under existing plans and developments. This development is surplus and irrelevant to that policy target. As such the whole proposal is unnecessary.

2.2 The proposed 'terraced step' houses are out keeping and character for Vicarage Close. The materials and design are completely different.

2.4 There is loss of privacy to houses overlooked by the development under the plans - the adaptations do not meet the concerns raised in the pre-application meetings with the Council.

2.5 Noise funnels down Vicarage Close and into Park Road - having open terraces will add to noise pollution as well as affecting homes in Park Rd and Vicarage Close.

2.6 I can't see that the plan shows or takes into account the Parking zone pole which acts as an obstruction to vehicles turning from Park Rd into Vicarage Close. This is a material oversight.

2.7 The combined affect of the Parking Zone Pole, the Lamp post and the Electricity box is to act as visual barrier to vehicles and bikes turning into Vicarage close. As there are no cars entering Vicarage Close this is not a problem but once the houses are built there it will be as cars from the development will be entering Vicarage Close as cars are turning from Park Rd into Vicarage Close.

2.8 The bin sheds to house the council bins will also act as visual barrier to people turning into the road and increase the chance of an accident.

2.9 Pedestrians have to move out from the lamp post, the parking zone pole, the box and move into the road or across the pavement and also act as a barrier to road users.

2.10 Vicarage Close is a popular route for school children going to Hemel Hempstead School or South Hill School. The increased traffic, increased parking, the loss of semi-circular pavement (taken by one of the houses) at the top of the close will all add to potential dangers and hazards for the children. As we all know children often forget road safety issues - at the moment this is a very safe walk but once the development adds to the density and crowding the walk will become more hazardous.

3.0 Parking and Cars.

3.1 There is insufficient parking space for the numbers of houses. The parking spaces in the plan do not allow for a large cars or SUVs (a popular choice of car).

3.2 There is insufficient space for cars needed for certain types of disability.

3.3 The lack of parking space will adversely affect the amenity of surrounding properties through roadside parking on this narrow lane/busy junction as second cars, large cars, visitor cars all have to park in the area.

3.4 The overcrowding will act as danger to other road users, especially cyclists as well as pedestrians especially children and young people.

3.5 Vicarage Close is sometimes closed when we get bad snow - cars can't get up it or get stuck. The added cars will add to the problem.

3.6 The increase in cars, vans etc. will make it difficult for service and council vehicles to access the road.

4.0 Capacity of physical infrastructure

4.1 Layout and density of building design and finishing materials: the houses are too dense. The materials do not look as though they are in keeping with the rest of Vicarage Close or Park Rd.

5.0 Overlooking and Loss of privacy

5.1 The houses will overlook houses on Park Rd. Vicarage Close. This is a loss of privacy. Any new owner can adapt the house. Trees can be cut down.

6.0 Overshadowing and Loss of outlook.

6.1 The houses will overshadow both houses on Vicarage Close as well as Park Rd. They will create an loss of outlook for houses in Vicarage Close and Park Rd. The adaptations made to the plan after the pre-meetings do not meet the concerns raised by the council officer.

7.0 Local Plans and Planning policy.

7.1 The development fails CS4 in "Mixed-use development will be supported where it supports the principles of sustainable development and does not conflict with other policies" The plan fails to meet enough sustainable criteria.

7.2 The plan says that one of the houses is not sustainable and the other four are partly sustainable.

7.3 Only some criteria are met. The council should have regard to those criteria that are not met.

7.4 The development conflicts with other policies e.g. noise, traffic, overlooking, a highway being blocked, parking etc.

7.5 The plan fails the Sustainable Community Strategy e.g. "creating a cleaner and healthier environment" - strategic objectives and

	<p>Dacorum's distinctive character ie. CS23, CS24, CS25, CS26, CS28, CS29, CS30, CS31, CS32</p> <p>8.0 I am not sure that the application meets NP1 and would ask the decision maker to have regard to this.</p> <p>9.0 I do not think that the plan meets CS11.</p> <p>9. 1. CS11(d) - it does not maintain existing neighbourhood pattern. It is not in keeping with any houses in Park Rd or Vicarage Close.</p> <p>9.2. CS11(e) making best use of existing green infrastructure - the development destroys a large garden. The micro gardens will not provide the same sort of green infrastructure.</p> <p>9,3. It does not meet CS11 in that is is not based on the neighbourhood concept and clear design when the Close was built.</p> <p>9. 4. It does not meet neighbourhood needs because of noise, parking, pollution created by water not being absorbed.</p> <p>10.00 Vans.</p> <p>10.1 The plan assumes that people will have cars large numbers of home owners in Hemel Hempstead are van owners or users. They will not be able to park on the parking bays and will have to use the road.</p> <p>11.00 If the application is successful</p> <p>11.1 If the application be approved, the council should consider using its powers to enforce controlled hours of operation and other restrictions that might make the duration of the works more bearable. The proposed site of development is very small and contained, with no road frontage, so we would ask that consideration be made about how and where construction vehicles and staff would gain access to the site for unloading and parking without causing a highway hazard or inconveniencing neighbours.</p> <p>12.00 Human Rights Act.</p> <p>As the council is aware there are rights to privacy, family life as well as others under the Human Rights Act. This plan does not meet those criteria and I would ask the council to please consider the HRA in making its decision</p> <p>13.00 If you would like to discuss any particular point or want more clarification on these or other objections I would be happy to discuss with you.</p>
17 Park Road	<p>My objections to the proposed 5 dwelling plan for 16 Park Road relate to over-development of the site.</p> <p>This will be extremely intrusive on the privacy of the surrounding residents.</p>

	<p>Intolerable strain will be put on the existing parking facilities which are already over-stretched. The width of Vicarage Close is not conducive to easy access to the proposed properties.</p> <p>I have had no notification of the ownership of the semi-circular pavement area at the top end of the site that has been used for car parking in the past. Also it seems an extremely small space to sit one of the proposed properties!</p>
<p>18 Park Road (Comments Aitchinsons)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">from</p>	<p><u>The Site</u></p> <p>The site currently comprises a detached two-storey dwelling (16 Park Road) and its rear garden. I am advised that the semi-circular area of hardstanding originally formed a general amenity area for the residents of Vicarage Close. The surrounding area is residential in character and consists predominantly of two-storey detached and terraced houses.</p> <p>Ground levels on site slope down from west to east. This results in a notable change in levels between the front and rear parts of the site.</p> <p><u>The Proposal</u></p> <p>Permission is sought to demolish the existing dwelling and construct five new dwellings in its place. While the existing property fronts Park Road, the proposed dwellings would all be orientated north facing the existing row of detached properties on the northern side of Vicarage Close.</p> <p>The proposed dwellings would be two storeys in height and arranged as two semi-detached pairs and a detached property, all linked via first floor terraces. Houses 1, 4 and 5 would have fully pitched roofs, while houses 2 and 3 would have crown roofs. The external walls would be brick and tile hung.</p> <p>Gardens would be provided at the rear of houses 2 to 5, and units 1 to 4 would have outdoor terraces. The garden at house 5 would wrap around the side of the property, and the terrace for house 2 would be located at the top of the building within a roof void.</p> <p>House 5 would have three bedrooms, while the other units would have two. House 5 would also have two parking spaces, while the other units would have one. Parking for units 1-4 would be provided underneath the first-floor terraces.</p> <p><u>Overdevelopment of the site</u></p> <p>In our view, the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Currently, the plot supports a single residential dwelling and garden, and contributes positively to the spacious character of the area. In contrast, the proposal would represent a cramped and contrived form of development. The number of dwellings would be excessive, and the scale and amount of development would be incongruous to the</p>

existing layout and character of the area.

Density

The Council's Character Area Statement for Hemel Hempstead identifies this part of the town as area 'HCA11: Cotterills'. The document advises that the general density of existing development in the area is 'medium range', between 25-35 dwellings per hectare.

The application site is approximately 578 square metres (0.0578 hectares), including the semicircular area of hardstanding. As such, the construction of five dwellings equates to a proposed density of approximately 86 dwellings per hectare, vastly exceeding (more than double) the average density in the character area.

When compared to the existing properties on the opposite side of Vicarage Close (2, 4 and 6), these have a combined site area of approximately 1112 square metres (0.1112 hectares) and a density of 26 dwellings per hectare, falling within the average range.

Likewise, the terraced properties at 1-19 (odd) Vicarage Road, which individually have smaller plots, have a density of approximately 49 dwellings per hectare, significantly lower than that proposed at the application site.

Appendix 3 (Layout and Design of Residential Areas) of the Dacorum Local Plan states:

'Proposals should be guided by the existing topographical features of the site and its immediate surroundings. They should respect the character of the surrounding area, and in particular there must be adequate space for the proposed development without creating a cramped appearance.'

Furthermore, Policy CS11(a) of the Core Strategy states *'within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should respect the typical density intended in the area...'*

Contrary to the above, the proposed density of the development would be excessive and out-of-keeping with the character of the area. In conflict with Appendix 3 and Policy CS11(a) there is inadequate space on site for the scale and number of dwellings proposed, resulting in a cramped and overcrowded form of development. As such, the proposal constitutes an overdevelopment of the site.

Garden sizes and arrangement

Appendix 3 (ii) of the Local Plan states all residential development is required to provide open space for use by residents whether the development be houses or flats.

'Private gardens should normally be positioned to the rear of the dwelling and have an average minimum depth of 11.5m. Ideally a range of garden sizes should be provided to cater for different family compositions, ages and interests. A reduced rear garden depth may

be acceptable for small starter homes, homes for the elderly and development backing onto or in close proximity, to open land, public open space or other amenity land. Larger family or executive style homes will be expected to provide a garden of greater depth. For infill developments garden depths which are below 11.5m but of equal depth to adjoining properties will be acceptable. Generally all gardens should be of a width, shape and size to ensure the space is functional and compatible with the surrounding area.'

Furthermore, Policy CS12 (g) of the Core Strategy states new development should respect adjoining properties in terms of '*landscaping and amenity space*'.

The proposed rear gardens for houses 2 to 5 would measure just 5 metres in depth (approximately). As such, they would be less than half the minimum depth set out in Appendix 3. Moreover, house 1, would have no rear garden at all.

It is noted that the garden at house 5 would wrap around the side of the property, and the other properties would have terraces. However, the proposed terraces would be an incongruous feature, with no other houses in the area having anything similar. In particular, the terrace serving house 2 would be in a roof void at the top of the building and would be especially contrived.

In our view, the lack of useable garden space at the rear of the buildings, and the fact first and second floor terraces have had to be incorporated to overcome this, provides further evidence that the proposal represents a gross overdevelopment of the site.

Design and layout

Core Strategy Policy CS12 states new development should '*integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties in terms of: layout, security, site coverage, scale, height, bulk, materials and landscaping and amenity*'.

Appendix 3 of the Local Plan advises that spacing between dwellings should be provided at a distance which is consistent with the surrounding areas.

In terms of layout and spacing, the proposed dwellings would be arranged as two semi-detached pairs and one detached property, linked by first floor terraces.

The existing properties on Vicarage Close and Park Road are generally set back from the road, with parking and landscaping provided to the front. Furthermore, the existing properties benefit from decent sized rear gardens, generally exceeding the 11.5 metre minimum depth. As such, the existing layout of development has a spacious character.

In contrast, the proposed houses would be sited very close to the road and pavement on the southern side of Vicarage Close, and, as set out above, would have very shallow rear gardens (5 metres deep

approximately).

As a result, the proposal would appear cramped and physically constrained, at odds with the layout and spacing of existing development in the area. Furthermore, given their modest set back from the road, the proposed two storey dwellings would have a visually imposing and oppressive impact within the street, closing in the southern side of Vicarage Close.

In other respects, house 1 would occupy a very prominent and obtrusive position in the middle of the Close. It would be sited forward of the existing row of properties behind (1-19 odd), and as such, would have an awkward relationship with the existing pattern of development on the street, and an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area generally.

Contrary to criterion (iii) above, the proposed site coverage would also be excessive. The proposed built development, including the terraces and carports, would dominate the site, resulting in very little open space. Generally, existing houses in the area, have generous plot to building ratios. The proposed development would not accord with this.

Individually, the design of the proposed buildings would also be incongruous. Houses 4 and 5 would form a semi-detached pair, however, house 5 would be noticeably wider. Similarly, houses 2 and 3 would have crown roofs, while the other houses would have fully pitched roofs. Crown roofs are not a feature of the area and this added bulk at roof level would be perceptible from the street given the change in levels.

In our opinion, the proposed first floor terraces would also be a discordant feature, akin to a flat roof garage being used as a balcony. They would introduce noise and general activity at an elevated level within the street, and domestic paraphernalia (washing lines, parasols, play equipment etc) would be visible from outside the site to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area.

It is also important to note that the proposed boundary wall at the corner of Park Road and Vicarage Close would be considerably higher than that shown on the sketch street scene image above. As shown on the elevation plan below, the proposed wall would measure approximately 1.8 metres in height and would completely enclose the corner of Park Road and Vicarage Close, eroding the existing sense of openness.

Again, this would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street and would harm the visual amenity of the area.

In view of the above, the proposed development would fail to integrate with the existing pattern and spacing of development in the area. It would have a detrimental impact on both the Park Road and Vicarage Road street scene and would harm the visual amenity of the area generally. The proposal is therefore contrary to Appendix 3 of the Local Plan, Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy, and the relevant

provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Poor standard of environment for future occupiers

In our view, the proposed development would fail to provide future occupiers with an acceptable standard of environment.

The Government's Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard, published in March 2015, states single bedrooms should be a minimum of 7.5 square metres.

Bedroom 3 in house 5 looks very small and could be below the above standard. We request that the Council investigate this matter as part of their assessment. Furthermore, double bedrooms must be a minimum of 11.5 square metres. The proposed second bedrooms in houses 1 to 4 also look small and could be below the above standard. We ask that the Council investigate this.

In addition, bedroom 2 in house 2 would be served by roof-lights only, providing a very poor standard of environment internally, with minimal outlook.

As noted earlier, the proposed rear gardens would also be very small and dominated by the proposed buildings. As such, they would not provide future occupiers with a good standard of amenity.

The proposed ground floor openings and gardens at the back of houses 2 and 3 would be overlooked by the first-floor rear facing windows at 18 Park Road, providing future occupiers of these units with an unacceptable level of privacy.

In addition, the ground floor front facing openings of all the houses, would be sited very close to the public footpath on Vicarage Close. As such, these rooms would have very little privacy with passers by being able to look in.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

A core planning principle, as set out in the NPPF, is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. This is echoed in Core Strategy Policy CS12(c) which states that development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties.

18 Park Road

The proposed development would have a significant detrimental impact on the residential amenity of 18 Park Road.

The two storey rear elevations of houses 2 and 3 would be sited just 5 metres (approximately) from the common boundary and rear garden of 18 Park Road. As such, the development would have an adverse overbearing impact on the adjacent property and would completely enclose the northern side of the neighbouring garden.

As noted above, grounds level rise from east to west on Vicarage Close. As a result, the rear patio and ground floor openings at the back of 18 Park Road are situated below the main garden.

Houses 2 and 3 would therefore be constructed on higher ground, exacerbating their height and dominance when viewed from 18 Park Road.

In view of the above, the proposed development would have a visually oppressive and overwhelming impact on the adjacent property and garden. In this regard it is noted that 18 Park Road also has a side facing ground floor opening at the rear, which is orientated towards the application site and serves a dining room.

The development would also have a significant impact on the receipt of light at 18 Park Road. Appendix 3 of the Local Plan states '*a 45-degree angle of light should be maintained as a basic minimum to all significant windows of habitable rooms.*'

We believe houses 2 and 3 would intrude upon a 45-degree line taken from the nearest ground floor window at 18 Park Road, significantly affecting the receipt of light.

The affected window at 18 Park Road serves a lounge and therefore a habitable room within the property. The change in levels on site would further exacerbate the adverse impact on the receipt of light.

The proposal would also have an adverse impact on the privacy of 18 Park Road. While houses 2 and 3 would have no rear facing first floor openings, the proposed roof-lights, which are sited very close to the common boundary, would give the perception of overlooking, particularly when left open.

Moreover, future occupiers of the proposed first floor terraces would be able to overlook the neighbouring garden from an elevated position in very close proximity. While the plans show the proposed terraces would have privacy screens, the front elevation drawings indicate these would only measure between 1.3 metres and 1.5 metres in height (from floor level on the terrace). As such, they would not prevent overlooking.

In addition, noise and general activity associated with the proposed terraces would take place above the neighbouring garden, further compounding their adverse un-neighbourly impact.

2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close

To achieve adequate privacy, Appendix 3 (iii) of the Local Plan states: '*The minimum distances of 23 m between the main rear wall of a dwelling and the main wall (front or rear) of another should be met to ensure privacy. This distance may be increased depending on character, level and other factors.*'

The proposed first floor front facing windows would be sited less than

15 metres from the front facing openings at 2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close opposite.

The proposal would therefore contravene the above standard and would harm the privacy and amenity of the properties opposite.

In respect of light, we would like the Council to investigate whether the proposed houses would intrude upon a 25-degree line taken from the front facing ground floor openings at 2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close. In this regard, it is noted that the proposed houses are located to the south of the properties opposite.

18 Vicarage Close

My clients are concerned that the proposed first floor side facing window serving bedroom 2 in house 1 would overlook the front facing openings at 18 Vicarage Close at a distance significantly less than 23 metres, to the detriment of the privacy of these occupiers.

1 and 3 Vicarage Close

The proposal would also have an adverse impact on the residential amenity and privacy of 1 and 3 Vicarage Close.

The proposed dwelling on plot 1 would be sited in front of these existing properties at a distance of approximately 13 metres. As such, views from the existing ground and first floor openings at 1 and 3 Vicarage Close would be adversely affected by the proposal.

Moreover, users of the proposed first floor terrace adjacent to plot 1 would be able to overlook the front facing openings of the properties behind, adversely affecting their privacy.

Loss of the semi-circular amenity area

My client believes that the semi-circular area of hardstanding, which forms part of the application site, was originally designated as a general amenity space for the residents of Vicarage Close.

Furthermore, they do not believe residents in Vicarage Close were notified or consulted of the sale of this land.

Policy 75 of the Local Plan (Retention of Leisure Space) states '*building on leisure spaces will not be permitted unless:*

- a) the proposal is ancillary to the leisure use of the land;*
- b) a sufficient proportion of the site with appropriate facilities is retained in open use to meet the formal and informal leisure needs of the local population (see Policy 73 (b));*
- c) there is a demonstrable surplus of sports pitches and informal leisure space;*
- d) leisure space lost is replaced to an equivalent or better standard in an accessible alternative location; or*
- e) there is an overall benefit to sport as a result. In all cases the*

amenity, landscape and nature conservation aspects of the site will be taken into account.'

In view of the above, we request that the Council investigate the loss of this land, as part of their assessment.

My client would also like the Council to investigate whether the redevelopment of this piece of land would result in the loss of a public footpath (pavement).

Access and parking

My client is concerned that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on highway safety. Given the proximity of the proposed houses to the road and public footpath, vehicles backing out of the proposed car ports would have little visibility to the potential detriment of pedestrian and vehicular safety. This matter would be compounded by the narrow width of the road, and on-street parking which could obscure views further.

Additionally, the proposed house on plot 1 would obscure views within and across the Close, to the potential detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.

In terms of parking, the provision of one off-street parking space for each two-bedroom property would be below the standards set in Appendix 5 of the Local Plan, which requires 1.5 spaces for a two-bedroom dwelling. As a result, my client is concerned the development would lead to additional pressure for on-street parking in an area already subject to resident permit restrictions.

In this regard, my client is also concerned that the existing on street parking spaces along this part of Vicarage Close would be lost as a result of the development. As noted above, cars parked along this part of the road could obscure the views of vehicles leaving the proposed car port spaces. As such, my client believes double yellow lines will need to be implemented along both sides of the road.

Ecology

I am advised by my client that bats are present in the area. As the existing dwelling would be demolished this matter needs to be considered.

Other matters

It is noted that the plans in the Design and Access Statement do not have a scale bar. As a result, it is not possible to accurately measure these drawings and determine the impact of certain aspects of the development. For example, the section drawing below shows the proposed roof terrace at house 2. However, without a scale bar it is not possible to measure the height of the surrounding walls, and whether future occupiers will be able to overlook the neighbouring garden at 18 Park Road.

	<p>This matter needs to be addressed so both the Council and surrounding residents can properly assess the application.</p> <p>Furthermore, my client would like to note that the proposed block plans do not show all surrounding properties that will be affected by the proposal. As such, it is difficult to accurately determine the impact of the development on all surrounding properties.</p> <p><u>Site notice</u></p> <p>I am informed by my client that no site notice has been displayed at the site. Given the scale of development proposed, a site notice would need to be displayed on public land close to the site for a period of 21 days.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>In conclusion, I believe the proposal represents an unsustainable form of development.</p> <p>The scale of the proposal is excessive and would represent an over-development of this small and physically constrained site. The proposal would not be in-keeping with the existing pattern of development in the area, and the proposed crown roofs and first floor terraces would be incongruous and harmful to the visual amenity of the street.</p> <p>The development would harm the privacy and amenity of surrounding residents and would fail to provide future occupiers with an acceptable standard of environment.</p> <p>Furthermore, my client is concerned it would have a detrimental impact on highway safety and the proposed parking arrangements are unacceptable.</p> <p>For the reasons given above, we request that the planning application is refused.</p>
19 Park Road	<p>Key Considerations</p> <p>Policy and Principle: The provision of new dwellings within the key towns within the Borough is strongly encouraged in accordance with Policies NP1, CS1 and CS4 of the Core Strategy. Such units would make a valuable contribution to the supply of new homes addressing the need for new homes as set out in Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Layout and Design: A high standard of design is expected in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan, both upon the site and in relation to neighbouring properties. This should respect the adjoining properties in terms of layout, security, site coverage, scale, height, bulk, use of materials and landscaping.</p> <p>Layout and Design:</p>

	<p>Overdevelopment of the site, visually intrusive.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed dwellings in view of their site coverage, close proximity to the boundary and extremely limited (or non-existent) garden sizes will appear cramped and incongruous within the locality. The back gardens do not look like they meet the minimum requirement of 11.5M in depth and are in fact around 5M and will be significantly smaller than any other property nearby.</p> <p>Access and Parking:</p> <p>The following standards from Appendix 5 should be applied to the residential development of the site. 1 bed - 1.25 spaces 2 bed - 1.5 spaces 3 bed - 2.25 spaces 4 bed+ - 3 spaces.</p> <p>The proposals make insufficient space for off-street parking in accordance with the above standards and it is not clear whether there would be sufficient space to access and manoeuvre both into and out of the site within a forward gear.</p> <p>There are already parking problems in the area of Vicarage Road and Park Road and this would make parking worse. People currently park up the kerb now without these additional houses.</p> <p>Also what happens with visitor parking, there is no provision for this. This extra development will mean overspill of parking on to Park Road, which is also full with cars at the best of times.</p> <p>We would like to know how the semi-circle of land has been sold off without any notification to any local residents. Children use this area to play on as it is safe and off of the road, where will they play now?</p> <p>Residential and Amenity: The depth of the gardens to the proposed dwellings fall well below the expected standards in Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan. The number of dwellings is excessive and not in keeping with the existing surrounding houses.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Due to the number of proposed dwellings, the roof top and first floor amenity areas and the fact that the site is sloping up a hill, these dwellings will be visually intrusive, over bearing and create a loss of privacy to all neighbouring properties and gardens. To put in such a cramped development would have an adverse effect on the value of all of the affected houses.</p>
20 Park Road	<p>I object to this application for all the reasons indicated above. The proposal is out of keeping and will have a detrimental affect on all of the occupiers of the neighbouring houses. The increased noise, being overlooked from windows, roof terraces, private amenity areas, raised gardens etc will spoil our lives. There will be too many people and cars, with not enough parking spaces. The local wildlife will also suffer, including nesting bats.</p>

<p>25 Park Road</p>	<p>We object to this project and agree with all points raised by No. 4 Park Rd and find this proposed plan unacceptable. Currently parking in the road is at a premium - with a potential of 5 dwellings with only 1 parking space per household this is totally inadequate.</p> <p>Further, we understood hardstanding at the end of the existing property to be public land, how has this been included in plan. If purchased by applicant why were we not informed by letter or public notices (on lamposts etc). Seems very underhand. PLEASE CONFIRM HOW THIS HAS OCCURRED</p> <p>We also are able to back up the objection regarding the wildlife and know there to be a bat and hedgehog population in the area as we frequently see these in our garden.</p>
<p>29 Park Road</p>	<p>We strongly object to the proposed development at number 16 Park Road. We agree with all the opposing comments.</p> <p>The reasons we object to the development are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parking - the proposed development does not provide sufficient parking space. In addition to this, there is already intense on-street parking pressure on Park Road, and we believe the new development will only add to the problem. 2. Character of the design - the proposed development does not respect local context and street pattern. It would be entirely out of the character of the area. 3. Loss of privacy and overlooking - the proposed development does not afford adequate privacy for the no 18. We would urge you to consider the responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act (Protocol 1, Article 1), which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes the home and other land. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. 4. Disturbance to wildlife - the proposed development is going to have an impact on the wildlife in the area, particularly the bats that are regularly seen in this area.
<p>31 Park Road</p>	<p>Having read all of the opposing comments we unequivocally agree with them all. We would further like to add the following comments in opposition to the application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Living in Park Road in a three bed property, with the opportunity to purchase up to three parking permits, has not been adequate parking provision for us at times. With the new proposal of only one parking space for each new two bedroom property, and two spaces for the three bed property, will create a significant increase in demand for parking spaces. We would like to ask the question what does the council intend to do to address this live issue?

	<p>2. Following on from this point the selling off of the existing tarmacked area behind No 16 Park Road to No 16 Park Road has already created even less parking opportunities for permit holders in this area. When was the consultation period, and why were residents not informed of this proposal? There appears to have been a complete lack of transparency and this does feel somewhat underhand.</p> <p>3. We note that the plans show additional planting of at least one silver birch tree. This species of tree has the potential to grow over 30 metres in height and would therefore dominate the space in which it is proposed to be planted, its roots could also undermine much of the immediate area. With this in mind, we would also like to question the sustainability of the other proposed planting within the properties. It is suggested as being the resolution to privacy for those properties that will be overlooked by this development. We feel that soft planting is not a permanent solution to this pressing issue, but one that initially masks this. Lastly regarding this point, I think it is suggested that in some way new planting will help to alleviate the demands on the existing drainage system. But in reality the roots of these plants will seek out the nearby water course and therefore undermine it.</p> <p>4. We also note that the proposed plans show that each new property will have a waste bin storage area at the front of each the houses. As this will open onto the public pathway, there will not only be a conflict of interest in the use of the pathway, but there could also be possibility of passers by being subjected to the stench of decomposing waste matter.</p> <p>As residents who have lived in Park Road for the last eight years, we have always felt part of a supportive local community which is very respectful to its existing occupants, and the environment we live in, including the abundance of local wildlife. This application shows no respect for its current inhabitants and their future wellbeing.</p>
37 Park Road	<p>I strongly object to the proposed demolition and development of 16 Park road this is being carried out with total disregard to the residents in Vicarage Close and access via Park Road. The comments on particular made by 17 Vicarage Close and 4 Park road are extremely valid but I would like to stress others.</p> <p>With the proposed 5 properties in addition to driveway parking there is potential for 3No cars per household to park on the two roads mentioned earlier where parking is already a problem with the nursery parking and Saba who have no interest when challenged about other parking issues.</p> <p>Vicarage Close is used by parents and children alike to safely access the three schools along Heath Lane due to no through traffic I feel this would be compromised by the additional properties, which would put lives and health at risk.</p>
37 Park Road	<p>This road is permit parking. There are already too many cars for this road and not enough spaces, for which residents pay a premium to park, and cant. Even though plans show space for a car, reality is that most households have 2 or more vehicles, and there is simply no</p>

	<p>more room for cars to park. This is also a cut through road for school children, as young as 4, who will need to negotiate a busier road system as the result of more cars. This is also completely out of keeping with the area, this road is mainly detached or semi detached larger properties built many years ago, not an area for new build or smaller dwellings. That is why people purchased their houses on this road.</p>
45b Park Road	<p>Increase in traffic on an already busy side road which contains a sports centre & their car park, a nursery and a public car park</p>
59 Park Road	<p>We object to this proposal.</p> <p>This proposed development is out of keeping with the existing houses on Park Road and Vicarage Close, would lead to more traffic and remove pavement on a road that is used by children walking to school, would be likely to exacerbate parking shortages, and could harm the local bat population.</p> <p>The application does not properly address many of the concerns that it raises (eg about environmental impact), and contains a number of inaccuracies (eg it states that the existing house that would be knocked down and replaced has three bedrooms, when in fact it has four).</p> <p>In addition we would draw the officers' attention to the many valid points made by other local residents.</p>
1 Vicarage Close	<p>The proposed scheme is a massive overdevelopment of the site, the 5 proposed dwellings on such a small plot would see a 3 fold increase on the number of houses per m² of land based on the current layout of the close. Core strategy policy CS12 states that new developments should integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties, this scheme is not in keeping with the rest of the homes with the close and the proposed terraces are not consistent with any properties in this area and would be an intrusion for many surrounding properties.</p> <p>The objections that have a direct impact on our property are:</p> <p>1. Outlook</p> <p>The proposed build will encroach on properties 1 & 3 Vicarage Close being just 11.7 m from our Boundry wall, The proposed dwelling on plot one will substantially reduce the outlook from our property and will have a visual dominance that results in an overbearing and oppressive sense of enclosure, although its north facing and won't necessarily block out sunlight it will without doubt contribute to a loss of natural daylight.</p> <p>I believe that Guidelines state that there must be a minimum distance between front and rear facing windows of one property and a two story wall of another of 14 metres, the fact that the architects designing this scheme think an 11.7m separation distance is acceptable is ludicrous</p>

and sets a benchmark as to the validity of the entire development.

2. Overlooking

The proposed private amenity terrace for plot one will directly overlook front facing windows of our property, screening to the rear elevation is shown at as little as 1.3m on the plans and is shown to be designed with a slatted material, as such, it will not prevent overlooking. Furthermore this terrace will be the only source of outdoor space for plot one meaning it will have a lot of domestic paraphernalia for example washing lines, parasols etc, this would detract from the outlook of our property and overall would have a negative impact on the area.

It's also questionable whether the private roof terrace of plot 2 will also overlook our property, it's difficult to tell from the plans as the scales are not accurate enough to judge the full height of the terrace boundaries.

3 Parking

The Parking provision for the development falls well below the government guidelines, with just one space allocated to each 2 bed property and two spaces for the three bed. There has also been no allowance for visitor parking, which will put strain on already busy permit parking area, this on top of the loss of parking on the road up the close due to the new driveways will have a detrimental impact.

4 plan accuracy

Plan accuracy throughout the whole application is abysmal, there are so many errors and inconsistencies, some parts don't even have a scale. The most important ones for us, are firstly that there is very little mention of houses 1 & 3 Vicarage Close on the plans and they do not feature on the drawings despite being just 11.7 metres from the proposed build, this is very misleading to the planning officer, without a site visit you wouldn't even realise they were there!

Secondly, the height of the proposed properties has been determined by the ridge line from 16 Park Road, I fail to see how this can be accurate given that the site is on a gradient up in to the close?

5 Road safety

I have concerns over road safety surrounding the proposed development. I have a young family that frequently use the footpaths within the close, I feel that there are potential dangers for them and other local residents. The new carports would make it very difficult to see oncoming traffic and pedestrians on the footpath when reversing out, the proximity of the dwellings would be so close to the public highway, that when reversing out, by the time the driver has a clear view up and down the close they would already have crossed the footpath meaning they would not have been able to see approaching pedestrians.

	<p>On entry to the close, the road is barely wide enough for cars to pass, which will be made worse if new owners choose to park across their driveways due to the lack of allocated parking. The house on plot 1 also poses a risk of obscuring traffic coming down the close which currently is risk free due to the open plan layout.</p> <p>6 Loss of amenity space</p> <p>The development will be directly responsible for the loss of the shared local amenity space directly behind the rear of 16 Park Road, this space was designated as a play area when the close was built in 1966 according to several local residents that still reside within the close who bought their properties directly from the original developer Sunley homes, it is still used as such to this day. I believe that allowing a build on this area is contrary to NPPF 127f and policy 75 of the local plan (Retention of leisure space), as such I request that the council investigate the sale of this land as part of their assessment of this application.</p> <p>As well as the above points that are directly relevant to my property, there are several other major factors as to why the development should be refused, these include: All front facing windows and terraces directly overlook houses 2,4&6 Vicarage Close, and at little over 14m separation distance, this is in breach of the 22m ruling and is an intrusion of their privacy.</p> <p>18 Park road will feel heavily overlooked by 3 of the 5 properties, local guidelines state that rear gardens must be a minimum of 11.5 metres from the house to the adjoining boundary to minimise this, the rear gardens of the proposed build measure just 5.6m according to the plans.</p> <p>The introduction of new trees along the boundary line to "soften the blow" are unlikely to prevent overlooking as they would take too long to reach maturity, having said that with gardens of little over 5m in length it unlikely they will stay in place very long anyway.</p> <p>As a side note, I believe it's the applicant's responsibility to display signage to notify local residents of the proposed development. This has not been done and I have weekly evidence to support this.</p> <p>I hope that you can see the validity of my objections and see the passion that I and the rest of the residents in this close have about the area we live.</p> <p>I would appreciate it if you could find time to carry out a site visit before making judgment on the application, so you can see for yourself the sheer size of the development on such a small space and the effects it will have on the surrounding residents.</p>
2 Vicarage Close	<p>My wife and I have lived in Vicarage Close since moving to Hertfordshire from Yorkshire in 1965. We bought a new property in the Close on sale from Sunley Homes and later when funds allowed, in 1979, moved from the town house at number 12 to a four-bed detached property at number 2. This property, of same original design</p>

as that at 16 Park Road, is opposite and across the narrow entry road into the Close from this property which is now proposed for demolition. The Close of eighteen families has always existed as a happy unit of friends and, although some deaths have occurred in recent times, houses that became vacant have been filled by new residents who similarly enjoy living in this carefully planned cul-de-sac, thus maintaining the good sense of community spirit. We have chosen to reside in Vicarage Close for over 55 years as a result of the high quality of life that has been offered by the success of the original plans:

Covenants

Covenants to the properties of the Close have generally been observed in a united approach to the management of the estate. One of the Covenants was that properties should remain open planned and no hedges should front the properties. These same Covenants also applied to Sunley Homes in Park Road, something that is conflicted by the proposed plans.

Wise design and distribution of buildings

Sunley Homes designed the estate wisely producing a balanced layout of blocks of buildings in which the sun and light was afforded freedom of access to all areas. Two blocks of town houses line the east-west and upper north-south branches of the Close. The detached six, originally all four bed houses were at the eastern end of the close and on Park Road sit as a block of like buildings. This orientation of the structures meant no building was overlooked by another except for the proposer's back garden, which can be seen to varying degrees by the 3 detached properties in Vicarage Close. Under the proposed plans, the new houses located in this garden will require that these detached properties therefore lose their current privacy as the five new properties gaze from minimal distance onto them. At first glance, it might seem that the site has some spaciousness but again, this can be attributed to wise and efficient planning by Sunley Homes who managed to cram eighteen properties, including three detached houses, into a relatively small area and still leave space for a children's communal play area to compensate for the small back gardens afforded to the town houses.

Children's play area - a site amenity

Part of the planned distribution of the layout was an area on which the site Foreman's office stood. This was the children's play/recreational area. It served as this for over 50 years from 1966 until it was acquired, without the knowledge of the residents of the Close, by the proposer of the suggested development. This extension of the proposer's land into Vicarage Close potentially means an amenity of the Close is removed from the youngsters and the generations of children that will follow. Should the proposal be approved, children will be confined to solitary play in their relatively small gardens. The children knew the area as the 'white pavement'. It was an area where the toddlers of the Close played communally in safety. Sunley's Site Manager saw to the safe and aesthetically appealing paving and

curbing of the area once his office was removed. The older children, particularly the boys, played football on the north-south road across the estate. Again, this was in relative safety as any vehicle entering the estate could see children at play before reaching them. The Foreman, on leaving the site for the last time stressed that cars and larger vehicles must not be parked on the paved area as the paving and curb would not bear the weight, thus ensuring the recreational facility of this highly valuable area of land. In around 1990, we were highly disappointed to see the Council cover this area in gritty tarmac, which we believed to be a consequence of the Council taking over the area. We now feel let down in the sense that this area of land has been sold off to a private owner, without warning to Vicarage Close residents, who now face total loss of this amenity space and the negative secondary consequences that result.

- Is there any possibility the council could put a compulsory order on this former children's amenity and restore to the children what has been lost by them recently?

- Why were no notices posted locally indicating this land was for sale?

Thank you for guidance in the material considerations that the council can take into account:

I am not a planner but a long-standing resident of the Close who will have to live here if the current proposer's plans are approved. Whilst a lay person when it comes to knowledge of planning, I am a resident whose home environment will be directly and adversely affected, along with the seventeen other families who reside in Vicarage Close and the residents of Park Road who will be indirectly, but significantly negatively affected. Therefore, what follows are our view of these plans and how they measure up to the criteria:

1 LOSS OF LIGHT AND OVERSHADOWING

Plans greatly increase shade and loss of light within the estate. They put the equivalent of wall roof height across the middle of the estate linking with east-west town house blocks as an almost continuous barrier to light and the Sun's heat

My property, 2 Vicarage Close, is south facing. The sun radiates light and heat from a southerly direction and casts shadows in a northerly direction during the day. These plans will build the equivalent of a solid wall of new properties causing a shadow of semi-darkness from roof top height blotting out the sun, heat and considerable amount of light from striking my property. This will be particularly bad throughout the winter when the sun is low in the sky. Properties 4 and 6 will be similarly be affected.

2 OVERLOOKING AND LOSS OF PRIVACY

Plans greatly increase potential overlooking and loss of privacy

Sunley Homes designed Vicarage Close wisely locating blocks of buildings and gaps to allow maximum penetration by incoming light

and heat in all areas of the site at some point in the day. This cannot be claimed by the TAS plans. They 'plug' the gaps that Sunley Homes created to cut out the heat and light entry. The plans show an overabundance of trees and plants, particularly between 18 Park Road and the new properties, in attempt to stop no 18 being overlooked. Trees disturb foundations when close to buildings and any new owners can easily dispose of them, leaving this property closely and widely overlooked.

Although Sunley managed to fit 18 properties into a relatively small plot, none of them are overlooked by their neighbours, except 16 Park Road where the landing window, half-way up the house, could be overlooked. The following houses which did not previously suffer visual intrusion will suffer direct, close and extreme visual intrusion if the plans are approved: detached houses 2, 4, 6 Vicarage Close; detached houses 18, 20 Park Road; town houses 1, 3, 14, 16, 18 Vicarage Close. We feel this is completely unacceptable.

At present we are only overlooked by 1 low down landing window: the plans show at least 10 windows and doors will overlook us directly opposite in addition to the planned balconies. There will be less than 15 metre separation distance (window to window). The scheme will remove the existing character of the area and, by demolishing the present property, will double the dwellings per hectare density on the narrow approach to the Close.

3 INADEQUACY OF PARKING

Plans create potential chaos

When we say 'road', let us remember this was planned prior to 1966 as a narrow access/exit road to a cul-de-sac and not designed to take upwards of possibly a further ten cars or more. The estate cannot carry such numbers particularly the entry/exit road which is only 4.8 metres wide and was designed to only have cars from properties feeding it on one side, not both sides as now proposed. Nor can we expect the newcomers to diligently park in their carport on every occasion. Cars parked both sides outside their house will block the road and seal off the Close to those higher up. Park Road already spills into Vicarage Close at times. What will happen to the second car or even third if there is one? Larger vehicles like ambulances and fire engines, which are time pressed, and of course the wider refuse lorries will have an impossible time completing their journey. I am an octogenarian and so are several others in the Close; we may need the emergency services in haste. Where will tradesman be able to park who need to have close access to their tools in their vans? The site does not have the capability to accept them. There would need to be a change made to the current resident parking zone as yellow lines would be needed down both sides of the road to avoid congestion. This would obviously increase the demand for parking spaces in Park Road, a road that is already lined with parked cars.

4 POLLUTION (NOISE AND AIR) AND DISTURBANCE TO WILDLIFE

	<p>Plans greatly increase potential noise and disturbance</p> <p>These plans squash into the small garden of formerly one detached property, five of these mini houses centred as part of the Close.</p> <p>The natural noise produced by one family unit will be multiplied 5 times. The new properties will face the detached houses across the narrow road and their short open planned frontage. The new properties form a continuous line from opposite the drive of 2 Vicarage Close to almost the outer edge of the former play area. The three detached houses will also make an almost continuous line nearly to the opposite end of the last proposed mini property. These lines of buildings will tend to confine, trap and eventually channel any sounds produced from either side either towards 18 Vicarage Close and Park Road depending upon prevailing weather conditions. Heavy fumes such as those from vehicles will also be confined and trapped and hopefully possibly, eventually swept out by moving traffic. None of this will be very pleasant from an environmental point of view. Presently, there is a wide-open space and nothing to hinder the dispersal of fumes and noise.</p> <p>According to these plans there will be 15 additional refuse bins and 5 waste buckets. These will be in very close proximity to the houses opposite, and the extra numbers will likely attract vermin and particularly foxes which are regular visitors up and down the Close.</p> <p>5 CONFLICTING DESIGN, APPEARANCE AND TYPE OF MATERIALS</p> <p>Planned property design is not in keeping with existing properties, numbers 2, 4, 6</p> <p>The surrounding area is residential with a mix of mainly 2-storey, detached, semi-detached and terraced houses. All properties in Vicarage Close are 3 and 4-bedroom family homes with no 2-bed properties, as proposed. Properties have spacious front gardens, set back from the road with garages and driveways. We strongly believe that the demolition of one visually attractive detached house in order to build 5 small dwellings creates an unsuitable over-development which in no way enhances the surrounding area in environmental terms.</p> <p>Finally, we came to Hemel Hempstead attracted by what was a well-planned town. These principles still apply and it would be a shame if 18 households were to lose their environment and amenities and be afforded a lower quality of life because of the financial benefit to be potentially achieved by one household who, in all likelihood, will no longer be a member of the local community</p>
3 Vicarage Close	<p>We write this in connection to the proposed plans to build 5 houses on the site of 16 Park Road, HP1. I have examined the plans and we know the site well having moved to Vicarage Close in August 2014. We write this to OBJECT strongly to the proposed development of these 5 houses and will set out the objections as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planned development on the semi-circle piece of land - The

proposals show the plan to build a house on the semi-circular piece of land seen opposite 1, 3 and 5 Vicarage Close. The houses situated at 1, 3 and 5 are located in the South East corner of Vicarage Close and are north facing. This location is affected by the lack of light during the day time, especially during the winter months. The current plot as it stands grants the maximum amount of natural light to shine on these premises. The proposals to build a dwelling directly opposite 1, 3 and 5 Vicarage Close will have a dramatic impact on the amount of natural light our properties will receive, especially when you consider the close proximity of the development to the front of our houses. The claustrophobic effect of this development will have an adverse effect of the views offered from the ground and first floor of 1, 3 and 5 Vicarage Close. This development will also overlook the front facing windows of our properties interfering with the current privacy offered.

2. Blind spot in Vicarage Close - The planned development on the semi-circle piece of land within Vicarage Close will create a blind spot for traffic (pedestrian and vehicular) when moving within Vicarage Close. Vicarage Close is a cul-de-sac of 18 houses, all of whom have motor vehicles. The cul-de-sac sees traffic from residents, visitors and commercial on a daily basis. The road as it stands is narrow and therefore traffic has to be careful when moving in and out of the close. I can foresee an issue of safety if the proposed plans are granted. Currently as is stands, if vehicles from 1, 3 and 5 wish to leave their driveway and exit Vicarage Close it is easy to acknowledge vehicles coming up the close as you can see them coming. The proposed plan to build on the semi-circular piece of land will make it impossible to see any vehicular / pedestrian traffic coming up Vicarage Close, especially for the residents of 1, 3 and 5. This blind spot is a massive safety issue and risks creating road traffic collisions. This risk is amplified when you consider that there are many children who play in the close, 5 children residing between 1, 3 and 5 Vicarage Close. This proposed plan will create a massive risk for children playing out in the close, as any vehicular traffic heading up the cul-de-sac will be unsighted to anyone in the road, hidden by the proposed new house.

3. Proposed properties will overlook many properties in Vicarage Close and Park Road - In addition to point 1 which was directed towards the specific dwelling on the semi-circle piece of land, the proposed plans aims for 5 houses in total to be built. Vicarage Close is such a unique development in which none of the current houses overlook one another thus allowing the maximum amount of light for each house. The proposed dwellings will have a dramatic impact on the right to light not only to 1, 3, and 5 but also to 2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close and 18 and 20 Park Road. All the properties highlighted currently enjoy the access to light and privacy as successfully developed by the original property developers, Sunley Homes. The proposed plans appears to put an end to the right to light and privacy currently offered and I feel the plans do not fully address these issues.

4. Increase in vehicle activity and issue of parking - Any new development will always bring an increase in vehicular activity due to modern car ownership. The proposed plan does provide a parking space for each of the 5 new dwellings, however the average household in England, as quoted by nimblefins.co.uk, is 1.3 cars.

Using this statistic, the new development will bring an increase in vehicle traffic to the area, not just an increase in the vehicles associated with the new households, but also visitor and commercial traffic. Vicarage Close has very few opportunities for on-street parking as the majority of the Close consists of dropped kerbs allowing access to driveways. The proposed development removes one of the few opportunities for residential / commercial parking along Vicarage Close. The fear of this reduced parking opportunity may lead to cars parking in the two turning circles within the cul-de-sac or cars parking over the driveways of current residents in Vicarage Close. The vehicle impact will be seen beyond the boundaries of Vicarage Close and will have an impact on the parking on Park Road (a road that offers residential parking along one side of the road only), many of the houses on the South side of Park Road have no driveways and therefore rely on the residential parking spaces outside their houses currently offered on Park Road. Any increase of vehicular traffic will have an adverse effect on noise / pollution in the already densely populated area of Boxmoor.

5. Not in keeping with the current properties - The proposed construction of the 5 new dwellings would not be in keeping with the style of the existing properties on Vicarage Close / Park Road. Many of the properties on both Park Road and Vicarage Close were built from 1930's onwards and as a result sit back from the road and have traditional front gardens / driveways. The design of the proposed housing development offering no front gardens and the proposed roof terraces diverges away from the traditional look of the area and consideration needs to be made to maintain the unique building characteristics the area of Boxmoor currently offers.

6. Wildlife - any proposed development would have an impact on the currently wildlife in the area, reducing the access to open green space wildlife currently enjoy. One interesting point is to raise is the current bat population seen in the area around Vicarage Close, Park Road, especially seen between 16, 18 and 20 Park Road. Any proposed development would have to take into consideration the local bat population and commission a survey.

7. Loss of access to space - As a cul-de-sac the area offers a safe area for residents, especially children, to enjoy the outdoor space in relative peace which includes the semi-circular piece of land. This planned development includes the loss of this open space and will threaten the relative safety of pedestrians due to the increased number of parked and moving vehicles. It has come to our notice recently that the area (semi-circular piece of land) used for play has been sold to a non-resident of Vicarage Close without prior notice being given to any of the residents of Vicarage Close. We are wholeheartedly disappointed by the sale of this land, which we believed was Council owned, without consultation of the local residents. We also wish to bring to notice the lack of a site notice around the area of the proposed development. Given the scale of the development proposed, a site notice would normally be required to be displayed on public land close to the site for a period of 21 days, providing the wider local population with the details of the proposed new development. We ask the Council to look into the sale of the

	<p>semi-circular piece of land and the lack of a site notice being displayed.</p> <p>We understand the apparent financial motive for the proposer however the proposed development will have a long standing detrimental effect on the residents of Vicarage Close and Park Road long after the proposer has moved on. Our reasons have been set out and we OBJECT to the proposed development and urge the Council to reject the application.</p>
<p>4 Vicarage Close</p>	<p>My family and I reside at 4 Vicarage Close, located with less than a 15 metre separation distance (window to window) opposite the houses on proposed development site. This, the carport amenity space and balconies create serious intrusion on our privacy and light - the whole proposal is cramped and contrived.</p> <p>In respect of the above development we are writing to formally object to the planning application. The material planning considerations which should be taken into account in determining the above planning application are summarised below:</p> <p><u>Scale and Character of Development</u></p> <p>The surrounding area is residential comprising a mix of mainly 2 storey, detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings originally all built as one congruous development by Sunley Homes Ltd in the 1960s. All properties in Vicarage Close are three- and four-bedroom family homes (there are no two bed properties as proposed on new development).</p> <p>We consider that the scale, density, height and massing of the proposed development is out of character with the adjoining surrounding residential development which is generally low density with spacious full front gardens back from the road, driveways, garages and proportionally sized back gardens (there are currently no balconies or roof-top terraces as proposed on new development).</p> <p>We consider that the density of the scheme will adversely affect the amenity of the cul-de-sac and remove the central concrete semi-circle children's play area/ amenity space and existing character of the surrounding area. This play area/ amenity space was purchased without any consultation with Vicarage Close residents by the developer. This area also locates mains water and broadband services under it, making it unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that the demolition of a single (perfectly suitable) residential family 4-bed dwelling and garden to build a provision of 5 houses constitutes an environmentally unfriendly over development of the site that is incongruous to the surrounding area. This development would also see one property being removed from Park Road, creating an increase in housing of 28 per cent, dramatically doubling the dwellings per hectare housing density on the narrow entry to Vicarage Close cul-de-sac.</p> <p>As a result, the above development fails to satisfy the design criteria set out in Policy CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.</p>

Impact on Highway Safety

The proposed development does not provide adequate provision for car parking for the new properties or guests. The car port entries will add additional parking, traffic and turning stress on the local highway network. This could result in the need to open vehicle access at the end of the road onto Heath Lane, ceasing the cul-de-sac arrangement and creating a through road.

The entry to Vicarage Close has a narrow carriageway that is 4800mm wide. This is less than the neighbouring roads in Charles Street (7,000mm wide) and Park Road (6,000mm wide).

To permit and enable a safe turning radius for the new car port parking and for existing properties 2, 4 and 6, there would need to be changes made to the current resident parking zone, that introduced double yellow lines down both sides of the entry road. This would significantly reduce the currently available residents parking and increase overflow parking stress to Park Road. And contrary to this proposal, this development does cause changes to vehicular access from the public highway.

This is contrary to the provisions of the development plan and Policy CS8 and CS9.

Additional comments

The overall application submission is ambiguous and lacking in information including important measurement inaccuracies within the drawings.

Notably, it is difficult to judge if rules on the 25- and 45-degree angles to surrounding existing properties are met?

Also, a more detailed Design and Access Statement has not been submitted with the application to consider its potential impact on noise, overlooking or loss of sunlight and daylight to surrounding residential properties?

In addition, screening on the car ports is a slatted wooden design that would cause privacy and noise issues. There are no details provided regarding the existing trees, length of time newly planted trees will take to grow and provide required privacy?

Or how the development of the concrete semi-circle children's play area/ amenity space complies with the development plan and will be replaced by an equally sized area somewhere else in the cul-de-sac?

If permitted, this or some such development would create future potential building plot(s) on the current site of existing properties 2, 4 and 6. This would invite/ create two or possibly more separate developments within the one (as intended) Vicarage Close cul-de-sac.

Considering all of the above we respectfully request that the above

	<p>planning application is refused on the grounds that it is contrary to Policies CS8, CS9, CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p>
<p>5 Vicarage Close</p>	<p>On behalf of my family, I strenuously oppose the proposed 5 home development at the current one home residence of 16 Park Road.</p> <p>We are the newest residents of our close. After having spent months looking at over 20 houses across Hemel Hempstead, we chose 5 Vicarage Close not just for the house itself, but for the privacy the close provided, including a safe space for my two sons (4 and 1 years old) to play as they grew up. It is worth noting that the previous occupant of 5 Vicarage Close, bought the house new and only left because she moved to a retirement community--- we have found that this is not a unique situation for our Close, once people move here, they tend to stay, due to the reasons stated above.</p> <p>But to list our most tangible oppositions:</p> <p>1) I would like to reiterate no 17's opposition to the visual obstruction that the proposed development would add to almost half of the residents of the close, including ourselves. I do not have more to add than they have written below, except to also state that the mitigation that is included in the plans are woeful solutions to what will be an almost complete lack of privacy for a significant number of houses. As I mentioned above, one of the main reasons we moved to the close was because it allowed for an open space for my children and other young children to play outside safely and securely. My son just learned to ride his bike and I have felt so lucky that we can let him practice on the semi-circle and the main road of the Close because he (and I) can see any oncoming vehicles with plenty of time to react. The addition of building on the current open semi-circle will not only take away a space that is currently used by my children to explore and play, but would obscure any oncoming cars up the narrow road separating 2,4,6, and the proposed development. Lastly, there are water-mains and broadband wiring located under the semi-circle that surely would prohibit any development?</p> <p>2) An increase in both vehicles and parking need would cause congestion and bottle-necking at the base of the close.</p> <p>3) We (particularly my 4 year old) are very worried about the damage or destruction to the habitat of the bats that reside in our Close.</p> <p>It is really unfortunate that after deciding so recently to build and grow our family and community in Vicarage close that we weren't made aware that the deeds to the semi-circle located at the back of 16 Park Road was for sale. It does feel like the rug was pulled out from under us and that the area could be used for something less cynical that continues to foster the sense of community that the Close offers.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for taking the time to listen to those of us that will be affected by these plans. The seriousness and validity of our objections are bolstered and vindicated by support from our local government, including our councillors and the MP, Sir Mike Penning, who has indicated he has written to your office.</p>

7 Vicarage Close	<p>My Family strongly object to the development of land to replace existing house with 5 new dwellings, Myself and my Family have lived on vicarage close for 42 years, our children and grandchildren have grown up on Vicarage close, it has always been safe environment for our children to grow up in, we have deep concerns regarding this proposed development.</p> <p>We feel that that the proposed development would be an overdevelopment of the allocated plot, this will greatly affect the local environment and will be overlooking our neighbours properties which would reduce the privacy we have all enjoyed for so many years. The new development would increase the traffic within the street, and we will there would be insufficient parking spacing resulting it being more hazardous for our children to enjoy the safety the street has always provided, we are also concerned with the loss of open space and the amenity area this development will cause, deeply effecting our grandchildren.</p> <p>We are concerned with traffic and increased parking in vicarage close. this will decrease road safety in the area making it more hazardous for our children to play and enjoy the environment that they have done so for many years.</p> <p>The proposed units do not have any front gardens or driveways as does the entire street, this would be completely out of character and intrusive to its current residents.</p>
8 Vicarage Close	<p>I object to the development for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic Have Traffic Engineers assessed the safety and practicality of the increase traffic flow and accommodation of additional vehicles? If not please confirm that such an assessment will be undertaken. Particular attention should be given to traffic movement in and out of the Close, ensuring that the limited levels of visitor parking are not reduced but extended, make allowance for potential disabled parking, and the safety of entry and exiting from the proposed development parking spaces. Please be guided by practicality rather than hiding behind inadequate existing minimums parking requirements. 2. Out of character design The proposals do not respect and reflect the neighbourhood character. Neighbourhood characteristics that are not taken into consideration include: plot size and shape, streetscape, front setbacks, architectural style, location of car parking or size of private open space. In addition, the gradient difference will have an impact on the adjacent plots on Park Road and opposite in Vicarage Close. 3. Loss of pavement and amenity space It is outrageous that the semi-circular pavement and amenity area at the top of the potential development is under threat. The change of use should be rejected in line with the Local Plan rules. Ideally, both uses will be preserved despite the change of ownership. There are potential safety issues if this use of this area is changed.

	<p>4. Pavements adjacent to proposed development. It appears that the proposed plots currently have their bin stores directly outside their kitchen windows. It is unlikely that future occupants would want to use this storage due to the hazard and smell, particularly during the summer months. This seems impractical and as a result, bins may be permanently left out and become an obstruction on the pavement.</p> <p>5. Density The density of development is greedily excessive.</p> <p>6. Light Clearly there will be potential loss of light issues for adjacent houses, yet there is no evidence of a daylight and sunlight assessment. Please confirm that such an assessment will be undertaken. Even the proposed new treeline could result in further light reduction.</p> <p>7. Noise It is difficult to understand how the potential noise impact on adjacent properties can be acceptable given the density of development.</p> <p>8. Services Is there sufficient capacity and access to existing services, ie water, gas, electricity, and telecoms?</p> <p>9. Wildlife Given that endangered wildlife has been sighted, please confirm that a full wildlife assessment will be undertaken.</p>
9 Vicarage Close	<p>I have lived in this close since it was built in 1966 and have brought up my family here. I love where I live and feel strongly that this build is just not suitable, not only for this area, but for the small plot at 16 Park Road and the land to the rear.</p> <p>Parking is at a premium in this area and is controlled and helped with residents permits. Even so, when it is busy cars have to park opposite our driveways making it extremely difficult to reverse out and they also park on the road/pavement outside our properties making it difficult to gain access to our driveways. The addition of these 5 houses will only add to the problem.</p> <p>The new houses will have a negative impact on the close. House number 1 on the semi circular area will be stuck in the middle of the close and look very out of place. Also the current space is where local children have played for generations. My children and other children in the Close played there as children. It was a safe place where children would congregate to play Barbie's, bikes, hopscotch, skipping, as well as football, etc. It was a safe communal area for them to play where adults could keep an eye on them all while giving them a sense of community and independence. It would be a shame to see this taken away.</p> <p>A lot of the neighbours will suffer due to the proposed new houses being so close to their homes. Houses 1 and 3 will feel cramped into a</p>

	<p>corner, overshadowed by the house on the semi circle. While houses 2, 4 and 6 will have their windows looked straight into, which must be an invasion of privacy?</p> <p>Please help to protect the Close that I and my family dearly love, to secure a pleasant future for all of its residents.</p>
10 Vicarage Close	<p>I oppose the proposed development of 16 Park Road. This would heavily impact parking in our area, making entering and exiting our driveway a difficult manoeuvre. We also object to the over development of the design. We think this area should remain as it was originally intended with open space.</p>
11 Vicarage Close	<p>I unfortunately object to the development of land to replace 1 existing house with 5 new houses.</p> <p>Whilst I support development on this occasion it is my belief / opinion that this is an over development of this piece of land and will result in increased traffic which I do not think the area will cope with. This will then lead to the increased demand for parking.</p> <p>This development will lead to over population of the area, increase the noise levels and reduce the access to the open space of the close where residents meet as a community.</p> <p>Finally the roof terraces are not in keeping with the surrounding properties and will encroach on neighbouring properties privacy.</p>
12 Vicarage Close	<p>We purchased our family home in 1997 in Vicarage Close due to the benefits that our children would gain from using its open space layout. Our children have used this area on regular occasions over the past years, and the other children from the neighbourhood have also enjoyed playing in this area, making camps and playing games. This is the only communal area that our children have in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Respectively, we were very disappointed to hear that this space (believed to be common land for the residents) had been sold without public notice. How could this be possible?</p> <p>Another impact will be the increase in cars within the area. This will strongly impact the ability to enter or exit the driveway of our house, as there is limited narrow space across the road in an area that cars would need to use.</p> <p>This over development proposal would spoil the open space environment of the close that the original designer had intended for this community.</p> <p>Additionally, during the winter months, the hill entry to Vicarage close is occasionally impassable due to ice on the steep surface. The current north-side 1.5 fence shades the road from thawing. This higher development will make this situation dangerous for cars and pedestrians.</p>
14 Vicarage Close	<p>I would like to register my objection to the planning application reference 20/01866/FUL at 16 Park Road.</p>

	<p>I have lived in Vicarage Close since the houses were built in 1966, making me a resident here for 54 years.</p> <p>Never in my time here have I seen such a shocking plan to build five properties in place of just one house and it is clear to me that this is a massive over development of the site and not in keeping with houses in this area.</p> <p>When I moved in all those years ago in 1966 I was told by the Sales Office that the amenity space was a designated children's play area. I was very saddened to realise that our amenity space which children have used to play on for decades has been bought without consent and could potentially be turned in to an eyesore for Vicarage Close. This Close has always had an open outlook and feel with no development since the original development was built approximately sixty years ago.</p> <p>I do not believe that the proposed development would be 23 metres away from my home and this proposed development will ruin the feel of the close and will have a detrimental effect on parking, noise, privacy and the loss of our beloved amenity space.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that you will conclude that this one existing dwelling is not suitable as a development site in such an established area.</p> <p>The whole of Vicarage Close is a very close knit community and this proposed planning application has had a huge impact, not only for myself, but also for the elderly residents that enjoy the peaceful environment in Vicarage Close.</p> <p>There have been no Site Notices anywhere within the Close or in Park Road and I strongly believe that this proposed development will cause nothing but heartache and the new proposed dwellings would be tiny and not afford the new residents a good quality of living.</p> <p>Although each proposed house has one car parking space the reality is that more parking will be need that what is proposed, plus parking for visitors which is not being taken in to account. This will make Vicarage Close congested and unsafe for elderly residents and children in Vicarage Close.</p> <p>Please refuse this planning application for the sake of the entire Close and a visit to the site would, I'm sure, prove that this is just a house with a garden and not a development site.</p> <p>Many thanks for your time in considering my objection to this planning application.</p>
15 Vicarage Close	<p>Loss of the semi-circular amenity area, originally designated as a general amenity space for the residents of Vicarage Close. There was no consultation on the sale of this and we believed it was Council owned as they have maintained it previously. The proposal is an over-development of the plot. There is insufficient parking allocation which would lead to increased parking within the Close. Existing residents</p>

	<p>close to the new development would be greatly impacted. Where will visitors park? Access to the Close for Emergency vehicle's/Refuge Collection/Delivery vans etc. Could be impacted too. There have been no site notices posted re the proposal</p> <p>This proposal is not in keeping with the character of the area. It is cramped and contrived and will have a big impact on many of the existing residents</p>
16 Vicarage Close	<p>I wholeheartedly agree with the sentiments expressed so far by my neighbours for opposing this development. The project is totally unreasonable and shows little consideration for local residents. All comments that have been made so far are quite valid, however here are some of which I am particularly concerned:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why destroy a perfectly good family home, which has recently been refurbished, seems like a waste of valuable materials to me? 2. Why build any new properties here when there are (still?)plans to build just off the Link Road,where there is plenty of space and no residents to disturb? 3. We already have a parking problem, with vehicles regularly obstructing the footpaths and larger (delivery) vans having trouble negotiating the narrow access road to Vicarage Close. Building five new homes here, even with 6 parking spaces, will only compound the problem. 4. I understand from some of the original residents that the tarmac semicircle at the back of 16 Park Road was intended as a children's play area when the close was constructed in 1966. Most people here say that it should still be a communal area. <p>To summarise: 5 homes on a plot that was designed for just one cannot be satisfactory to anybody.</p>
17 Vicarage Close	<p>On behalf of my family I strongly oppose the proposed development. Having resided in Vicarage Close as a child before more recently becoming a homeowner here myself, I know the local area well. Whilst I understand that the proposal is financially lucrative for the proposer, I put it to you that in cost/benefit terms, these plans pose severe detriment to the local community on social and environmental grounds.</p> <p>Whilst my family's concerns are abundant, my key reasons for opposition are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The designed appearance of the proposed dwellings is not in keeping with the local built environment. <p>The proposed housing development is of higher density than the adjacent detached properties that exist to the South (18 Park Road), lie parallel to the North (2, 4, 6 Vicarage Close) and line Park Road (nos 17, 19, 25) at its perpendicular intersection with Vicarage Close to the East. The design of the proposed units which lack any front</p>

gardens/open space and include roof terraces are completely out of character with these properties and the remainder of the properties in Vicarage Close which sit back from the road as a result of their traditional front gardens and/or driveways. I am in no doubt that these new houses, of completely different design, would visually appear at odds to the sensitively and holistically planned development that emerged as Vicarage Close in the mid 1960s.

2) The proposed properties will directly overlook 18 Park Road and several properties in Vicarage Close, and will block light to existing homes in Vicarage Close.

Sunley Homes successfully designed the current Vicarage Close development to allow penetration of light and, very importantly, to ensure that no home is overlooked by other houses within the Close. The 5 proposed dwellings (2 pairs and one single, linked by car ports and overlain by first floor 1.5m high wall-lined terraces) present as one parallel 38 m long block to the 3 detached houses (nos 2, 4 and 6) only a stone's throw away, across the (4.8 m) narrow road. This will act as significant obstruction to light and heat for these properties whose south-facing frontages currently receive light from the open space surrounding the one detached house that this development is proposed to replace.

Arguably, of yet greater concern is the close and extreme visual intrusion that the detached properties in Vicarage Close (nos 2, 4 and 6) and Park Road (nos 18 and 20) and the 5 town houses in Vicarage Close (nos 1, 3, 14, 16 and 18) are expected to suffer under this proposal as a result of being suddenly and newly overlooked. I am confident that you will agree that the proposed trees between the new properties and 18 Park Road and the proposed planting beds to the edges of the first floor terraces "to reduce visual impact" are potentially removable and simply represent a vain and unrealistic attempt to imply preserved privacy! The terrace walls, 1.3m or 1.5m high, whilst blocking light, lie below head height for the average teenager and adult and are therefore inadequate in this respect.

3) There will be significantly increased vehicle activity in Vicarage Close and its intersection with Park Road

According to these plans, the number of households is proposed to increase by 28%. The current demographic structure in Vicarage Close suggests that traffic will therefore increase by at least this amount. The increased noise and movement would be of detriment to the quality of life of residents within the Close, and even Park Road, but particularly to those properties that line the east-west branch of Vicarage Close extending from its intersection with Park Road. The road was planned to feed traffic from properties on one side, not both sides as is now proposed, and is therefore narrow at 4.8m. Even cars do not pass in opposing directions on this road; vehicles entering and exiting the Close are required to wait at the Vicarage Close/Park Road intersection and the north-south/east-west intersection of Vicarage Close respectively to allow an oncoming vehicle access. Vicarage Close is a cul-de-sac with one entrance/exit - the increased commotion, particularly at the bottom of Vicarage Close (outside 2

	<p>Vicarage Close, 19 and 25 Park Road) is a potential problem in the waiting.</p> <p>4) Increased vehicles will place unacceptable pressure on parking in Vicarage Close.</p> <p>Vicarage Close is too narrow to allow street parking for more than a couple of cars without looking unsightly, causing congestion and chaos, and posing a safety hazard. Since 'Statistica' confirms that the average number of cars per household in the South East is well above one, it seems reasonable to predict that new residents will arrive with more than the one vehicle that can be accommodated by a property's car port. It can only therefore be assumed that the surplus residents' and visitors' vehicles will be parked in the designated turning area at the top of the cul-de-sac (opposite no 19), on Vicarage Close's curbs that were never designed to bear this weight and possibly in Park Road, which is already lined with parked cars. In this situation, it will become impossible for refuse lorries to gain access and I fear for the safety of pedestrians (from within the Close and those who regularly use it to connect Park Road with Heath Lane), as well as for inhabitants should the emergency services need to gain access quickly to homes within the Close.</p> <p>5) Increased density of buildings will reduce access to open space in Vicarage Close.</p> <p>I am grateful for the freedom that Vicarage Close afforded me as a child in the 1970s and 80s. Since, by design, houses look onto the Close, vehicular movement was (and still is) relatively limited and there is a good amount of open space, I was able to play safely with friends in the fresh air, despite the majority of properties having relatively small back gardens. Although I do feel let down by the Council, Sunley Homes and the current owner of the deeds in the fact that the Close's extremely valuable amenity space at the rear of 16 Park Road was allowed to be sold off, I am pleased that my own children have also had access to a safe outside environment for play. I feel for the current (and future) households who have children whose recreational space (previously known as 'the white pavement') is threatened with replacement by property and whose opportunity for outside play in the cul-de-sac would be rendered unsafe due to the increased number of parked and moving vehicles. As someone who values our green/open space, I also ask that full consideration is given to the wildlife and particularly the bats that are regularly seen in this area, in environmental terms.</p> <p>I shall appreciate your close consideration of these 'costs' which I believe without hesitation, render this proposal highly inappropriate. I strongly urge you to prevent these plans from posing a risk to the local community and its environment and a negative impact that is both irreversible and sets extremely concerning precedent for future developments in this area.</p>
19 Vicarage Close	We at the above address, having lived here since we were one of the

first families to move into the close in 1966, vehemently object to this proposed development which is in complete contrast to the current Vicarage Close and Park Road developments and communities.

It is self-evident that the proposed development has paid no cognisance of the surrounding houses, the local community, the local residents or the loss of an amenity space (which we believe under current legislation should never have been sold off and furthermore the change of land use is detrimental to the local residents and community). Instead it is purely an attempt by someone who wishes to seize an opportunity by developing an existing house and its land, selling up and moving away from the area and with the sole aim is to make a significant amount of money, regardless of the social and environmental impact on the existing residents, local community and the surrounding roads, after they have left.

The opposition to this development and the reasons for the objections would be obvious to anyone who surveys the existing Vicarage Close, Park Road, the surrounding area or troubles to talk to the existing residents, because clearly the proposed development is totally out of keeping with the existing dwellings and surrounding space. We set out below our more specific objections to this development, as follows;

1. The proposal is deemed to be an overdevelopment of the site in accordance with the number of dwellings per hectare of the existing space. The proposals are not in keeping with the spacious character of the area, as the number of dwellings have been squashed into a relatively small space, in order to solely maximise the financial gain, rather than consideration of everything that a property developer and the local authority should consider when assessing a new development, in the middle of an existing residential area. This is conflict with the provisions of the Dacorum Borough Council Local Plan (Appendix 3) and Policy CS11a.

2. The proposals are at conflict with the Dacorum Borough Council Local Plan (Appendix 3) which states "Proposals should be guided by the existing topographical features of the site and its immediate surroundings. They should respect the character of the surrounding area, and in particular there must be adequate space for the proposed development without creating a cramped appearance". Clearly the proposals do not comply.

3. The proposals additionally conflict with the Dacorum Core Strategy Policy CS12 which states that the new development should "integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties....". The proposed development conflicts with the provisions of this strategy in every regard, and in particular the spacing between dwellings, and more importantly the existing spacious layout of the existing development.

Additionally the proposed development sites all houses very close to the road, unlike the existing Vicarage Close properties where the properties are set back from the road with a driveway and front garden, likewise the new proposed dwellings have less than 5m rear gardens which are less than half the size of the existing dwellings.

Accordingly this proposal cannot possibly be construed as integrating with the existing?

4. In addition we further note that these proposed new dwellings have first floor terraces and crown roofs, neither of which are either in keeping or an attempt to integrate into the existing streetscape.

5. We understand that a core principle of planning is to always secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of the land and buildings, a matter echoed in the Core Strategy Policy CS12(c) which states that a development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties.

It is self-evident that the proposed development is visually intrusive, will result in both the loss of natural daylight and sunlight to the properties which will be directly opposite both the front and the back of the proposed new house on what was always known as "the white pavement", along with those houses numbered 2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close. Additionally the proposed new dwellings will impact on and provide direct disturbance to all of the surrounding properties in both Vicarage Close and Park Road.

6. It is furthermore noted that the proposed new dwellings provide insufficient spaces for the parking of vehicles and hence this will inevitably lead to cars being parked in the road causing traffic congestion and health and safety issues for pedestrians. This issue will become further compounded by the significant increase in vehicular activity in the Close with a minimum of five resident vehicles, and more likely 10nr, as the majority of households have two vehicles these days, along with all additional deliveries and visitors, generated by the 28% increase in properties in the close.

7. The proposed new dwellings increases the volume of properties within the close by 28% when clearly the original Close was planned and developed with character and spacing of properties in mind and hence so to just rip up this original development and cram 28% additional properties into significantly less than 20% of the area of the existing Close is completely out of context with the surrounding area and the existing development.

8. Lastly there is the issue of the amenity space at the rear of the existing 16 Park Road, which when the close was first built was known as the "white pavement" due to the white paving slabs, maintained by the local council. It was an area played on by young children, including our own three children right from the early 1970's, until they grew up and moved away. Since then it has been played on by all children living in the close until such time as it was sold off unbeknown to the local residents, and yet now the owner is proposing to change the use of this community space. Surely this must require its own planning application in its own right?

The proposed change of use from a children's play area on land all residents believed to be council owned land (particularly as the land has always been maintained by the local council) is wholly unjust and

against all planning legislation.

In addition and lastly there is according to the Close "Title Deeds" a right of way which exists across this piece of land, and this can only be from the footpath adjacent to the existing 16 Park Road fence, across the semi-circle piece of land to the footpath at the bottom of the close by Nr1 Vicarage Close. Clearly a right of way for pedestrian access cannot be built across. Equally a change of land use needs to comply with certain planning restrictions, and this proposed development fails to comply with any such restrictions.

We believe that taking into consideration all of the foregoing, along with the other complaints registered by all local residents coupled with the support provided by both local councillors and our Local Member of Parliament, it can only be viewed that this proposed development fails to comply with any local planning conditions, local authority planning requirements, social or environmental considerations and should be rejected as it is unjust and non-compliant with all local planning requirements in every respect.

Agenda Item 5c

ITEM NUMBER: 5c

20/01667/FUL	Demolition of 4 single story barns currently used as dwelling. Erection of a low carbon 1.5 storey 4 bed family home, annex and garage.	
Site Address:	Greenings Farm Stocks Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RX	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr Simon Booth	Mr David Kirkland
Case Officer:	Colin Lecart	
Parish/Ward:	Aldbury Parish Council	Aldbury & Wigginton
Referral to Committee:	Objection received from Parish Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be GRANTED

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The Site is Located in the Rural Area and Chiltern Hills of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The applicant has submitted information which establishes the previously developed nature of the site and as such the principle of the development is acceptable. It is considered the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area due to its positioning, high quality design, and landscaping works which would enhance the immediate landscape. The proposal is considered to represent a high quality and innovative design which would not have a wide ranging landscape impact on the surrounding area. The proposal complies with Section 12 of the NPPF (2019), Policies CS7, CS12, CS24 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013), and Saved Appendices 3 and 5 of the Local Plan (2004).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site is located on Greenings Farm in Aldbury and is accessed via a private unsurfaced road. Aldbury village recreation ground is located to the south. The site is located within the Chilterns AONB and the Rural Area. The Adlbury Conservation Area boundary runs along the southern edge of the access road. A public Right of Way runs along the southern boundary of the site as well as through the fields to the north east.

The site currently comprises four single-storey barn units with a combined gross internal area of 434m². These are currently being utilised as follows:

- South west barn – 3 bedroom dwelling
- North west barn – storage
- North east barn – half split 50/50, half being a 1 bedroom dwelling and half being a games room used as ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling
- South east barn – storage

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 The application seeks permission for the demolition of 4 single storey barns and replacement with a new 5-bedroom dwelling.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications (If Any):

4/0048/02 - Historic File Check DMS for Documents and Further Details
DET - 22nd May 2002

4/0324/90 - Historic File Check DMS for Documents and Further Details
DET - 26th April 1990

4/02256/12/FHA - Timber framed car shelter and log store
GRA - 12th April 2013

4/00430/10/TCA - Works to trees
RNO - 21st April 2010

4/03034/07/DRC - Details of materials required by condition 2 of planning permission 4/0096/07
(replacement dwelling)
GRA - 10th March 2008

4/02330/07/DRC - Details of phase 1 environmental study and site completion report required by
conditions 8 & 9 of planning permission 4/00096/07 (replacement dwelling)
GRA - 7th December 2007

4/00096/07/FUL - Replacement dwelling
GRA - 26th April 2007

4/01310/03/FHA - Two storey extension
REF - 24th July 2003

4/00204/03/FHA - Two storey extension
WDN - 27th March 2003

4/00046/02/DRC - Details of landscaping required by condition 3 of planning permission 4/00408/01
(manege)
GRA - 6th March 2002

4/00408/01/FUL - Formation of manege
GRA - 8th May 2001

4/01058/00/FHA - Boundary wall and gates
REF - 31st July 2000

4/00599/99/FUL - Conversion of barn to residential unit and tack room
GRA - 17th June 1999

4/00091/97/LDC - Unrestricted residential occupancy (lawful development certificate - existing use)
GRA - 30th April 1997

Appeals (If Any):

6. CONSTRAINTS

Parking Accessibility Zone (DBLP): 4
Special Control for Advertisements: Advert Spec Contr
Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: CAONB outside Dacorum
CIL Zone: CIL1
Conservation Area: ALDBURY

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: RAF HALTON: DOTTED BLACK ZONE
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)
Rural Area: Policy: CS7
EA Source Protection Zone: 3
T1 Oak

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)
Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS7 - The Rural Area
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS24 – The Chiltern Hills of Outstanding Natural Beauty
CS27 – Quality of the Historic Environment
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Saved Appendix 3
Saved Appendix 5

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;
The quality of design and impact on the surrounding area
The impact on residential amenity; and
The impact on highway safety and car parking.

Principle of Development

9.2 The application site is located within the Chiltern Hills of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Rural Area. Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy (2013) states that the replacement of existing buildings

for the same use and the redevelopment or previously developed sites are acceptable within the Rural Area provided it has no significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside.

9.3 Policy CS24 states the special qualities of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be conserved. Development should have regard to the policies and actions set out in the Chilterns Conservation Board's Management Plan and support the principles set out within the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide.

9.4 It was noted at pre-application stage that a number of the barns were being used as residential and ancillary uses related to this. It was advised that further information be submitted to confirm the previously developed nature of the site in the absence of a full planning history on all of the barns.

9.5 The applicant has submitted information related to the previously developed nature of the site which consists of:

- A statement outlining the historic use of the barns
- A 1977 map showing the barns
- An Appendix showing photographs of the current use of all the barns
- A sales brochure dated 2014 which outlines the use of the barns then.

9.6 The barn initially had an agricultural use and are shown on the 1977 map produced. It has been stated that the previous owners purchased the property around 2000 and introduced equestrian/residential uses onto the site. This can be evidenced by permission 4/00599/FUL (conversion of barn to residential unit and tack room) and permission 4/00408/01/FUL (formation of ménage). It is the applicant's understanding that the previous owner refurbished the rest of the courtyard and barns around 2000, a year after receiving permission to convert the south west barn into a residential unit. It is thus estimated that the site has not been in an agricultural use for at least 20 years and therefore the site can be considered previously developed land.

9.7 In the absence of any information to refute the details provided by the applicant, it is considered that on the balance of probability, the site comprises previously developed land within the context of Annex 2 of the NPPF (2019). As such, the principle of development of the land is acceptable providing it does not have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.8 Policy CS7 states that the redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Rural Area is acceptable provided that it has no significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside. Policy CS24 states that the special qualities of the Chilterns AONB should be conserved. The site is also adjacent to the Aldbury Conservation Area where Policy CS27 states development should favour the conservation of heritage assets.

9.9 Paragraph 131 of the NPPF (2019) states that great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in the area. Paragraph 127(b) states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

9.10 The proposal is considered to be of a high quality design and abides by the guidance set out in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide. The Chiltern Society were consulted on the proposal and have recommended approval due to the high quality design and it was not considered to be intrusive on the wider landscape. It was noticed the entrance is at the start of Bridleway PROW Aldbury 56, as it is for the existing property. However, the property is in a secluded situation, behind Greenings Farmhouse, so it is away from the road, and there is a high hedge which adds to the seclusion.

9.11 The conservation officer was also consulted on the application. Initial concerns were raised with regards to the roof lights on the northern elevation and the roof materials. Amendments have reduced the number of roof lights on the northern elevation and have indicated that clay roof tiles will be used to match the earthy tones seen elsewhere in the AONB. The conservation officer had no objection upon receiving these amendments. Details of materials will be secured by condition.

9.12 The new dwelling would be set closer to Stocks Road than the existing buildings. However, it would be set back from the boundary by approximately 30m. Due to this setback and the existing landscaping along the road, the dwelling would not be overtly prominent from Stocks Road. It would however be seen from the Rights of Way network to the south and north east.

9.13 As mentioned in the Chiltern Society's response, the dwelling would be seen from the Right of Way adjacent to the southern boundary. However, this is an enclosed area and the dwelling would become screened by tree cover as one travels down the Right of Way to the west.

9.14 The agent has submitted proposed 3D views from the Rights of Way to the northeast. It is considered that in long range views the dwelling would not have a wide ranging landscape impact, due to the gradient of the land and existing views of development in the area. The dwelling would become more prominent when travelling down this Rights of Way towards Aldbury. However, it is considered the design quality of the proposal provides visual interest on the approach to the village.

9.15 The increase in height in height in itself is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the character of the area. While the highest apex of the roof would measure 9.53m, the roofline has been significantly broken up with an average height of 6.42m over all sections of the roofline. The development would also result in a reduction in footprint on the site from 474m² to 423m². Furthermore, the proposed green roof on a section of the property with significant landscaping works on the former paddock land will serve to soften the image of the development further.

9.16 The barn style form of the building along with the clay roof tiles and black timber cladding resemble the typical style of other farm buildings found within the Chilterns AONB. Stocks Golf Clubhouse is located approximately 300m away from the site. It was noted at application stage for this building that a barn like structure was preferred. The Planning Department also requested an asymmetrical and more organic roof form which would be closer in spirit to an accretive, informal group of farm buildings. These features are included in the proposal to break up the massing of the overall building.

9.17 Paragraph 3.31 of the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide (2010) states that the overall guidance within the document does not mean that there is no place for contemporary and innovative architecture which demonstrate adherence to the basic principle of being in harmony with their site or surrounding buildings. It is considered the building represents an innovative design which also pays respect to the basic characteristics of buildings found throughout the AONB.

9.18 Due to the above, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area and complies with the aims of the NPPF (2019) in encouraging innovative, high quality design.

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.19 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) state that development should not have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of surrounding properties in term of light, outlook and privacy.

9.20 The development would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Due to the spacious nature of the plot, the development would be located a sympathetic distance away from Greenings Farmhouse. It would also be orientated north east from

this property, thereby reducing any potential impacts on sunlight. Moreover, the elements of the property closest to Greenings Farmhouse would be single storey and the main fenestrations on the property are orientated at an angle away from the plot of the farmhouse.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.21 The standards contained within Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004) would mean that a property of this size in this location (zone 4) would need to provide three car parking spaces. This standard would be met and exceeded upon through the provision of a triple garage and a large courtyard area to park in.

9.22 Hertfordshire Highways were consulted on the application and has no objection to the proposal. No new or altered pedestrian or vehicular access is proposed to or from the highway and no works are required in the highway.

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.23 A protected tree is located on the entrance into the site. A Tree Protection Plan will be secured by condition to ensure that no works or storage of materials take place within the root protection zone of this tree.

Ecology

9.24 A combined Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment were submitted with the application. The ecology officer was satisfied with its contents and concluded that bats did not pose a constraint to the development. The orchard planting and wildlife pond are considered beneficial in ecological terms.

9.25 A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan will be secured by condition which will detail the planting and management of the orchard and wildlife pond, as well as the location of artificial birds nests within the site.

Sustainability

9.26 The dwelling has been designed around low energy principles. The building would be highly thermally and acoustically insulated beyond current building regulation requirement. The dwelling will benefit from a ground or air source heating system, solar powered systems on the garage roof with a battery storage system, passive solar gain via the southern glazed facades, high levels of internal thermal mass. The materials used for the building fabric will be low processed and natural allowing for easy deconstruction, recycling and biodegradable waste management. The building materials specified will tend to be towards being A+ rated by the Green Guide to Specifications. Overall, the development would accord with the principles set out in Policy CS29.

Other matters

9.27 Class A, B and C (Schedule 2, Part 1) Permitted Development Rights will be removed from the proposal by condition should permission be granted. Class E (outbuilding) rights will not be removed. It is considered the east facing elevation towards Stocks Roads is the principal elevation of the development. Thus, Permitted Development Rights would not extend to outbuildings forward of this elevation, within the former paddock area.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 The applicant has submitted information which establishes the previously developed nature of the site and as such the principle of the development is acceptable. It is considered the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area due to its positioning, high quality design, and landscaping works which would enhance the immediate landscape. The proposal is considered to represent a high quality and innovative design which would not have a wide ranging landscape impact on the surrounding area. The proposal complies with Section 12 of the NPPF (2019), Policies CS7, CS12, CS24 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013), and Saved Appendices 3 and 5 of the Local Plan (2004).

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission/listed building consent be GRANTED.

Case Officer Check List	Officer Check/Comments
Has the consultation letter/site notice/advert period expired?	Y
Was a site notice posted and if so, was the date entered into Uniform?	Y
Is the Article 35 Statement included?	Y
Is the CIL box ticked/un-ticked in Uniform?	Ticked
Are all plans, documents, site photographs and emails saved to DMS?	Y
If applicable, please give the reason why the application is overtime.	Amendments and need to report to committee
Does the application involve the demolition of any buildings that are currently in use?	Y
Is there a Legal Agreement?	N
Has the Uniform Legal Agreement box been filled in?	
Is a copy of the agreement on DMS (both redacted and non-redacted versions)? Has the agreement been published on the website?	

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

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

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

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

**PL-02 Rev P2
PL-03
PL-04 Rev P2
PL-05**

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

3. **No development (excluding demolition/ground investigations) shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Please note these details shall include details of the tint of the windows within the pitched roofs of the eastern elevation.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the area in accordance with Policies CS7, CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

4. No construction of the superstructure shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:

- all external hard surfaces within the site;
- other surfacing materials;
- means of enclosure;
- soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs;
- minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, signs, refuse or other storage units, etc.); and
- retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.

The planting must be carried out within one planting season of completing the development.

Any tree or shrub which forms part of the approved landscaping scheme which within a period of 5 years from planting fails to become established, becomes seriously damaged or diseased, dies or for any reason is removed shall be replaced in the next planting season by a tree or shrub of a similar species, size and maturity.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the development and its contribution to biodiversity and the local environment, as required by saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 (e) of the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2013).

5. Prior to the commencement of the development details of a management plan including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas including the proposed orchard planting and wildlife pond. The plan should also show the location of the artificial bird nests requested by the ecology officer. The details should be built upon the submitted Master Landscape Plan and Design Binder.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the development and its contribution to biodiversity and the local environment, as required by saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 (e) of the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2013).

6. No work (including site clearance) in relation to the development hereby approved shall be undertaken until full details setting out how retained trees shall be protected, in accordance with BS5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include:

- A scaled Tree Protection Plan showing the approved development layout and retained trees (surveyed in accordance with BS5837:2012), to include their accurate crown spreads and root protection areas (RPAs).
- The sequential order of events required for tree protection.

- The position and specification of tree protection fencing in accordance with BS5837:2012 (as applicable).
- The position and specification of ground protection in accordance with BS5837:2012 (as applicable).
- Details of hard surfacing constructed using no-dig techniques where proposed over the RPA of retained trees (as applicable).
- Details of proposed levels.
- The position of service routes and drainage (to include soakaways), and means of installation if these encroach through the RPA of retained trees.
- The position(s) of welfare site cabins and areas for the storage of materials.
- Tree protection measures during the landscaping stage(s).
- Details of arboricultural site supervision to include timing and how each site visit shall be recorded.

There shall be no excavation, changes in levels, storage of materials or access within the RPA of retained trees unless previously specified and agreed.

The works must then be carried out according to the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure that damage does not occur to trees and hedges during building operations in accordance with saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

7. **The clearance of trees and demolition of buildings 3 and 4 (as shown on the Greenings Farm site plan within the ecological report by the Wildlife Conservation Partnership (WCP) October 2019), 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 these areas should be made no more than two days in advance of clearance by a competent Ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest.**

Reason: To protect breeding birds, their nests, eggs and young in accordance with Paragraph 175 (a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981).

8. (a) **No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to the submission to, and agreement of the Local Planning Authority of a written preliminary environmental risk assessment (Phase I) report containing a Conceptual Site Model that indicates sources, pathways and receptors. It should identify the current and past land uses of this site (and adjacent sites) with view to determining the presence of contamination likely to be harmful to human health and the built and natural environment.**
- (b) **If the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the report which discharges condition (a), above, indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination then no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:**
- (i) **A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;**
- (ii) **The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.**

(c) No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report; if required as a result of (b), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

(d) This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:

(i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (c) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.

(ii) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.

9. **Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 7 encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority as soon as practically possible; a scheme to render this contamination harmless shall be submitted to and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority and subsequently fully implemented prior to the occupation of this site. Works shall be temporarily suspended, unless otherwise agreed in writing during this process because the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.**

Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.

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

Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B and C.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development in the interests of safeguarding the residential and visual amenity of the locality in accordance with Policies CS7, CS12 and CS24 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

2. Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

3. Construction Hours of Working - (Plant & Machinery) Informative

In accordance with the councils adopted criteria, all noisy works associated with site demolition, site preparation and construction works shall be limited to the following hours: Monday - Friday 07.30am - 17:30pm, Saturdays 08:00am - 13:00pm, Sundays and Bank Holidays - no noisy works allowed.

Construction Dust Informative

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

Noise on Construction/Demolition Sites Informative

The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Control of Pollution Act 1974 relating to the control of noise on construction and demolition sites.

Contaminated Land Informative

The Environmental Health Team has a web-page that aims to provide advice to potential developers, which includes a copy of a Planning Advice Note on "Development on Potentially Contaminated Land and/or for a Sensitive Land Use" in use across Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire. This can be found on www.dacorum.gov.uk by searching for contaminated land and I would be grateful if this fact could be passed on to the developers.

4. Any excavations left open overnight should be covered or have mammal ramps (reinforced plywood board >60cm wide set at an angle of no greater than 30 degrees to the base of the pit) to ensure that any animals that enter can safely escape. Any open pipework with an outside diameter of greater than 120mm must be covered at the end of each working day to prevent animals entering / becoming trapped.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
The Chiltern Society	<p>On behalf of the Chiltern Society, I support this application.</p> <p>The proposed building will be on a previously developed site, and it is noted that the footprint will be slightly less than the four barns which will be demolished.</p> <p>The site lies within the Chilterns AONB. The plan is outstanding and innovative and promotes a very high level of sustainability.</p> <p>It will be completely energy efficient. It aims to have Passivhaus standards, and to mitigate climate warming and pollution.</p> <p>It is a 1.5 storey house and built around a sunken courtyard, so that it is not too high and intrusive on the landscape.</p> <p>The appearance is attractive and in keeping with the local area.</p> <p>I note that the entrance is at the start of Bridleway PROW Aldbury 56, as it is for the existing property.</p> <p>The property is in a secluded situation, behind Greenings Farmhouse, so it is away from the road, and there is a high hedge</p>

	<p>which adds to the seclusion.</p> <p>The quality is exceptional and therefore I recommend approval.</p>
<p>Conservation & Design (DBC)</p>	<p>The existing buildings are single storey with shallow pitched roofs. These are of minimal architectural interest. We would therefore not object to their demolition.</p> <p>We would support high quality contemporary architecture. We believe that in general this building responds to this brief but we have a number of concerns.</p> <p>The proposed roof heights are substantially larger than the existing. Barn buildings. Given that the building is located in the base of the valley and there are many footpaths both marked and not across the landscape particularly within Ashridge we believe that the proposed building would be most visible. We would therefore recommend that the materials proposed for the large proposed roofs should be reviewed. The metal would appear out of keeping and although it is a dull colour it would be catch the eye within the landscape. It would therefore be recommended that this element be reconsidered and clay tiles be used to provide the warm muted earthy tones seen elsewhere in the valley and wider Chiltern AONB area. We are also concerned about the proposed rooflights to the external elevations in particular to the north. These will be visually disruptive and detract from the external roofspace.</p> <p>A further concern is the large windows within the pitched roofs particularly those visible from the east. We would recommend that at a minimum these have a dark tint and are non reflective so that they do not stand out against the walling. Non reflective glass would also be recommended for the large areas of glazing to the outward facing principle elevation.</p> <p>The proposed landscaping appears appropriate and we would not object to this element of the scheme.</p> <p>Recommendation The application should be continued and the above points addressed.</p>
<p>Hertfordshire Ecology</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Ecology on the above, for which I have the following comments:</p> <p>An ecological report has been submitted in support of this application - (The Wildlife Conservation Partnership (WCP) October 2019). This detailed a visit on 22 October 2019 of the site, which comprises four timber stables and farm outbuildings, two paddocks and hedgerows</p>

along the eastern and southern boundary.

No evidence or potential for roosts were found within the buildings, though evidence of bats was found within building 2 in the form of a small number of scattered droppings, and a couple of pairs of clipped butterfly wings. This was assessed as being consistent with bats foraging and feeding within the open building but not roosting. I have no reason to dispute this conclusion. Consequently, no further survey work is required and bats do not need to be considered a constraint to the proposed development.

Two of the buildings have been used by nesting birds; old swallows' nests were found in building 3 and a robin's nest in building 4. The trees on site were assessed as being unsuitable for roosting bats. However, they may have potential for nesting birds, and some of these trees appear to be required to be removed to make way for the proposed building. Consequently I advise the following as a Condition of approval.

" The clearance of trees and demolition of buildings 3 and 4 (as shown on the Greenings Farm Site Plan within the ecological report by The Wildlife Conservation Partnership (WCP) October 2019), 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 these areas should be made no more than two days in advance of clearance by a competent Ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest."

Furthermore, swallows are listed as being of conservation concern, and the loss of this nesting habitat should be compensated for by the inclusion within the new buildings of seven artificial nests for this species. Details should be included within the requested LEMP - see below.

The paddocks are described as amenity grassland, and no protected or plant species of conservation concern were identified during the survey. Both fields are being retained within the proposal as grassland and the hedgerows will be unaffected.

Signs of the use of the site by badgers were located in the form of pathways and latrines along the site boundaries; however no signs of setts were located on site. As a precaution against an offence being committed in relation to this protected species, I advise the following is included as an Informative with any consent given.

"Any excavations left open overnight should be covered or have mammal ramps (reinforced plywood board >60cm wide set at an angle of no greater than 30 degrees to the base of the pit) to ensure that any

	<p>animals that enter can safely escape. Any open pipework with an outside diameter of greater than 120mm must be covered at the end of each working day to prevent animals entering / becoming trapped."</p> <p>I am pleased to see that the master landscape plan includes new planting for a native mixed hedgerow, planting of new trees (including orchard style planting of fruit and nut trees), the creation of a wildlife pond, and areas of wild flowers.</p> <p>New tree planting should be of native species where possible, and in order to provide biodiversity gain, be in excess of the number required to compensate those being removed. The removed trees should be compensated for on a one for one basis for young and semi mature trees, and a two for one basis for mature trees.</p> <p>To bring all these biodiversity enhancements and aspirations together, I recommend production of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), which should include details of native-species and number of trees being planted and lost; details of how the new pond will be maintained as suitable for wildlife and the location, number, type and location of artificial bird nests . The LEMP should be submitted to the LPA for consideration, either prior to determination or, if not, then secured by Condition. .</p>
Parish/Town Council	<p>Objection due to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall height and scale of the building in the area of AONB and its visual impact on Stocks Road and other surrounding areas within and just outside of the village. 2. The positioning of the building is closer to Stocks Road than the current buildings which will impact on the visual scene and the street scene from Stocks Road and surrounding areas. 3. The style is not in keeping with surrounding properties.
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	<p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.</p> <p>INFORMATIVES</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public

highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence.

Further information is available via the website

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

2. Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence.

Further information is available via the website

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

3. Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

COMMENTS

This application is for Demolition of 4 single story barns currently used as dwelling. Erection of a low carbon 1.5 storey 4 bed family home, annex and garage. The site is accessed from a private drive leading from Stocks Road, which is an unnumbered "C" classified Road with a 30mph speed limit.

	<p>PARKING Additional parking will be provided in an integral garage. There is sufficient space on site to allow vehicles to manoeuvre to enter and leave the highway in forward gear.</p> <p>ACCESS No new or altered pedestrian or vehicular access is proposed to or from the highway and no works are required in the highway.</p> <p>CONCLUSION HCC as Highway Authority considers that this proposal will not have a severe residual impact on the safety and operation of the surrounding highway, subject to the informative notes above.</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>Having reviewed the planning application I am able to confirm that there is no objection to the proposed development, but that it will be necessary for the developer to demonstrate that the potential for land contamination to affect the proposed development has been considered and where it is present will be remediated.</p> <p>This is considered necessary because the application site had been previously developed and as such the possibility of ground contamination cannot be ruled out at this stage. This combined with the vulnerability of the proposed residential end use to the presence of any contamination means that the following planning conditions should be included if permission is granted.</p> <p>Contaminated Land Conditions: Condition 1:</p> <p>(a) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to the submission to, and agreement of the Local Planning Authority of a written preliminary environmental risk assessment (Phase I) report containing a Conceptual Site Model that indicates sources, pathways and receptors. It should identify the current and past land uses of this site (and adjacent sites) with view to determining the presence of contamination likely to be harmful to human health and the built and natural environment.</p> <p>(b) If the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the report which discharges condition (a), above, indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination then no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:</p> <p>(i) A full identification of the location and concentration of all</p>

pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;
(ii) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.

(c) No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report; if required as a result of (b), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

(d) This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:

(i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (c) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.

(ii) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.

Condition 2:

Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 1 encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority as soon as practically possible; a scheme to render this contamination harmless shall be submitted to and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority and subsequently fully implemented prior to the occupation of this site. Works shall be temporarily suspended, unless otherwise agreed in writing during this process because the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.

Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.

Informative:

The above conditions are considered to be in line with paragraphs 170 (e) & (f) and 178 and 179 of the NPPF 2019.

The Environmental Health Team has a web-page that aims to provide advice to potential developers, which includes a copy of a Planning Advice Note on "Development on Potentially Contaminated Land and/or for a Sensitive Land Use" in use across Hertfordshire and

	<p>Bedfordshire. This can be found on www.dacorum.gov.uk by searching for contaminated land and I would be grateful if this fact could be passed on to the developers.</p> <p>21/07/2020:</p> <p>With reference to the above planning application, please be advised Environmental Health have no objections or concerns. However I would recommend the application is subject to construction working hours with Best Practical Means for dust.</p> <p>Construction Hours of Working - (Plant & Machinery) Informative</p> <p>In accordance with the councils adopted criteria, all noisy works associated with site demolition, site preparation and construction works shall be limited to the following hours: Monday - Friday 07.30am - 17:30pm, Saturdays 08:00am - 13:00pm, Sundays and Bank Holidays - no noisy works allowed.</p> <p>Construction Dust Informative</p> <p>Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or by carrying out of other such works that may be necessary to suppress dust. Visual monitoring of dust is to be carried out continuously and Best Practical Means (BPM) should be used at all times. The applicant is advised to consider the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance, produced in partnership by the Greater London Authority and London Councils.</p> <p>Noise on Construction/Demolition Sites Informative</p> <p>The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Control of Pollution Act 1974 relating to the control of noise on construction and demolition sites.</p>
--	---

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
4	8	0	2	6

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
<p>4 Park Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6AT</p>	<p>On behalf of the Chiltern Society, I support this application. The proposed building will be on a previously developed site, and it is noted that the footprint will be slightly less than the four barns which will be demolished. The site lies within the Chilterns AONB. The plan is outstanding and innovative and promotes a very high level of sustainability. It will be completely energy efficient. It aims to have Passivhaus standards, and to mitigate climate warming and pollution. It is a 1.5 storey house and built around a sunken courtyard, so that it is not too high and intrusive on the landscape. The appearance is attractive and in keeping with the local area. I note that the entrance is at the start of Bridleway PROW Aldbury 56, as it is for the existing property. The property is in a secluded situation, behind Greenings Farmhouse, so it is away from the road, and there is a high hedge which adds to the seclusion. The quality is exceptional and therefore I recommend approval.</p>
<p>High Trees 7 Beechwood Drive Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5SB</p>	<p>a) This application should be rejected on planning grounds.</p> <p>b) The proposed design is out of keeping with its surroundings, the countryside and Aldbury in particular. It will be visible from various footpaths and other vantage points and its appearance should be very carefully considered.</p> <p>The profile is reminiscent of a light industrial estate in Hemel Hempstead instead of a rural Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It looks like a long, low workshop with some kind of hangar at each end.</p> <p>This does not echo or rhyme with any existing buildings, has no historical precedent in the area and totally out of keeping therefore.</p> <p>As the site survey itself says, Stock Golf Club House was a very contentious development because of its large, visible roof elevations and was not in keeping with the local "vernacular" - this proposed development is far worse!</p> <p>c) It may claim to be environmentally efficient and sustainable but has large glazed areas and significant insolation - has this been allowed for properly?</p> <p>d) Such a high roof line (9.53 metres) is NOT one and a half stories as claimed but more like a full two storey house with pitched roof. Yes, there is a slight depression of 0.9m where the highest ridge is located but that still leaves an effective elevation of 8.63m (approx. 28 ft 4 ins). It appears this maybe as high or even higher than the roofline of the Greenings Farm building nearby (sadly the drawings for this retained on the DBC web site are not dimensioned so a rough scaling has to be used).</p>

e) The proposed buildings will be far more visible, from all directions - the Nowers, Stocks Road, Pitstone Hill or Greenings Lane and would be detrimental to the skyline and views.

It would replace low level, single storey barns currently hidden by a wall from two directions.

f) This is another example of creeping development. The barns are still serviceable and still used with one being lived in. Until Dacorum BC failed to enforce planning controls some years ago there were no residences or residential rights behind Greenings Farm. This development would add a new, larger residence and encourage development on land behind.

g) There IS a shortage of smaller and more affordable homes in Aldbury and areas where infilling could be achieved with little or no impact on the views and environment. This in contrast is a large house with swimming pool!

I urge DBC to oppose this application and any other application for a large residential development there.

a) This application should be rejected on planning grounds.

b) The proposed design is out of keeping with its surroundings, the countryside and Aldbury in particular. It will be visible from various footpaths and other vantage points and its appearance should be very carefully considered.

The profile is reminiscent of a light industrial estate in Hemel Hempstead instead of a rural Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It looks like a long, low workshop with some kind of hangar at each end.

This does not echo or rhyme with any existing buildings, has no historical precedent in the area and totally out of keeping therefore.

As the site survey itself says, Stock Golf Club House was a very contentious development because of its large, visible roof elevations and was not in keeping with the local "vernacular" - this proposed development is far worse!

c) It may claim to be environmentally efficient and sustainable but has large glazed areas and significant insolation - has this been allowed for properly?

d) Such a high roof line (9.53 metres) is NOT one and a half stories as claimed but more like a full two storey house with pitched roof. Yes, there is a slight depression of 0.9m where the highest ridge is located but that still leaves an effective elevation of 8.63m (approx. 28 ft 4 ins). It appears this maybe as high or even higher than the roofline of the Greenings Farm building nearby (sadly the drawings for this retained on the DBC web site are not dimensioned so a rough scaling has to be used).

e) The proposed buildings will be far more visible, from all directions - the Nowers, Stocks Road, Pitstone Hill or Greenings Lane and would be detrimental to the skyline and views.

It would replace low level, single storey barns currently hidden by a wall from two directions.

f) This is another example of creeping development. The barns are still serviceable and still used with one being lived in. Until Dacorum BC

	<p>failed to enforce planning controls some years ago there were no residences or residential rights behind Greenings Farm. This development would add a new, larger residence and encourage development on land behind.</p> <p>g) There IS a shortage of smaller and more affordable homes in Aldbury and areas where infilling could be achieved with little or no impact on the views and environment. This in contrast is a large house with swimming pool!</p> <p>I urge DBC to oppose this application and any other application for a large residential development there.</p>
<p>Wychwood Toms Hill Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5SA</p>	<p>I would like to object to the redevelopment of four potential residential dwellings to be replaced by one massive one as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The huge scale of the development.- The proposed building will be considerably larger than the four existing buildings, being both much higher and bulkier due to the four existing discrete buildings being replaced by a larger single entity on a much larger footplate and at existing ground level 2. Visibility -The building is also extending considerably further forward towards Stocks Rd than the existing buildings with the current screening wall and hedge being removed by the owners opening up the whole site to visibility from all directions within the Chiltern AONB such as the fields opposite and probably also from the ridge above (Duncombe Terrace).The building will be highly visible and in my opinion detrimental to the landscape. 3. The style of the building. While there is talk in the documentation of reflecting local building style there is nothing even vaguely similar in the local area that I am aware of. In fact this design seems a clash rather than merge in with its surroundings. The steeply pitched multiple roofs and large expanse of folding glass doors is completely at odds with the feel of the village and surrounding countryside. 4. Eco friendly - this shouldn't be a big architectural sell in this day and age, it should be a given for all new builds so in my view this incongruous box shouldn't be approved just because of any merit it has in eco credentials. 5. The barns could currently provide four affordable residential dwellings which the village needs and some have been rented out as such. <p>Thank you for considering my comments</p>
<p>24 Malting Lane Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RH</p>	<p>I support this application. The design is attractive and reminiscent of agricultural barns in place across the Chilterns. Whilst undoubtedly modern the building will be highly energy efficient and sustainable. In my view local planning policy should be sufficiently flexible to allow new design and innovation (such as are apparent in this scheme) which still respects the distinctive qualities of the area.</p>
<p>9 Bolebec End Pitstone LU79JY</p>	<p>My family have lived in Aldbury on and off for decades. It is a beautiful village in stunning surroundings and whilst it has many traditional dwellings, I think it is extremely exciting that we can start to see some contemporary architecture in such a popular village. Examples such as the development at The Walled Garden show that innovative designs</p>

	still have a place in traditional settings, and should be encouraged
Greenings Cottage Stocks Road Aldbury HP23 5RX	<p>I am writing in support of the application. Aldbury is an attractive village in heart of the Chilterns AONB. The village has developed over hundreds of years and its character is defined by an eclectic range of architectural styles that have evolved over time. Every building in the village would have looked contemporary and modern when first built, whether it was last year or in the 18th Century. Aldbury needs to keep evolving and can't remain in aspic. What is important is that new development doesn't encroach on protected land, is high quality in design and in materials, and is sensitive to the landscape and the local vernacular. By these measures this application should be approved as it would enhance the village and contribute positively to its evolution.</p> <p>I am writing in support of the application. Aldbury is an attractive village in heart of the Chilterns AONB. The village has developed over hundreds of years and its character is defined by an eclectic range of architectural styles that have evolved over time. Every building in the village would have looked contemporary and modern when first built, whether it was last year or in the 18th Century. Aldbury needs to keep evolving and can't remain in aspic. What is important is that new development doesn't encroach on protected land, is high quality in design and in materials, and is sensitive to the landscape and the local vernacular. By these measures this application should be approved as it would enhance the village and contribute positively to its evolution.</p>
8 Wilstone Wharf Wilstone Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4PX	<p>I am writing in support of this application. I have lived in Aldbury for many years and am really pleased to see proposals for an exciting innovative new house being submitted to the Council. Aldbury is a traditional village but new contemporary architecture should be encouraged in areas where there is a clear improvement on the existing setting, which is, in my opinion, the case with this application.</p> <p>The proposed house replaces very tired barns which look incongruous in their setting. The new house would nod to agricultural design and form and use materials which reflect the existing barn materials. In short I consider that proposals such as these should be welcomed and fully supported.</p>
The Great Barn 5 Stocks Farm Barns Stocks Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RX	<p>We support this application as it is replaces 4 existing barn buildings and so doesn't constitute new development on undeveloped land. The proposed development will be a visual improvement on the existing buildings, some of which are of poor quality and require improvement. The proposal isn't obtrusive and I don't think it will be overly visible from Stocks Road. Where a proposal is to replace existing buildings with something much better, then I think that constitutes an improvement to the visual amenity of the immediate environment.</p>

ITEM NUMBER: 5d

4/02109/19/FUL	Site fencing and hardstanding (retrospective)	
Site Address:	Land Off Pipers Hill/ Church Meadow Pipers Hill Great Gaddesden	
Applicant/Agent:	C/O Agent	Parry
Case Officer:	Jane Miller	
Parish/Ward:	Great Gaddesden Parish Council	Watling
Referral to Committee:	Contrary to the views of Great Gaddesden Parish Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 The application seeks permission for site boundary fencing 1.8m (retrospective) to support an agricultural use; to alter part of the fence; and the alteration and completion of hardstanding within the Rural Area and is considered to be acceptable in principle, in accordance with CS7 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).
- 2.2 The proposal is considered acceptable within the Rural Area and would not have a significant impact on the appearance and character of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Great Gaddesden Conservation Area, surrounding area, residential amenity of the surrounding properties and highway safety. The proposed development therefore complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and Policies, CS7, CS12, CS24 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013).

3 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 3.1 The application site outlined in red on the site plan and location plan forming part of Drawing No. 2476-01 Rev D, denoting the position of the fence, lies to the north east of Church Meadow, and takes in the corner with Pipers Hill within the Great Gaddesden Conservation Area.
- 3.2 The extent of the site for the purposes of this application comprises a narrow strip of boundary land which with the exception of the existing playing field opposite Great Gaddesden School, runs along Church Meadow from the northwest in a south easterly direction and continues just past the corner with Pipers Hill. Towards the south-eastern corner with the application site, there is an existing gated access, and the site takes in the partially completed relatively small area of hardstanding behind the gates.
- 3.3 The wider site, known locally as Bishop's Tip, on which this application forms a small part of, is indicated by the blue boundary as shown on the location plan 1:1250 part of Drawing No. 2476-01 rev D and lies between Church Meadow (the highway), and The River Gade to the north east. Hemel Hempstead Garden Centre and the B440, Dagnall Road, lie beyond the wider site to the east, whilst the main hub of the village,

Great Gaddesden, including the majority of dwelling houses, school and the church lie to the west and south west.

- 3.4 The current land use is agricultural, as noted on the decision notice for the previously granted and implemented planning application 4/01310/79, raising level of land opposite the Cock and Bottle P.H., Great Gaddesden, this is the 'wider site' referred to above. The reasoning for condition 5 on the Decision Notice 'to ensure complete restoration of the land to agricultural use.

4 PROPOSAL

- 4.1 This planning permission seeks permission for site boundary fencing (retrospective), to alter part of the fence, and alteration and completion of hardstanding.
- 4.2 This is a re-submission of the previously withdrawn planning application 4/01875/19/FUL. The 1.8m high fencing will support agricultural use for example grazing animals, and replaces the existing dilapidated chestnut paled 900mm fencing. Following earlier correspondence with our Conservation Officer, the fence will be reduced to 0.75m at the corner of Church Meadow and Pipers Hill where the fence meets the lower existing flint and brick wall. The area of hardstanding has been reduced on the current application to approximately 84 square metres.
- 4.3 Amended plans were requested to include:
- ☐ Completion of red outline showing the site.
 - ☐ Extending the red outline to include the access to the highway.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications

4/01723/91FUL Change of use to form car park and formation of vehicular access REFUSED
06/02/92

4/01875/19FUL Site fencing (retrospective) and completion of hardstanding WITHDRAWN
03/09/19

6. CONSTRAINTS

CIL2

Source Protection zone

SSSi Impact Risk Zones

Chilterns AONB

Area of Archaeological Importance

Rural Area

Conservation area

Former land use

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)
Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS7 – Rural Area
CS8 – Sustainable Transport
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS24– The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
CS27 – Quality of the Historic Environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Great Gaddesden Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals.

9 CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of Development

9.1 The application site is located within the Rural Area, wherein, in accordance with Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy (2013), small scale development will be permitted including for agriculture, provided:

- It has no significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside; and
- It supports the rural economy and maintenance of the wider countryside.

9.2 Whilst fences are not specifically mentioned in Policy CS7 the proposal can be considered small scale and includes a replacement fence to support agricultural use.

9.3 The principle of development is therefore acceptable subject to compliance with the relevant national and local policies.

9.4 The key considerations in this application are the developments:

- a. Rural Area Impact Assessment
- b. Impact on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- c. Effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
- d. Effect on the character and appearance of the immediate area;
- e. Effect on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties; and
- f. Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

Policy CS7 : Rural Area Impact Assessment

- 9.5 The application site is located within the Rural Area, wherein in accordance with Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy (2013), small scale development will be permitted including for agriculture, provided i. It has no significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside; and ii. It supports the rural economy and maintenance of the wider countryside.
- 9.6 The green mesh fencing is not considered excessively high and the choice of materials for both hardstanding, subject to condition, and fence ensure they blend into their countryside surroundings, as seen against the backdrop of hedgerow, trees and other vegetation within the wider site of Bishops Tip.
- 9.7 Overall, this small-scale development comprising a replacement fence and area of hardstanding to support agricultural use would not be considered to have a significant impact and therefore not conflict with the purpose of the Rural Area in maintaining a generally open and rural characteristic.
- 9.8 Further, the scheme would support the rural economy and maintenance of the wider countryside. Carrying out the development itself would be expected to result in some degree of local economic benefits as would the purchase of resources such as additional feed to support any resultant future agricultural use such as grazing animals.
- 9.9 The proposal is considered to accord with CS7.

Impact on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

- 9.10 The application site is located within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). In the AONB the prime planning consideration will be the conservation of the beauty of the area. Wherever development is permitted it will be on the basis of its satisfactory assimilation into the landscape. Saved Policy 97 of the Dacorum Local Plan states that 'Building, plant and structures must be sympathetically sited and designed, having regard to natural contours, landscape, planting and other buildings; there should be no adverse effect on skyline views.' Policy CS24 of the Dacorum Core Strategies states that the special qualities of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be conserved. In addition, development is required to have regard to the policies and actions set out in Chilterns

Conservation Board's Management Plan and support the principles set out within the Chilterns Building Design Guide and associated technical notes.

- 9.11 The extent of the site comprises a narrow strip of boundary land, and with the exception of the existing playing field opposite Great Gaddesden School, the fencing has been erected, adjacent to Church Meadow from the northwest in a south easterly direction and includes the corner with Pipers Hill. Towards the south-eastern corner of the site, there is an existing gated access, and application site denoted by the red outline includes a partially completed relatively small area of hardstanding, approximately 84 square metres, behind the gates.
- 9.12 Drawing 2476.01 rev D, shows that the boundary fence has been constructed at a height of 1.8m, and will be reduced to 0.75m at the corner of Church Meadow and Pipers Hill.
- 9.13 The fence materials used are green colour coated metal, with open mesh on green posts.
- 9.14 Dense hedgerow is present between this boundary fencing and the wider site of Bishop's Tip along Church Meadow and section of Pipers Hill. The planning officer noted during her site visit that the only clear view into the wider site was at the entrance gates and that other than the partially completed area of hardstanding the site appeared to be covered in vegetation.
- 9.15 It is worth noting that there are examples of industrial type metal fencing in the immediate area in this part of the AONB, which the planning officer considered more visible in nature, notably the school security fencing opposite the site, and boundary at the nearby garden centre.
- 9.16 The application also seeks permission to complete the area of hardstanding behind the existing gated access off Church Meadow towards the south east of the site as seen on drawing 2476.01 Rev D. As stated by the agent in the supporting Design and Access, and Conservation Area statement '**following concerns raised from the previous application, the proposed area of hardstanding has been reduced and altered to create a more 'informal' layout to suit the rural setting**'.
- 9.17 Work ceased on the area of hardstanding after the sub-base had been put down, however the statement explains that this application seeks to complete this work with a timber edging and gravel/hogging base (on crushed conc/MoT Type 2 sub-based) appropriate to the rural setting.
- 9.18 The hardstanding will provide provision for parking one vehicle/trailer and create a turning facility within the site. It would also enable the occasional use for horseboxes and vehicles attending to the animals grazing.
- 9.19 The small area of hard standing within the site is not considered unreasonable to support agricultural grazing land, especially as in this instance when the wider site is adjacent to a highway within the village and opposite the school, busy with traffic during drop off / pick up times.

- 9.20 Further, there is a wide variety of fencing for agricultural / grazing land available, and it is noted that this choice may not be typical, however the applicant is satisfied that the fencing is suitable to support grazing animals on this agricultural site. The original replaced fence was in poor condition, however the replacement will keep grazing animals within the site safely contained in this village location, which is also close to busy roads including B440 Dagnall Road.
- 9.21 The importance of the hardstanding and fencing protecting the visual beauty of the AONB is acknowledged, and whilst higher than the previous fence, overall the green colour coated metal fencing, with open mesh on green posts is considered to blend into the surroundings, as seen against the backdrop of trees and hedgerow behind this boundary fence within the wider site. The area of hardstanding cannot be viewed from clear vantage points along Church Meadow until right at the site entrance and therefore has limited impact on the character and appearance of the locality.
- 9.22 Subject to the inclusion of conditions on the decision notice if granted in respect of the hardstanding materials and fence height reduction, the proposed materials are considered acceptable and overall the development is considered to accord with saved Policy 97 of the Dacorum Local Plan and Policy CS24 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

Impact on the character of the Conservation Area and the Street Scene

- 9.23 Saved Policy 120 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) states that new developments, alterations or extensions to existing buildings in the conservation areas will be permitted provided they are carried out in a manner which preserves or enhances the established character or appearance of the area. This is echoed by Policy CS27 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013), which seeks to ensure development will positively conserve and enhance the appearance and character of conservation areas.

The Conservation and Design Officer has made the following comments:

- 9.24 *'The green mesh fence replaced the previous timber fencing. The colour helps it to blend into the surrounding hedging and therefore reduces the fencing impact. The planting growing up the fence also helps reduce its impact. We welcome the reduction of fencing to the low wall and this is an improvement as it is the most sensitive part of the site at the junction. As such the harm has been reduced. However due to its height and prominence within the conservation area (being next to the road) it would have an impact upon the conservation area character and ideally more of the fencing should be lowered'*
- 9.25 *'The proposals would have the additional impact of the track and turning area. This has been reduced in scale and reformed in place when compared to the previous proposals. This would appear more appropriate within its landscape setting. As such we would not object to this element of the scheme'.*

'We therefore believe that there is a very low level of harm to the designated asset. In particular when considering the surrounding fencing within this part of the

conservation area. The benefits of the scheme need to be balanced against this as per the guidance set out in the Framework’.

‘Recommendation Ideally the height of the proposed fencing should be reduced throughout. However the most sensitive part of the site has now been protected by the revised proposals. As such we would no longer object to these proposals’.

- 9.26 Having visited the site and reviewed the Conservation Officer’s comments above, the planning officer agrees with their analysis. Improvements have been made to the proposal since the previously withdrawn application. Firstly, as seen on Drawing 2476-01 Rev D, the altered layout of the hardstanding has created a relatively small area more appropriate to this rural setting, which would not be viewed from clear public vantage points along Church Meadow until the existing gated access thereby minimalizing any impact on the character and appearance of the locality.
- 9.27 Secondly the fence will be reduced in height to 0.75m at the junction of Church Meadow and Pipers Hill, where the fence then ends and an existing flint and brick wall continues along Pipers Hill to wards to north east. Whilst ideally a lower fence would have been preferable, the 1.8m height is not considered to be refusable. The colour and materials chosen i.e. green mesh enable the fence to blend well into the surroundings thereby maintaining Great Gaddesden’s rural, sylvan aspect. The fence stands against a backdrop of hedgerow and trees immediately behind helping reduce any impact on the street scene within the Conservation Area and for these reasons is not considered harmful.
- 9.28 Finally, whilst the wider site has become overgrown, the scheme will help tidy up and revive this agricultural site within the Conservation Area. Grazing pasture is not uncommon within the valley floor, and the fence will keep grazing animals safe and help prevent possible littering within the wider site in this village location. The small area of hardstanding would enable access for a vehicle for the care of grazing animals and maintenance of the wider site.
- 9.29 S. 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a general duty on local planning authorities with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area. In particular, there is a requirement for special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- 9.30 Having given great weight to the proposals as described above and the impact these would have on the character and appearance of the Great Gaddesden Conservation Area, subject to conditions overall it is considered that it would preserve the character of the Conservation Area. The proposal therefore accords with Saved Policy 120 of the Dacorum Local Plan, Policies CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013), the NPPF (2019) and S.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Effect on Residential Amenity

- 9.31 The NPPF outlines the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact upon neighbouring properties and their amenity space. Thus, the proposed development should be designed to reduce any impact on neighbouring properties by way of visual intrusion, loss of light, privacy and disturbance.
- 9.32 Given the scale, positioning and nature of the development, it is considered that the proposal would result in no significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties when considering visual intrusion, loss of daylight, sunlight, loss of privacy or disturbance. It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with Policy CS12.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

- 9.33 Policy CS12 (2013) of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that on each site development should provide a safe and satisfactory means of access for all users. Paragraph 109 of the NPPF (2019) states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
- 9.34 The 1.8m boundary fence has been constructed and runs alongside Church Meadow, and will be reduced in height to .75m at the corner with Pipers Hill. The application also includes provision for hardstanding to provide parking for one vehicle with turning facility behind the existing gated access and cross over onto Church Meadow as described above.
- 9.35 Accordingly, Hertfordshire Highways were consulted as a statutory consultee in relation to the merits of the application.
- 9.36 Please see Hertfordshire Highway's comments in full at the bottom on the officer report, which recommends refusal for the reason that the application site constitutes encroachment onto Highways Land between 220mm – 120mm over a 25m stretch and encloses statutory plant and equipment, which therefore blocks access for utility maintenance.
- 9.37 However, notwithstanding any potential enforcement in relation to encroachment onto HCC land, which would fall outside of the planning process, the planning officer contacted the highways officer for further comment in relation to Highway Safety aspect. We received the following response on the 23rd September 2020: *'As Highway Authority HCC has the responsibility to protect all users of the highway. The fence has not been moved and is currently preventing access to various utilities covers. Further, the applicant has produced no evidence to support a loss of highway land and HCC would not support any request for the stopping up of this land.'*

- 9.38 Whilst the Highways Officer response reiterated the issue in respect of blocking the utilities maintenance, this is a matter for the parties to resolve. See paragraphs 9.41–9.42. No other comments were received or raised hence on that basis we conclude no issues in respect of Highway Safety including concerns with regard to visibility.
- 9.39 To conclude, whilst it is understood that vehicles have been able to enter the site previously when necessary, using the existing access onto Church Meadow, a new hardstanding parking and a turning facility for one vehicle and trailer is being created within the site in preparation for the site’s use as grazing. The hardstanding will facilitate avoiding potential conflict between those requiring access to this agricultural site, and other road users including local school traffic. Further, the fence whilst standing at a height of 1.8m adjacent to the Church Meadow, will be reduced to 0.7m at the corner with Pipers Hill. Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Other Considerations

Access to utilities / encroachment

- 9.40 Part of the land within the red outline is owned by Dacorum Borough Council and Hertfordshire County Council. Accordingly, the agent has completed ownership Certificate B on the application form, which acknowledges that some of the area within the red outline is outside of the applicant’s ownership, and he also confirmed the date that notice was served on the said parties.
- 9.41 Further, it is also apparent following the planning officer’s site visits and information received that there is some utility company equipment, understood to include BT equipment and pole, within the boundary fence on site. The agent did advise the planning officer that it was his understanding that the fence was erected in the same position as the original removed chestnut paling fence, however, during her site visit the planning officer noted at least some of the original fencing was still visible behind the newly constructed fence, and that some utility equipment is not accessible from the highway.
- 9.42 Following discussion between the planning officer and the agent in respect of the blocked accessed, the agent suggested that it would be possible to cut the base of the fence to give access to any fittings that are fouled by the fence. The following condition will be added to the decision notice if granted:

“Notwithstanding the details shown on drawing 2476-01 Rev D, within two months of the date of this decision notice, a scheme to facilitate access to public utility equipment within the site must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Subject to approval, the scheme shall then be fully implemented within two months of the date of approval, and then retained thereafter in perpetuity.
Reason: To provide safe and satisfactory means of access to all users in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2013”

9.43 Further, HCC Enforcement were contacted directly during September 2020 for any update on this site, and they commented that if the officer is minded to approve the application, then any permission has to state an advisory as a minimum. Their informative will be added to the decision notice if granted.

Contamination

9.44 Given the history and constraints for this site, The DBC Environmental Health Department were consulted accordingly and responded as follows:

9.45 *Having reviewed the documentation submitted with the above planning application and having considered the information held by the Environmental Health Department there is no objection to the proposed development.*

The following information has been considered in arriving at this decision:

- o The application site was in use between 1981 and 1985 as a tip/landfill, which was permitted to accept inert waste.*
- o Conditions on the permission for the land-raising activities that gave rise to the tipping that was granted in 1979 (4/1310/79) included the following:*
- o The materials tipped shall be limited to excavated soil and topsoil and no material of an injurious or poisonous nature or likely in any way to cause pollution or discolouration to surface or underground water supplies shall be deposited on site.*
- o In connection with the final restoration of the land, the following shall apply: (a) the final layer of materials deposited shall to a depth of 1m be composed of soil or soil forming material, and shall be spread evenly over the whole site. This final layer shall be kept free of materials likely to interfere with the restoration and cultivation of the site.*
- o The potential for the deposited inert materials to be associated with contaminated material, or for non-inert waste to have been disposed at the site cannot be completely ruled out.*
- o The nature of the application is such that the required groundworks (excavation or other form of disturbance of the surface of the site) will be expected to be of minimal depth (<1m).*
- o The extent of the application is such that the required groundworks will be minimal as a proportion of the area of the site as a whole.*
- o The majority, if not all of the groundworks have been completed.*
- o The application will not result in a change of land use and will not result in the introduction of a new route of exposure to any contamination that may be present beneath the surface of the site.*

9.46 *For the above reasons I do not believe that the imposition of a land contamination planning condition would be necessary, or relevant to the development to be permitted, or reasonable in all other respects.*

9.47 *However, the developer should be aware of the land use history of the site and the possibility that works that result in the disturbance of the upper layer of the site might expose materials that were deposited as waste rather than as a growth medium to*

support the landscaping scheme following closure of the tipping activities. With the above in mind the following informative is recommended:

9.48 *Informative*

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

9.49 Accordingly, the above informative will be added to the decision notice.

9.50 For background information, on the 15th November 1979 planning permission was granted and subsequently implemented, under planning reference 4/01310/79, to raise the level of land opposite the Cock and Bottle P.H. The site is now known locally as Bishop's Tip, Great Gaddesden is the wider site referenced in the officers report between Church Meadow and the River Gade, part of which this current application forms a small part of.

9.51 Importantly, Condition (3) of 4/01310/79 stated: *The materials tipped shall be limited to excavated soil and topsoil, and no material of an injurious or poisonous nature or likely in any way to cause pollution or discolouration to surface or underground water supplies shall be deposited on site. Reason: in the interests of public safety to safeguard public water supplies by preventing the tipping of materials likely to cause pollution of surface or underground water supplies. To prevent unauthorised access to the site.*

9.52 Further, Condition (5) of 4/01310/79 stated: *In connection with the final restoration of the land, the following shall apply (a) The final layer of materials deposited on site shall to a depth of 1 metre be composed of soil or soil forming material, and shall be spread evenly over the whole site. This final layer shall be kept free of materials likely to interfere with the restoration and cultivation of the site. Reason: to ensure complete restoration of the land to agricultural use.*

9.53 It is appreciated that many local residents and other interested parties, including the Chiltern Society have objected to this application siting contamination, and also harbour great concerns in respect of the past history of Bishop's Tip and any future plans the applicant may or may not have for the site. However, it is important that each case must be taken on its own merits, and in assessing this application we cannot take into consideration what may or may not happen in the future, or change past decisions.

9.54 Importantly, in respect of the current application, there is no change of use of the land proposed in this application and the site remains in agricultural use. Fundamentally, this application is seeking permission for a boundary fence (retrospective) and completion of a small area of hardstanding. The environmental health officer has responded that disturbance of the surface will be expected to be of a minimal depth (<1m), and that the majority, if not all of the ground works have already been

completed. In his professional view he does *'not believe that the imposition of a land contamination planning condition would be necessary, or relevant to the development to be permitted, or reasonable in all other respects'*.

Trees and Woodlands

9.55 The DBC Trees and Woodlands Officer advised that *in tree terms, 'no issues to report'*.

'The installation of the fence would have required the minor pruning (or none at all) of low quality trees, and minor ground disturbance to install fence posts; neither would have resulted in an objection had a TCA app been submitted'.

Ecology

9.56 The Hertfordshire Environmental Records Centre holds no other records of notable ecological interest in the area that could possibly be affected by the development. Therefore, there are no ecological constraints.

9.57 Based on the plans submitted, Natural England consider that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites.

Source protection zone

9.58 The environment agency were consulted at the validation stage, however no response was received. For clarification the planning officer contacted the EA again in September 2020 and they confirmed that they have any comments to make.

Letters of objection from local residents

9.59 The Council has received many letters of objection and concern to this proposal from local residents and interested parties.

I have summarised the objections / concerns and responded below:

Contamination Issues

9.60 It is acknowledged that many letters of objection and concern have been received from local residents and other interested parties in response to this application on the subject of contamination. Please see main body of report.

Land not fit for grazing

9.61 Many objections have been received claiming that the land/soil is not fit for/inadequate for grazing animals, however the current application is in respect of the boundary fencing and hardstanding only and not for any change of use of the

land which is agricultural and can therefore not be considered as part of the current application. Please see main body of report.

Fencing

- 9.62 See main body of report. Comments have been received in objection to the fencing including its suitability to grazing animals. There is a wide variety of fencing for agricultural / grazing land available, and whilst this choice may not be typical, the applicant is satisfied that the fencing is suitable to support grazing on this agricultural site.
- 9.63 Further comments stated that '*the reduction in height around the corner does nothing to improve the appearance nor make it acceptable*' however it is worth noting that in accordance with Schedule 2, Part 2 Minor Operations Class A of the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) (2019) that the erection, construction, maintenance or alteration of a gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure can be undertaken without planning permission as long as the height of the fence would not exceed 2m, or 1m, above ground level when adjacent to a highway used by vehicular traffic. Therefore, the LPA would not have any control of the materials used where the fence is less than 1m in height.

Hardstanding

- 9.64 Objections include that the hardstanding is unnecessary; an eyesore; contamination issue; is a purpose built roadway. Please see main body of report.

Local littering

- 9.65 Part of the justification for the fencing as set out in the supporting statement, is in order to prevent littering/dumping of garden waste within the site which it is claimed has been an increasing problem, including the area of the bus stop, which the planning officer acknowledges has actually not been in use for several years. Neighbours have objected to the statement's claim that local residents may have deposited garden waste over the fence and the officer notes that no evidence of littering has been submitted with this application. However, it is not unreasonable to seek to keep the site, within the village, litter free if the applicants intend to use the site for grazing.

Parking across the site entrance

- 9.66 No evidence was received to support the claim that the entrance is frequently blocked by parked cars, especially at school pick up/drop off time however an area of hardstanding is not considered unreasonable. See main body of report.

Site location plan

- 9.67 Several objections have been received relating to the site location plan being incorrect/incomplete, and whilst it is understood that the previously withdrawn application was incomplete, additional information showing the northern end of the site boundary was included with the current application. More recently at the planning officers request an amended plan rev D which included the access to the highway within the red outline as required due to the hardstanding element in this

instance, and completing the red outline elsewhere on the plan were received. Re-consultation on the amended plan was carried out accordingly.

Flood risks assessment

9.68 The site is not in flood zone 2 or 3 and therefore no flood risk assessment has been necessary.

Condition re structures

9.69 It has been suggested that a condition preventing structures, temporary or permanent to be placed on the land enclosed by the fence without planning permission be added to the decision notice if granted, however such a condition would it is considered that this would not be reasonable.

Objections received in respect of incorrect information on application form

9.70 The applicant details (2) were originally completed as c/o Bishop & Hutchins, Hatfield Town Council, c/o AD Practice Ltd. The agent was contacted and he confirmed by email that the company name as Hatfield Town Council was incorrect and asked that the form be amended accordingly.

9.71 Site Area (4) - the site area was reduced from on the current application, which would reflect the reduction in the area of hardstanding. See main body of report.

9.72 Ownership Certificates and Agricultural Land Declaration (25) – objection received that Mr Bishop is only a tenant and not land owner. Certificate B is completed when the owner of the land does not own all of the land within the red outline and to certify that notice has been given to the other landowners. In this instance, the form details names, addresses and date notice served for Herts County Council and Dacorum Borough Council. See main body of report.

9.73 Authority Employee/Member (24) – In response to objections that the agent answered no to (24) however, Mr Parry he does not work for Dacorum Borough Council.

Considering consultation responses/objections:

9.74 We received an objection for the need to re-register and re-submit objections/comments following the withdrawal of the previous application, and that those original comments should be taken into account. In response, it is not possible to consider previous comments under different applications. Full consultation with a 21 day period to respond was accordingly carried out when the current application was validated with subsequent re-consultation period.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.75 This scheme is not CIL liable.

10 CONCLUSION

- 10.1 This proposal for site boundary fencing (retrospective), to alter part of the fence; and the alteration and completion of hardstanding to support an agricultural use within the Rural Area is considered small scale and to be acceptable in principle, in accordance with CS7 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013). Further, the proposal will have no significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside and will support the rural economy and maintenance of the wider countryside.
- 10.2 There would not be a significant impact on the appearance and character of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Great Gaddesden Conservation Area, surrounding area, residential amenity of the surrounding properties and highway safety. The proposed development therefore complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and Policies, CS7, CS12, CS24 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013).
- 10.2 The proposal is considered to be acceptable.

11. RECOMMENDATION

- 11.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

1. **Within two months of the date of this decision notice, the fencing at the corner of Church Meadow and Pipers Hill will be reduced to 0.75m in height in accordance with Drawing No. 2476-01 Rev D.**

Reason: To accord with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt in accordance with Policies CS7, CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2013.

2. **Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the materials to be used for the completion of the hardstanding hereby approved shall comprise the follow:**

**Gravel/hogging base (on crushed conc/MoT Type 2 sub-based)
Timber edging**

Reason: to ensure a satisfactory appear to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area in accordance with CS7, CS12 and CS27.

3. **Notwithstanding the details shown on drawing 2476-01 Rev D, within two months of the date of this decision notice a scheme to facilitate access to public utility equipment within the site must be submitted to and approved in**

writing by the Local Planning Authority. Subject to approval, the scheme shall then be fully implemented within two months of the date of approval, and then retained thereafter in perpetuity.

Reason: To provide safe and satisfactory means of access to all users in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2013

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

2476-01 Rev D

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

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.
2. Environmental and Community Protection Informative:

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority with all works temporarily suspended until a remediation method statement has been agreed because, the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.
3. Hertfordshire County Council (Highways Authority) Informative:

A section of the fence has been erected upon land considered to be public highway, maintainable at public expense and statutory plant and equipment enclosed so as to be inaccessible. Regardless of any planning permission granted or any other permission granted by any other authority, the highway authority, Hertfordshire County Council, has not authorised the erection of a fence upon highway land and may serve notice for removal of the fence at any time and if not complied with may remove it in default and recharge all costs of so doing. Regardless of any maintenance or enclosure, adverse possession does not apply with regard to highway land. Highway land can only be stopped up by an Order of a Magistrate Court as Sections 116 / 117 Highways Act 1980 allow.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Great Gaddesden Parish Council	<p>With regard to the retrospective planning permission requested for 'Land off Pipers Hill - Church Meadow' known locally as Bishops Tip. Ref 4/02109/19/FUL</p> <p>On behalf of the Great Gaddesden Parish Council and following a meeting held on 21/10/19 I would like to share our OBJECTIONS to the planning application as it stands.</p> <p>The Parish Council are aware that this application is a retrospective application for a fence and hardstanding and our objection will force the application to Dacorum Planning committee. We are also aware that the planning committee deal mainly with larger issues than fences. However, due to the reasons stated below, we ask the committee's consideration of local homeowners concerns.</p> <p>Our reason for OBJECTION are as follows, and not in any order:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The appearance of the fence. The original fence was a low wooden stock fencing. this has been replaced by a modern, taller, green wire mesh panelled fence. This replacement fence is of industrial style and not in keeping of a rural village in the Chilterens area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB) Local residents believe that this causes harm to the visual impact of the AONB. 2. Land Grab. The new fence has been moved forward by approximatley a meter towards Church Meadow kerb. It's not been established who owns the land that the new fence line is now on. But it is land not owned by the applicant. The Parish Council feel it is wrong to permit the fence being moved onto land not owned by the applicant. The land involved is unmaintained kerbside verge. The new fence line has blocked access to BT service ducts and exposed wires which are believed to be cable TV. The fence has now put a BT pole within the revised Bishops Tip area giving reduced access. 3. Strong local community feeling. This application has been discussed at Parish Council meetings and a local meeting set up

	<p>by concerned neighbours. At each meeting there has been a large audience expressing concerns on the application. The Parish council invited David Parry to give a presentation at one meeting. Mr Parry is the architect putting in the application on his clients, Mr Bishop's behalf. Although he answered fully all the communities concerns, they still objected to the application. The Parish council can not ignore such strong local sentiment and have requested that a local resident, Mr James Milne represent the local community at the committee hearing. The Parish Council may attend as observers only.</p> <p>Although not objections, the Parish Council also have concerns about;</p> <p>A. Removal of the current hardstanding to fit the new application.</p> <p>If the committee decide to pass the application, can consideration be given to conditions regarding the removal of the hardstanding without disturbance to thin layer of topsoil.</p> <p>B. Under the heading of 'Conservation and Design Issues' the application states 'no structures as such are being considered' Can the committee ask what the 'as such' means. The Parish Council asks that should the application be passed that conditions added that no structures, temp or permanent be placed on the land enclosed by the fence without planning permission.</p>
The Chiltern Society	<p>4/02109/19/FUL LAND OFF PIPERS HILL, CHURCH MEADOW, GREAT GADDESSEN SITE FENCING (RETRO) AND COMPLETION OF HARDSTANDING</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of the Chiltern Society in respect of the above application. This resubmission, following alterations/corrections to the original application, has only very minor changes and therefore The Society wishes to reiterate its serious concern about this site and the past and recent activities that have occurred.</p> <p>The residents have confirmed that the site may have been tipped with contaminated materials in the 1980s when permission was given by Herts County Council for the land level to be raised. Unless there was constant monitoring, there is no way of knowing what inert materials were deposited. This has been confirmed by the Council's Lead Scientific Officer in his report dated 17 September 2019. He states 'The potential for the deposited inert materials to be associated with</p>

contaminated material, or for non-inert waste to have been deposited at the site cannot be completely ruled out.'

Whilst he doesn't specifically object, there is a caveat that...'due to the land use history of the site and the possibility that works result in the disturbance of the upper layer of the site might expose materials that were deposited as waste rather than as a growth medium to support the landscaping scheme following closure of the tipping activities.'

Therefore, The Society would request that the applicant provide detailed analysis and carry out any necessary decontaminating measures before any further work is carried out. This is particularly vital given the proximity to a school and its playing area, residential properties and the River Gade. In this connection the water authority should be involved in any assessment and potential decontamination measures.

The site lies within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In the National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019, Section 15: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment, para. 170 states:

intra alia 'Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);
b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, ...

d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;

e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability....

and f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

Further, under Ground Conditions and Pollution para. 178.... Planning policies and decisions should ensure that: a) a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. This includes risks arising from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation (as well as potential impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation); b) after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and c) adequate site investigation information,

prepared by a competent person, is available to inform these assessments.

179. Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner (which in this instance includes HCC).

180. Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development.

Clearly a much more detailed approach should be taken in considering this application as it is not just a matter of fencing and the formation of a parking/turning area.

Also, before any decision is made by Dacorum, the question of what Herts County Council intend to do about the unauthorized works (ie. fencing) that has been carried out on their land should be clarified. Do they condone this 'land grab'?

With respect to the fencing, the type installed is clearly inappropriate for land in the rural area, th Chilterns AONB and the Great Gaddesden Conservation Area. The comparison with the fencing provided around the school is factitious as this is needed for security of the children.

If, as the applicants claim, the land maybe used for the grazing of livestock, the height and materials are completely unnecessary, as all the livestock farmers in the area who use other less intrusive and more appropriate fencing for the area clearly demonstrate. The reduction in height around the corner does nothing to improve the appearance nor make it acceptable. Again, the claim that there has been tipping of garden waste and rubbish from the bus stop (note: this bus stop has not been used for several years) into the site is not a reason for this type of fencing.

Again, livestock farmers do not provide substantial and robust track and turning facilities into their fields in order to tend to their animals. It is totally unnecessary, especially as the applicant states that it would '... allow vehicles to fairly safely use the site for the very occasional use when required.' If it is that occasional a sign saying 'No Parking' would adequately suffice and visits could be restricted to outside the very short periods of school dropping off/collecting times.

Therefore, the Chiltern Society OBJECTS to this application and would request that retrospective planning permission be refused and

	<p>enforcement action be taken to remove the fencing and the partly constructed access track and following a contamination investigation, the land owner(s) should be required to undertake remedial action under close supervision.</p>
<p>Conservation & Design (DBC)</p>	<p>Site name /address Land at Pipers Hill Great Gaddesden</p> <p>Brief description of proposal: Fencing and hard standing.</p> <p>The site is an area of land to the north of the village of Great Gaddesden. Until relatively recently it was somewhat overgrown. It has a flint and brick boundary wall to the roadside and towards the village had a chestnut pale fence. This has now been replaced with modern mesh fencing. Some hard standing has been added.</p> <p>Historically this appears to have been part of the flood plain/ water meadow. A large pond can be seen adjacent on earlier maps and this is now a wildlife area. However in the 1970s permission was granted to raise land levels on this site using building rubble.</p> <p>The green mesh fence replaced the previous timber fencing. The colour helps it to blend into the surrounding hedging and therefore reduces the fencing impact. The planting growing up the fence also helps reduce its impact. We welcome the reduction of fencing to the low wall and this is an improvement as it is the most sensitive part of the site at the junction. As such the harm has been reduced. However due to its height and prominence within the conservation area (being next to the road) it would have an impact upon the conservation area character and ideally more of the fencing should be lowered.</p> <p>The proposals would have the additional impact of the track and turning area. This has been reduced in scale and reformed in place when compared to the previous proposals. This would appear more appropriate within its landscape setting. As such we would not object to this element of the scheme.</p> <p>We therefore believe that there is a very low level of harm to the designated asset. In particular when considering the surrounding fencing within this part of the conservation area. The benefits of the scheme need to be balanced against this as per the guidance set out in the Framework.</p> <p>Recommendation Ideally the height of the proposed fencing should be reduced throughout. However the most sensitive part of the site has now been protected by the revised proposals. As such we would no longer object to these proposals.</p>

Environment Agency	No response received to consultations.
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	<p>1.11.2019 This retrospective application has been passed to HCC Enforcement to determine the extent of encroachment onto HCC land</p> <p>emailed received via CF 13/11/19 -</p> <p>05.11.2019 via HCWD Location Land off Pipers Hill/ Church Meadow Pipers Hills Great Gaddesden</p> <p>Application type Full application</p> <p>Proposal Fencing and hardstanding (retrospective)</p> <p>Amendment Information received following HCC Enforcement site visit</p> <p>Decision Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:</p> <p>The Highway Authority recommends refusal for the following reason:</p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <p>This retrospective application is for Fencing and hardstanding (retrospective)</p> <p>1. Encroachment onto Highways Land</p> <p>A site visit by HCC Highways Enforcement team on 4/11/19 has confirmed that the fence encroaches on highway land between 220mm - 120mm over a 25m stretch and furthermore encloses statutory plant and equipment.</p> <p>No permission has been given to do so by the highway authority and the land remains public highway unless stopped up either by a Magistrates</p>

	<p>Order or by Order of the relevant secretary of state.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>The only way to resolve this matter without the fence being moved is for the land to be stopped up, however, there is no certainty that HCC would support this. The land clearly has statutory plant and equipment on it which now cannot be accessed.</p> <p>Signed</p>
<p>Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)</p>	<p>Amendment Information received following HCC Enforcement site visit</p> <p>Decision Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:</p> <p>The Highway Authority recommends refusal for the following reason:</p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <p>This retrospective application is for Fencing and hardstanding (retrospective)</p> <p>1. Encroachment onto Highways Land</p> <p>A site visit by HCC Highways Enforcement team on 4/11/19 has confirmed that the fence encroaches on highway land between 220mm - 120mm over a 25m stretch and furthermore encloses statutory plant and equipment.</p> <p>No permission has been given to do so by the highway authority and the land remains public highway unless stopped up either by a Magistrates Order or by Order of the relevant secretary of state.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>The only way to resolve this matter without the fence being moved is for the land to be stopped up, however, there is no certainty that HCC would support this. The land clearly has statutory plant and equipment on it which now cannot be accessed.</p>

<p>Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)</p>	<p>This retrospective application is for Fencing and hardstanding (retrospective) This amendment changes the shape of the hardstanding, however the fence remains in the same position.</p> <p>1. Encroachment onto Highways Land A site visit by HCC Highways Enforcement team on 4/11/19 has confirmed that the fence encroaches on highway land between 220mm - 120mm over a 25m stretch and furthermore encloses statutory plant and equipment. No permission has been given to do so by the highway authority and the land remains public highway unless stopped up either by a Magistrates Order or by Order of the relevant secretary of state.</p> <p>CONCLUSION The only way to resolve this matter without the fence being moved is for the land to be stopped up, however, there is no certainty that HCC would support this. The land clearly has statutory plant and equipment on it which now cannot be accessed.</p> <p>Further email comments received 23.09.2020</p> <p>As Highway Authority HCC has the responsibility to protect all users of the highway. The fence has not been moved and is currently preventing access to various utilities covers.</p> <p>Further, the applicant has produced no evidence to support a loss of highway land and HCC would not support any request for the stopping up of this land.</p>
<p>Hertfordshire Ecology</p>	<p>The access track lies within and will result in the loss of habitat from the Great Gaddesden Churchyard Local Wildlife Site (LWS); this comprises semi-improved grassland of limited ecological value. It is identified as a LWS to safeguard the immediate landscape around a known bat roost nearby from damaging development. These are fixed boundaries, apply to many roosts across both the district and county, and can include urban areas or countryside and do not necessarily indicate that the land is of high ecological value.</p> <p>Whilst it could be argued the access drive will remove a small amount of the foraging habitat of bats, the land to be lost is small and of little value in this regard. Similarly the fence will have no impact.</p>

	<p>The Hertfordshire Environmental Records Centre holds no other records of notable ecological interest in the area that could possibly be affected by the development. Therefore, there are no ecological constraints.</p> <p>4/02109/19/FUL Site fencing and hardstanding (retrospective) Land off Pipers Hill/Church Meadow, Pipers Hill, Great Gaddesden HP1 3BU</p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 14 September 2020 which refers, and for consulting Herts Ecology.</p> <p>I note this is a re-consultation of a retrospective application. I commented on the previous application by letter of 9 April 2020 and little of consequence appears to have changed since. Therefore, my previous comments still stand and are repeated below in italics:</p> <p>The access track lies within and will result in the loss of habitat from the Great Gaddesden Churchyard Local Wildlife Site (LWS); this comprises semi-improved grassland of limited ecological value. It is identified as a LWS to safeguard the immediate landscape around a known bat roost nearby from damaging development. These are fixed boundaries, apply to many roosts across both the district and county, and can include urban areas or countryside and do not necessarily indicate that the land is of high ecological value.</p> <p>Whilst it could be argued the access drive will remove a small amount of the foraging habitat of bats, the land to be lost is small and of little value in this regard. Similarly, the fence will have no impact.</p> <p>The Hertfordshire Environmental Records Centre holds no other records of notable ecological interest in the area that could possibly be affected by the development. Therefore, there are no ecological constraints.</p> <p>I would add, for the avoidance of doubt, that existing and emerging ecological policy and law require all development to deliver a biodiversity net gain. However, given the small footprint of the development and the lack of ecological impact, no meaningful gain can be achieved that is proportionate to the insignificant loss. Therefore, this can be waived in these circumstances.</p> <p>I have no further comments.</p>
Natural England	<p>Response to amended plans</p> <p>The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this resubmission although we made no objection to the original proposal.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the original application are unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposal.</p>

<p>Natural England</p>	<p>NO OBJECTION</p> <p>Based on the plans submitted, Natural England consider that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites.</p> <p>Natural England's general advice on other natural environmental issues is set out at Annex A.</p> <p>Planning consultation: Site fencing and hardstanding (retrospective)</p> <p>Location: Land Off Pipers Hill/ Church Meadow Pipers Hill Great Gaddesden</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 09 March 2020 which was received by Natural England on 09 March 2020.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Protected Landscapes - Chilterns AONB</p> <p>The proposed development is for a site within or close to a nationally designated landscape namely Chilterns AONB. Natural England advises that the planning authority uses national and local policies, together with local landscape expertise and information to determine the proposal. The policy and statutory framework to guide your decision and the role of local advice are explained below.</p> <p>Your decision should be guided by paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework which gives the highest status of protection for the 'landscape and scenic beauty' of AONBs and National Parks. For major development proposals paragraph 172 sets out criteria to determine whether the development should exceptionally be permitted within the designated landscape.</p> <p>Alongside national policy you should also apply landscape policies set out in your development plan, or appropriate saved policies.</p> <p>SUMMARY OF NATURAL ENGLAND'S ADVICE</p> <p>NO OBJECTION</p> <p>Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites.</p> <p>Natural England's generic advice on other natural environment issues is set out at Annex A.</p> <p>Page 2 of 5</p> <p>We also advise that you consult the relevant AONB Partnership or Conservation Board. Their knowledge of the site and its wider landscape setting, together with the aims and objectives of the AONB's statutory management plan, will be a valuable contribution to the planning decision. Where</p>
------------------------	---

	<p>available, a local Landscape Character Assessment can also be a helpful guide to the landscape's sensitivity to this type of development and its capacity to accommodate the proposed development.</p> <p>The statutory purpose of the AONB is to conserve and enhance the area's natural beauty. You should assess the application carefully as to whether the proposed development would have a significant impact on or harm that statutory purpose. Relevant to this is the duty on public bodies to 'have regard' for that statutory purpose in carrying out their functions (S85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000). The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that this duty also applies to proposals outside the designated area but impacting on its natural beauty.</p> <p>Sites of Special Scientific Interest Impact Risk Zones</p> <p>The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires local planning authorities to consult Natural England on "Development in or likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest" (Schedule 4, w). Our SSSI Impact Risk Zones are a GIS dataset designed to be used during the planning application validation process to help local planning authorities decide when to consult Natural England on developments likely to affect a SSSI. The dataset and user guidance can be accessed from the data.gov.uk website</p> <p>Further general advice on the consideration of protected species and other natural environment issues is provided at Annex A.</p> <p>We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p> <p>For any queries regarding this letter, for new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p> <p>Consultations Team species</p>
Trees & Woodlands	<p>In tree terms, no issues to report.</p> <p>The installation of the fence would have required the minor pruning (or none at all) of low quality trees, and minor ground disturbance to install fence posts; neither would have resulted in an objection had a TCA app</p>

	been submitted.
Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)	<p>Having reviewed the documentation submitted with the above planning application and having considered the information held by the Environmental Health Department there is no objection to the proposed development.</p> <p>The following information has been considered in arriving at this decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The application site was in use between 1981 and 1985 as a tip/landfill, which was permitted to accept inert waste. o Conditions on the permission for the land-raising activities that gave rise to the tipping that was granted in 1979 (4/1310/79) included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The materials tipped shall be limited to excavated soil and topsoil and no material of an injurious or poisonous nature or likely in any way to cause pollution or discolouration to surface or underground water supplies shall be deposited on site. o In connection with the final restoration of the land, the following shall apply: (a) the final layer of materials deposited shall to a depth of 1m be composed of soil or soil forming material, and shall be spread evenly over the whole site. This final layer shall be kept free of materials likely to interfere with the restoration and cultivation of the site. o The potential for the deposited inert materials to be associated with contaminated material, or for non-inert waste to have been disposed at the site cannot be completely ruled out. o The nature of the application is such that the required groundworks (excavation or other form of disturbance of the surface of the site) will be expected to be of minimal depth (<1m). o The extent of the application is such that the required groundworks will be minimal as a proportion of the area of the site as a whole. o The majority, if not all of the groundworks have been completed. o The application will not result in a change of land use and will not result in the introduction of a new route of exposure to any contamination that may be present beneath the surface of the site. <p>For the above reasons I do not believe that the imposition of a land contamination planning condition would be necessary, or relevant to the development to be permitted, or reasonable in all other respects. However, the developer should be aware of the land use history of the site and the possibility that works that result in the disturbance of the upper layer of the site might expose materials that were deposited as waste rather than as a growth medium to support the landscaping scheme following closure of the tipping activities.</p> <p>With the above in mind the following informative is recommended: Informative</p>

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

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
53	26	0	25	1

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
3 Church Cottages Church Meadow Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BU	<p>This revised application has removed a number of errors from the previous version (such as not including all the fence that was installed without planning permission, wrongly citing the disused bus stop as a place for littering etc), however there are inaccuracies with the new reasoning behind the scheme.</p> <p>The main objection to this application is that the scheme is at odds with the setting. Great Gaddesden is a rural village, with the area in question being both a conservation area and an AONB. Industrial anti climb fencing that is used for commercial industrial premises, at a height of 1.8m high is not in keeping with the area and intrinsically changes the look and feel of the heritage setting.</p> <p>The adjacent area includes water meadows and heritage flint walls and buildings and farmland is fenced off with your typical stock fencing, not 1.8m anti climb fencing.</p> <p>I note the 'supporting evidence' claims residents have been dumping vegetation there. I think that sums up the contempt for the people living here. That simply hasn't happened. This does not occur on the surrounding land either, and that has much lower fencing?</p> <p>I also note the reasoning for the hard standing is because people park over the gates. In my 5/6 years living here I have never witnessed a resident or someone from the school park over the entrance. The village is chaotic at school pick up times, but this is for ten minutes twice a day, as you would expect with having a school in a small village.</p>

	<p>I think this application sets a dangerous precedent for businesses being allowed to harm the heritage appearance of rural conservation areas.</p>
<p>13 Church Meadow Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BS</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Application number 4/02109/19/FUL Re-Application</p> <p>Site Fencing (Retrospective) and completion of hardstanding, Land off Pipers Hill, Church Meadow, Great Gaddesden. HP1 3BU</p> <p>I would like to voice my objections regarding the latest retrospective planning application made by Mr Bishop and Ms Hutchins regarding the Land off Church Meadows and Pipers Hill in the village of Great Gaddesden.</p> <p>This land as I understand is part of an AONB and also now an extension of the conservation area.</p> <p>In this respect what on earth has possessed the owners to install an Industrial Grade metal fence which is classed as Anti Climb Security Fencing normally used around industrial facilities along the boundary of this land. Not only is it ugly and unnecessary, but it is installed on Hertfordshire County council land, which explains why the contractor severed the BT lines on several occasions during the installation. This fence and the padlocked gated entrance also cut across Hertfordshire County Council land with a large amount now being incorporated within this fenced area are the council aware of this, and as some utilities stations are within this fenced and padlocked area access is now impossible should there be any emergency.</p> <p>The owners claim they wish to graze livestock on this land, which begs the question what size animal are they hoping to graze that would require a fence of this magnitude when a simple replacement wooden fence of the original type would be adequate for most domestic livestock.</p> <p>And as it states in the application there is a meagre amount of topsoil covering the landfill so the chances of growing any suitable graze for animals to eat is slim, together with the fact that according to many residents there is a very real probability that this land has been contaminated by the nature of materials that were incorporated in the landfill during the 1980's, which should have been according to the original permission granted in 1979 have been limited to Excavated Soil and Top Soil only, and then finished with a 1 meter depth of top soil across the site, in this respect there really should be some testing done on the site to make sure it is safe and suitable for animals to graze, and also for the residents who live along the perimeter should any further disturbance of the land occur.</p> <p>I have also noted that on the site map that has been included with the application the larger area map does not cover the whole of the area in question stopping at the School Playing Field when in fact the fence continues the length of Church Meadows, this is not shown why would this be.</p>

	<p>As for the littering problem stated in the supporting application documents how on earth with all the other associated rubbish on the site could they pin a small amount down to villagers waiting for the bus at a stop which is no longer in use and to those reading the village notice board.</p> <p>Generally speaking if people are so inclined to drop litter the size and nature of a fence will be no deterrent.</p> <p>As for the hard standing and turning circle to enable horse boxes and other vehicles to tend the grazing animals this seems a little over the top as most farmers seem to manage with small trailers and quad bike type vehicles and are quite capable of traversing rougher terrain without a purpose built roadway.</p> <p>In my opinion this fence is clearly been installed to keep people out and not animals in, which begs the question what are Mr Bishop and Ms Hutchins plans for the future use of this land going to be as I strongly suspect sheep or any other animals won't play any part in it, and before we know where we are we will have some industrial type storage facility on our doorstep which would be quite unthinkable.</p> <p>The council needs to nip this in the bud, and refuse the retrospective planning application have the fencing returned to something more in keeping with the environment in which it is sited and if Mr Bishop and Ms Hutchins really can't think of a better use for the land how about making it safe and returning it back to the Village for the use and enjoyment of the residents for years to come, now there's a thought!</p> <p>I cannot in my wildest dreams imagine what possessed the Council in the first instance to grant the license to Mr Bishop for this land to be used for landfill, hopefully it will learn by its mistakes, it most certainly would not happen today.</p>
<p>Pipers Barn Pipers Hill Great Gaddesden HP1 3BY</p>	<p>I live within 30 yards of the area of land in question and have received no notification from you</p> <p>As I understand this plot is a conservation area in an area of outstanding beauty so why are there two ugly skips</p> <p>What can possibly be the reason that a 1.8m fence is needed?</p> <p>The area cannot possibly used for grazing as there is no grass just weeds and barb wire on the other side of the land</p> <p>There is also Japanese knot weed on the plot</p> <p>What is the reason for hard standing?</p> <p>Local farmers off load their animals straight from through the gate onto the land to graze</p> <p>The whole application does not make sense and I object strongly</p>
<p>Broadwater Dagnall Road Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BW</p>	<p>The unsuitably high fence is unsightly in our AONB.</p> <p>Such a fence will not prevent litter. No fence can prevent litter.</p> <p>The hardstanding is an eyesore. It stands out badly on this well-established green area.</p> <p>The possibility of contamination in the field has been ignored in the</p>

	<p>application. Given the landfill history of the site, it does not seem possible that the field is at all appropriate for grazing, which brings into question the real plans for the land.</p> <p>The Applicants say that they are contemplating grazing on the land. This is a very vague statement. It shows a lack of intention - so what is the real intention?</p> <p>The Applicant's company name was given as Hatfield Town Council. This name has since been removed. Such a huge 'error' in the Applicant's name must ring alarm bells.</p> <p>The Applicant cites a lack of maintenance by the land owner - this is not a reason to justify the ugly changes, or indeed any changes. This reason is irrelevant.</p> <p>The look of the changes already implemented and proposed are totally out of keeping with the village. They jar with the village's established image and ambiance which detrimentally affects the current and future villagers.</p>
<p>8 Church Meadow Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BS</p>	<p>Objection ! Why are you letting these people submit applications for the 2nd time before demanding a land test ! Our lives are at risk if you let this application go ahead !</p> <p>It's a landfill site with every material imaginable buried there ! Asbestos included and you want to allow bishops to dig up that ground not considering our health ? Land needs to be tested 1st before anymore applications submitted, not even to mention there both very inaccurate applications but no one seems to care about that !!!!</p> <p>A very concerned villager</p>
<p>1 Church Farm Cottages</p> <p>Pipers Hill Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BY</p>	<p>I object to the planning application.</p> <p>I object because the fence that has been erected is completely out of character with the surroundings and is a huge over reaction if the land owner is concerned about litter (what about a litter bin?).</p> <p>The fence is of an unnecessary height. The only other fences in and around the village of a similar height are where they are truly required e.g. water sewage works, to stop people drowning; the school, to keep the kids in and unwanted's out. To erect a fence nearly 2 metres in height to keep litter out is a bizarre decision.</p> <p>The fencing material is also a terrible choice if the land owner was genuinely committed to maintaining our conservation area and our AONB. A green mesh, metal fence, nearly 2 metres in height in an AONB?! Come on, be serious.</p> <p>I also object to having to register my objection for the second time for the same matter. The applicant withdrew the first planning application, rendering all of the previous comments (a clean-sweep of objections) redundant. The applicant is obviously banking on some objection fatigue. I'd therefore request that all of the objections to the related case are considered where they remain applicable to this new application.</p>

	Please consider my objections, thank you.
3 Jubilee Cottages Tring Road Dunstable LU6 2JU	The land in question is in a conservation area, an area of outstanding natural beauty. It adjacent to primary school and grade 2 listed cottages as well as many other homes along Church Meadow Cottages. To put up industrial anti climb fencing in such an area is totally out of character with surrounding. No other farmer does this to keep animals ? What is Bishops other intentions????? No other farmer in the area has hard standing in their fields to move animals around? Once again what is Bishops future intentions? There are many other fields gates down pipers Hill. None have these have hard standing. People do not park over them? Bishops have also grabbed land and put their fence in front of BT poles and power cables. I believe their intention is to use the site for storage of skips etc. The land is not fit for grazing with the rubbish that was put therein the 80,s. (no grass visible) All boundaries in the area are beautiful flint walls or wooden farm fencing . There is no need for anything else. If you grant them permission you will be allowing Bishops to carry out their business there.
6 Church Cottages Church Meadow Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BU	The type of fencing is incompatible with an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and it has been erected to encroach on the Council's verges, preventing the utility companies accessing their equipment thus threatening the supply of these services to local residents. Dacorum's response to the question of possible contamination of the site does not inspire confidence in their competence.
5A Church Meadow Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BS	This Re Working of the original plans still does not address the problems raised in the first application. Firstly the industrial style fencing is not in keeping with a rural location. Secondly The Fencing has been placed directly on top of BT Cables as can be evidenced at the bus stop. Thirdly The Fence is not in the correct position - It is situated on land not belonging to Bishops. Fourthly the plans only show the area to the South of the site. The Fence has been erected all along Church Meadow. In regards the hard standing I witnessed what was dumped on the site during the 1980s when regulations were a lot less strict. It looked like demolition rubble from a factory was dumped. As a villager we were deceived on the plans for the site in the 1980s - I hope we are not repeating the experience.
11 George Street Hemel Hempstead HP2 5HJ	I wish to object to the fencing off of conservation area, in an area of natural beauty, a fence more in keeping with industrial use. This is an eyesore in a beautiful village , Judith herring

<p>3 Church Cottages Church Meadow Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BU</p>	<p>I wish to object to the above application on the following grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The fence outline on the plan is not correct (the plan shows the fence stopping by the school playing field yet it physically continues to the end of the parcel of land adjoining the next field) 2. The fence is not in keeping with the rural character of farmland and being 1,8 mt high and of an industrial nature. 3. The applicant states there is no suspicion of the land being contaminated yet the land was a land fill site between 1981 and 1989 and an environmental report I commissioned by the company Groundsure Environmental Insight stated that the land would be identified as contaminated land as defined under the Environmental protection act of 1990. 4. The applicant has shown complete disregard for planning procedure by putting the fence up and starting to build a road both illegal acts. 5, The entrance to the site is directly opposite a junior mixed infants school and constitutes a potential risk to the safety of the children. 6. The fence extends onto land owned by Herts county council which has made access to power and telecoms junctions impossible. <p>The applicant has shown no regard for the local community , environment, or legal procedure and should be prevented from any further abuse of the above and the council and it,s officers would be shirking from their responsibilities by allowing this application to be granted.</p>
<p>4 Church Cottages Church Meadow Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BU</p>	<p>I object to this application. So now we have the third attempt by David Parry on behalf of Mr Bishop to seek permission to develop the toxic waste site in our village.</p> <p>It's basically the same document with a few alterations as a result of embarrassment when the applicant was publicly held to account for the previous two fraudulent applications; a result of "administrative errors" according to Dacorum. Yeah, right!</p> <p>The unauthorised use of Hatfield Town Council's company name has been shut down after Hatfield instructed solicitors to take action, at least we now have Mr Bishop and Miss Hutchins applying openly, though still hiding behind Mr Parry's lamentably inaccurate and somewhat illiterate document. But the actual ownership of this land is still unclear: Mr Bishop always proudly tells us, on his visits to the village to put the frighteners on us, that his father left it to him after the toxic waste dumping project, but section 25 ownership certificates in the application are filed as Herts County Council and Dacorum Borough Council; so it appears Mr Bishop is merely a tenant, and perhaps the two councils could have more influence than they like us to believe? If they own the land they could have more of a say in its use.</p> <p>Mr Parry hasn't done any additional research to justify his hefty fee, he still emphasises the terrible "littering problem" from people waiting for</p>

	<p>the bus! He still seems to believe that high, anti-climb industrial fencing is the norm in a rural conservation area. Perhaps he should climb out of his car sometime and take a country walk to have a look around? But of course he's very busy with his role on St Alban's council. It would be nice to know a little more about the motivation of this rather shadowy figure; why is he so keen to submit documents full of misleading half-truths in support of Mr Bishop, what is in it for him apart from his enormous fee? He's clearly ignorant of and uninterested in conservation matters.</p> <p>This time we have sight of an internal memo (ref.R600922) from Dacorum's Lead Scientific Officer, Mr Carr, to our friendly, independent planning officer Shane O'Donnell. It reassuringly tells us that even though he can't find any documentation or monitoring reports about Mr Bishop senior's landfill operation of the early 1980s, he has judged the site to be perfectly safe for development because he had a quick look over the fence. Access was restricted because Mr Bishop helpfully dumped a conservation-grade rubbish skip in the entrance to enhance the rural vista, so Mr Carr's extensive scientific soil test amounted to nothing more than a casual glance. I'm not sure that residents living opposite the land and parents at the school will take quite such a casual approach towards their health as Mr Carr apparently does. The extensive oral testimony of village elders who witnessed the asbestos tipping is arrogantly rejected; well you know what old people are like, losing their marbles!</p> <p>So in spite of the village fighting as one to oppose this development, requesting action by the borough solicitor to investigate possible corruption in relation to this application, and the well-known toxic waste present in the land, Dacorum seem immune to public fear and opinion and I'm sure will continue to ignore us all and press ahead to give Mr Bishop what he wants; I wonder what precisely that will be in the future, because this is clearly just the thin end of the wedge. As the Gazette newspaper speculated, traveller site or skip business?</p>
<p>Pipers Barn Pipers Hill Great Gaddesden HP1 3BY</p>	<p>Planning Application 4/02109/19/FUL</p> <p>There are several reasons behind this objection to Retrospective Planning Re-Application for the land off Church Meadows in Great Gaddesden, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire. (Planning Portal Reference PP-08122241). Much of my previous objections to Application 4/01875/19/FUL still apply and are repeated here.</p> <p>Application for Planning Permission</p> <p>One can only presume that the re-application itself still stated that at 2. Applicant Details/Company Name is "Hatfield Town Council", which was the same as the original application. This entry has been redacted - by Dacorum Borough Council? Why was not the re-application summarily rejected by Dacorum when received as to be appear erroneously a second time suggests a deliberate misrepresentation by the applicants yet again. The inclusion of Hatfield Town Council in a modified application indicates a lack of care and consideration for the whole planning application process on behalf of the Applicants and their Advisors.</p> <p>At 4, Site Area, the measurement of the area has increased on the re-application to 1,550 sq. metres from the previous 1,490 sq. metres -</p>

is this the result of the site being remeasured in the interval between first and second application? Which is the correct measurement?

At 6. Existing Use, the Applicant claims that the site is currently vacant, which is not disputed, but that the last use of the site was "reclaimed floodplain". This is somewhat at odds with the description in the Great Gaddesden Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Proposals Report (Dacorum Borough Council, 2010, p.35), which states:

"The site was used as a tip for building demolition materials until the early ninety seventies, since which time it has been unattended, and become an area of natural woodland."

Whilst accepting that this planning application is for retrospective permission for the fencing and to complete the hardstanding area, the Planning Committee's notice must be drawn to the fact that any future application for change of use or further development must require an appropriate contamination assessment.

At 7, Materials, the re-application now states that portions of the fence will be reduced to a height of 750mm. Retrospective permission is being sought for replacing a 900mm chestnut paling fence with a green mesh fence. Again, I reiterate that the landowners have not maintained the paling fence, and thus its ability to contain livestock has been severely compromised. In the Applicant's supporting information, they are said to be "...contemplating use of the land for grazing...". Some basic research on the Internet has shown that the fence currently erected is suitable for schools, commercial outlets and more suitable for ball court fencing.

Further research suggests that the height of fencing required for sheep would be 4 feet high (c. 1200 mm); for cattle a barbed wire fence of similar height; for horses between 54 and 60 inches, using wire/mesh, electric fence or post and rail construction. Even in the worst case scenario, the current 1800mm high mesh fence is some 20% above the height required for horse grazing, and 50% above that for sheep.

If the area is to be used for grazing, and a fence of 750 mm height is considered adequate by the Applicants to restrain and contain any livestock that are grazing on the land, why then cannot the height of the whole fence be reduced to 750 mm?

At 9, Vehicle Parking, the Applicant proposes parking for 1 space, defined as Livestock trailers etc. There is an anomaly between one parking space (singular) and the description of plural vehicles. Further, the application refers to "parking" not access and temporary loading and unloading of livestock to and from trailers. Other farmers in the vicinity move livestock into and out from their fields without the need to create a hardstanding area or to apply for planning permission to park vehicles.

At 11, the Applicant has stated that this is an area at risk of flooding. Therefore, has the required Flood Risk Assessment been completed and filed. Will members of the public be able to access this Assessment?

At 14, Waste Storage and Collection, the Applicant answers "no" to both questions about storage of waste, although at the date of writing (23rd September 2019), there is a skip full of ground waste and soil inside the gates of the property. This is both a contradiction to the re-application and in contravention of law relating to use of the land.

At 24, there is a declaration that the applicant and/or agent is not an Authority Member to ensure the application process is open and transparent. The Applicants - Bishop and Hutchins - are shown to be care of AD Practice Limited. In turn, this organisation's website says it is a "...small, well-established multidisciplinary architectural design practice...", and that its founder David Parry is:

"...a Parish Councillor for Park Street... [and] previously a St Albans District Councillor and Chair of the Planning Committee... [as well as] a member of their Agents Forum Advisory Panel".

Any fair-minded and informed observer, having considered these facts, would conclude that the "no" answer given in the application to this Section is duplicitous and not in any spirit of openness and transparency.

At 25, Ownership, can it please be explained that if the Applicants are the owners, how is it possible for them also be their own tenants? Or is this Section completed to establish a de facto tenancy by the Applicant over boundary land owned by Herts County Council. It should be note that Dacorum Borough Council have been added in the re-application. If the fence had been erected on the Applicants own land there would be no other owners or agricultural tenants.

It could be argued that the Applicants are suggested that the line of fencing currently erected is enclosing land not owned by them, and that the fencing line delineates a "land grab" from Herts CC and Dacorum. By showing these entities as "owners/agricultural tenants", this is a dubious device to claim ownership of all land inside the current fence line. This Planning Application for retrospective permission for the fence should not be surreptitiously effecting a transfer of land ownership.

Supporting Design and Access and Conservation Area Statement

The following objections are also raised through commentary on the statements and arguments used in support of the planning application.

In Background, it is stated that "...There is no evidence of recent maintenance of this land..." This statement implies that Herts County Council and Dacorum Borough Council have not maintained their land and that the Applicants - by inference - have maintained theirs, and thus an amalgamation of land will result in improved stewardship and maintenance. In fact, there has been little to no stewardship or maintenance carried out by the Applicants on a regular, housekeeping-type basis.

In Recent Activities and Planning History, it is claimed that there has been an increasing problem with garden waste being deposited. There is no evidence submitted to quantify the rate of increase or any photographic records shown to prove this assertion. It is contended that

had better stewardship of the land been maintained by the Applicants, then it would have looked a lot less like a wasteland and engendered a greater duty of care by local residents. With regular, two-weekly, garden refuse collections undertaken by Dacorum Borough Council and small garden plots in the village, it is hard to contemplate any requirement from local residents for the disposal of excess garden waste.

Vehicular traffic to and from the school at start and end of the school day during term time does pose challenges for local residents. There is a statement that the gates are "frequently blocked", once again without any attempt to quantify or provide robust evidence to support this claim. Any "blocking" of the gates would, by definition, be extremely brief as children were delivered and collected by parents safely. Residents in Church Cottages do not block the gates by parking; in any case the narrowness of the road at this point between the gates and the parking adjacent to the old phone box would prevent parking in front of the gates. The use of emotive terms is regrettable and inappropriate. There are greater problems for residents through inappropriate parking during school drop-off and pick-up times, and I cannot recall there ever being a problem with parking blocking the gates.

Other farmers appear to have no problem with transferring livestock without hardstanding and turning areas. There is no justification for hardstanding on the grounds of avoiding conflict with cars parking temporarily for School access.

In the section under Client's Instructions, there can be no justification whatsoever on the erection of any fence or boundary on land outside the ownership of the Applicants. If this principle was not upheld, then any "land grab" of other peoples' property could proceed unabated and regularised by retrospective planning application. Whether adequate maintenance or interest by Herts County Council takes place, this is not germane to this planning application. Indeed, in its present position, the fence has been erected outside of, and thus encloses, public facilities such as fire hydrants, telephone poles and utility access points. The Council must insist that the current fence is removed, and any approved fence re-erected wholly and entirely on the Applicants' own land.

It should be recorded as a matter of fact that the bus service, which I believed only called at Church Meadows once in the morning and once again in the evening, has not operated for some years. The choice of fence would not prevent a determined bus user from throwing waste over its height, nor forcing waste through its open mesh construction. In addition, the claim that the provision of parking and turning facilities removes the conflict with the bus stop is redundant. There is no conflict, as the bus service no longer operates!

Within Planning Issues, Fence, the re-application has added a paragraph that states that after consultation with the Authorities, the fence is to be reduced in height on the "...most prominent corner...". Once again, I reiterate that if it can be reduced in height at this point, and still be capable of restraining and confining any livestock to grazed on the land, ALL the fence can be reduced in height as well.

With regard to Planning Issues, Turning Facility, it is surely in the owners' own gift to instruct any vehicle drivers entering the site to restrict movements within the site to those specific areas covered by the exposed surface - it does not need a hardstanding area or turning circle to ensure this.

The Applicants acknowledge there is an existing "...rural setting within the Conservation Area", and that the proposed modifications they intend to "...create a more 'informal' layout to suit the rural setting". A more rural setting would involve no hardstanding or turning area. No amount of timber edging will convert hardstanding inside an enclosed piece of land into a more rural setting, commensurate with the enclosed fields and paddocks in the Great Gaddesden Conservation area.

If the Applicants' envisage the "...occasional use for horse boxes and vehicles attending to the animals grazing ..." this will be no more inconvenient, and "occasional" suggests a lot less than the morning and evening school "runs" which occur every day during term times.

Within Conservation and Design Issues it is stated that the works are "sympathetic" to the Conservation Area. Within Dacorum's Great Gaddesden Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals report (2010), under an assessment of Negative Features and Issues, it refers to traditional materials and details being eroded by the use of inappropriate materials. The replacement of a traditional paling fence with a 21st Century wire mesh fence of 1800mm height, more suitable for a ball court, surely counts as a further instance of this historical fabric erosion. In the same paragraph, the Report states that "...curtilages are being eaten into by inappropriate hard landscaping".

Finally, the Conservation Area Report, within its remit of its purpose to ensure that the special character of the Great Gaddesden area is not adversely affected by development also states:

"A defining feature of the Great Gaddesden Conservation Area is the subtle and restrained use of traditional materials for boundary treatments... The Council will resist proposals to remove traditional boundary walls or which fail to respect the form and materials of traditional boundary treatments"

The work covered by this planning application has already been carried out without planning permission, and the works are harmful to the character of the Conservation Area, as has been argued and shown above through the replacement of traditional fencing materials with an inappropriate modern design, completely out of keeping with the natural feel of Great Gaddesden village, and of a totally inappropriate height and construction, and being erected outside of the legal ownership of the Applicant's land.

Retrospective planning permission should be rejected, and the owners forced to make remedial action to erect any boundary fence made of traditional construction materials, on their own land, and of an appropriate height. Further works to the hardstanding already laid down should not be permitted.

<p>Gaddesden Place Bridens Camp Hemel Hempstead HP2 6EX</p>	<p>The application claims the fence is for grazing. That is clearly not the case. What was installed without planning permission (hence this retrospective application) is wholly inappropriate for the location in the village, and inappropriate for grazing (and there are no animals grazing on this land).</p> <p>If this fence was really for grazing purposes, as claimed, what should be installed is traditional low 4 wire fence and post, as exists everywhere in the area for grazing animals, and as would be in keeping with this area of outstanding natural beauty. https://www.chilternsaonb.org/uploads/files/Walks_and_Rides/Gade_Valley.pdf</p>
<p>48 Paston Road Hemel Hempstead HP2 5AZ</p>	<p>I am regular visitor to Great Gaddesden village drawn to its outstanding beauty and peaceful surroundings. Recently I was made aware of retrospective application in the area , It's unusual to me to comment on someone else issues but as it is environmental this time I will.</p> <p>Historical evidence show us potential abuse of the agreement during so called " land-raising activities " in terms what may may not be deposited there and 1m surface layer of top soil or soil forming material. That's all witnessed by residents.</p> <p>We have new high fence(not in keeping) there obstructing acces to service's build partially over local authorities grounds.It really stands out and you can see old wooden fence behind</p> <p>This is now being done retrospectively how is that even possible .</p> <p>The way application was filled in is really suspicious can proffesional really afford such errors? And what is the real long time purpose of above.</p> <p>It looks like past and present are merging and lack of control from 80's has its continuity up to today. It is listed as medium risk can we afford to disturb surface? permitting greater forces via infiltration wash potential hazardous material into watercourse right next to it ? Contamination assessment from distance, no core drilling ,sampling to find out what is really there.</p> <p>I wish every one wealth and prosperity but we are all living on a credit taken from this planet . It is my biggest wish that next generations can take ingredients to build their bodies and minds from the best and purest ingredients that uncontaminated planet provides.</p> <p>With all that in mind I believe that Dacorum Council will take right steps and measures to resolve the issue .</p> <p>Regards.</p>
<p>9 Church Meadow</p>	<p>I wish to object to the proposed planning application within Church</p>

<p>Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BS</p>	<p>Meadow/Pipers Hill. My objection is based around a numbers of concerns, some eloquently expressed already by others. The first objection is in relation to the possible disturbance of contaminated land. During our house purchase in 2018 this land was highlighted as an unused land fill site, with unknown make up. With a primary school less than 50m away, and with children ourselves I would expect the council to have a duty of care around this area, and before moving ahead undertake a FULL environmental survey to establish the exact make up of the site. Our surveys also highlighted the area as a medium risk for ground water flooding. I am concerned an works may increase this risk long term, which again the council must surely have a duty and responsibility for. The fencing which has already been constructed is completely out of character with what is a conservation area, and appears to be somewhat at odds in terms of size and scope to the proposed application. I would also question if the fencing is in the correct position as it appears to cover cables and other sundry utility services. And I can also attest to having witnessed OpenReach repairing underground cables for 2 days following the erecting of the currently installed wire fence. Having lived in the village of Great Gaddesden for only a short while, I would also encourage the council to decline this application and ensure they carry out some of their stated aims of preserving the conservation areas in and around the village.</p>
<p>2 Church Farm Cottages Pipers Hill Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BY</p>	<p>As a resident of Great Gaddesden for more than 10 years I would like to add my voice to the many who have raised objections to this development. I was, in fact, about to type "proposed development" in the previous sentence but the fact is that the applicants just went ahead and stuck up the fence and are now hoping that no one will mind. Such arrogance cannot be ignored. As others have already stated, the fencing is both ugly and an overkill if one believes it is simply to retain sheep. However, maybe its purpose is to keep people away from a hazardous waste site containing asbestos and other toxic substances. In any event, there is no place for industrial type fencing in our village and I would not like to see this area further industrialised by it being used as a storage facility for skips. In conclusion, I would recommend that the applicant be made to pay for a full contamination survey that may (or may not) put residents' minds at ease, and replace the industrial fencing with one more sympathetic to the area.</p>
<p>12 Church Meadow Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BS</p>	<p>As residents of Church Meadow my partner and I object to this application for the following reasons: The applicant has erected a fence completely out of character with</p>

fencing around the area. It looks like security fencing for an industrial site rather than anything to be used for livestock. In an AONB and a Conservation area it is singularly inappropriate.

The comparison with the school fence alluded to in the "Background Information" is specious as a school fence is for a different purpose. Similarly the argument of preventing rubbish being thrown in from a bus stop is ridiculous as the bus stop has not been used for several years and there is no evidence of rubbish accumulation on the site.

Para 5 With regards the hard standing and fencing, no other grazing fields in the area appear to need such access or fencing. If there are any parking issues then a clear notice on the gate should suffice. There is no such notice at the moment. The road outside is wide and well surfaced and should give adequate access.

Further to these objections we have concerns about details and inaccuracies in the application.

Para 6 "use of site". It is stated as being vacant and reclaimed floodplain. It is in fact a landfill site on the edge of, and raised far above, the level of the river Gade and the adjacent field.

The Applicant has marked 'no' for "contamination: actual. suspected" etc. There is rubble and waste all over the land which has not been leveled or covered with earth as mandated in the planning consents. On a walk along the western edge of the land in early Spring I and my partner saw plastic waste protruding from the edge of the raised embankment (only hardcore waste was permitted). If, as locals state, a factory was dumped there in the 1980s there must be legitimate concerns over contamination. This is on the edge of a watercourse in which children play downstream in Gadebridge Park.

If the Applicant had accurately described its use as "landfill site" the Applicant would then have been able to complete the box requesting "when did this use end". They have left it blank.

Para 8

The application seems to be incorrect here.

An altered access is proposed i.e. a hard standing road from the public highway.

Para 9

No other farmer in the area requires parking or hard standing in a grazing field. Why should it be allowed on an AONB and a conservation area.

Para 12.

The Applicant states there is no important habitat or designated site adjacent to or near. In fact the site is in the Chilterns AONM and a Conservation area.

12b. "designated sites"

Hard standing and industrial mesh fencing do affect adversely this

	<p>"designated site"</p> <p>Para 25 The positioning of the new fence has entailed a takeover of Herts County Council land and has led to utilities e.g, Openreach, having difficulty accessing infrastructure to carry out repairs and improvements.</p> <p>If Herts County Council have agreed to this could we have their certificate showing their approval?</p> <p>In our opinion the fence should be removed and replaced by one observing the original boundary appropriate for grazing livestock and in keeping with the area. The road should be removed and the requirements laid down in the planning permissions related to the land enforced; i.e. leveled and covered with 1 metre of topsoil in preparation for use as grazing. In view of the history of landfill next to a river a contamination survey should be carried out.</p>
<p>2 Church Farm Cottages</p> <p>Pipers Hill Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BY</p>	<p>As a local resident of 30 years, I am alarmed by the apparent new development of the site I have always known of as "Bishops Tip". The new metal fencing is unsightly in a conservation area and the recent enlargement of the hard standing seems unnecessary if the site is only to be used for grazing. I remember that in 1991 the owners applied for the site to be converted into a car park, which was refused.</p> <p>Details on the planning application are inaccurate. For example, there has not been a bus stop here for many years. Neither have I seen any evidence of tipping or refuse on the land during the last 30 years. If there had been, this would have appeared unsightly and I am sure local residents, and certainly I, would have complained and brought this to the attention of the council.</p> <p>I am concerned too that residents including children at the local school (where my child also attended) may be affected by contaminants from the waste which I now realise was tipped there many years ago. Therefore, to allay fears of residents, and to inform any decisions, surely there needs to be an analysis of the soil for contaminants, and a decision made about appropriate use of the land and its suitability, if any, for grazing of animals.</p> <p>Reading Dacorum Borough Council's Conservation Plan for Great Gaddesden, this fencing would surely be considered to be an unsympathetic boundary treatment in the centre of the village and conservation area. I believe this high industrial type fencing should be removed and replaced with something more sympathetic to our village in an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. So far, I cannot see that the Conservation Officer is involved in any decision making regarding these plans.</p> <p>It appears that the owners have no regard for planning regulations and I wonder what their intentions are.</p>
<p>Farm Cottage St Margarets</p>	<p>I live close to Great Gaddesden and objection is based around a numbers of concerns.</p>

<p>Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BZ</p>	<p>Before laying them out I think it important to remind Dacorum council that this is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the site in question is a rare habitat zone. Chalk streams such as the River Gade are increasngly rare. It is now one of less that 200 biomes of this type in the world. Protecting these habitats is our duty and this is increasingl recognised by national and local governments. Chalk streams such as the River Gade our own local Amazons, home to rare spcies in decline.</p> <p>The first objection is in relation to the possible disturbance of contaminated land. With a primary school less than 50m away, and with children ourselves I would expect the council to have a duty of care around this area, and before moving ahead undertake a FULL environmental survey to establish the exact make up of the site. If the land is conatimated in any way I do not think simply covering it with top siol is enough. Given the fragile habitat zone it is in the council should ensurethe land is fully decontaminated.</p> <p>I am also concerned an works may increase this risk of long term, term flooding which again the council must surely have a duty and responsibility for.</p> <p>The fencing which has already been constructed is completely out of character with what is a conservation area, and appears to be somewhat at odds in terms of size and scope to the proposed application.</p> <p>Also, the road was started without permission. It should be removed.</p> <p>many thanks for your considerations</p>
<p>White Hill Centre, White Hill, Chesham, Bucks, HP5 1AG</p>	<p>4/02109/19/FUL LAND OFF PIPERS HILL, CHURCH MEADOW, GREAT GADDESSEN SITE FENCING (RETRO) AND COMPLETION OF HARDSTANDING</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of the Chiltern Society in respect of the above application. This resubmission, following alterations/corrections to the original application, has only very minor changes and therefore The Society wishes to reiterate its serious concern about this site and the past and recent activities that have occurred.</p> <p>The residents have confirmed that the site may have been tipped with contaminated materials in the 1980s when permission was given by Herts County Council for the land level to be raised. Unless there was constant monitoring, there is no way of knowing what inert materials were deposited. This has been confirmed by the Council's Lead Scientific Officer in his report dated 17 September 2019. He states 'The potential for the deposited inert materials to be associated with contaminated material, or for non-inert waste to have been deposited at the site cannot be completely ruled out.'</p> <p>Whilst he doesn't specifically object, there is a caveat that...'due to the</p>

land use history of the site and the possibility that works result in the disturbance of the upper layer of the site might expose materials that were deposited as waste rather than as a growth medium to support the landscaping scheme following closure of the tipping activities.'

Therefore, The Society would request that the applicant provide detailed analysis and carry out any necessary decontaminating measures before any further work is carried out. This is particularly vital given the proximity to a school and its playing area, residential properties and the River Gade. In this connection the water authority should be involved in any assessment and potential decontamination measures.

The site lies within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In the National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019, Section 15: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment, para. 170 states:

intra alia 'Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);

b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, ...

d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;

e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability....

and f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

Further, under Ground Conditions and Pollution para. 178.... Planning policies and decisions should ensure that: a) a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. This includes risks arising from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation (as well as potential impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation); b) after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and c) adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is available to inform these assessments.

179. Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner (which in this instance includes HCC). 180. Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development.

	<p>Clearly a much more detailed approach should be taken in considering this application as it is not just a matter of fencing and the formation of a parking/turning area.</p> <p>Also, before any decision is made by Dacorum, the question of what Herts County Council intend to do about the unauthorized works (ie. fencing) that has been carried out on their land should be clarified. Do they condone this 'land grab'?</p> <p>With respect to the fencing, the type installed is clearly inappropriate for land in the rural area, th Chilterns AONB and the Great Gaddesden Conservation Area. The comparison with the fencing provided around the school is factitious as this is needed for security of the children.</p> <p>If, as the applicants claim, the land maybe used for the grazing of livestock, the height and materials are completely unnecessary, as all the livestock farmers in the area who use other less intrusive and more appropriate fencing for the area clearly demonstrate. The reduction in height around the corner does nothing to improve the appearance nor make it acceptable. Again, the claim that there has been tipping of garden waste and rubbish from the bus stop (note: this bus stop has not been used for several years) into the site is not a reason for this type of fencing.</p> <p>Again, livestock farmers do not provide substantial and robust track and turning facilities into their fields in order to tend to their animals. It is totally unnecessary, especially as the applicant states that it would '... allow vehicles to fairly safely use the site for the very occasional use when required.' If it is that occasional a sign saying 'No Parking' would adequately suffice and visits could be restricted to outside the very short periods of school dropping off/collecting times.</p> <p>Therefore, the Chiltern Society OBJECTS to this application and would request that retrospective planning permission be refused and enforcement action be taken to remove the fencing and the partly constructed access track and following a contamination investigation, the land owner(s) should be required to undertake remedial action under close supervision.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Anna Barnard Planning Field Officer, Chiltern Society</p>
<p>Gade Mead Pipers Hill Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BY</p>	<p>I would like to object to the retrospective planning application for land off Pipers Hill at Church Meadow, Great Gaddesden.</p> <p>Taking into account that Great Gaddesden is an A.O.N.B. and a conservation area.</p> <p>The fencing that has been erected, without planning permission. Is not of a conventional type for grazing animals. It reminds me more of site fencing.</p>

	<p>It is an unusual request for a hardstanding and turning area to be needed on land that is to be used for grazing. No grazing field in the area , in any type of situation, has a hardstanding. Which may injure the grazing animals if they slip or trip on it!</p> <p>As the site has been used for tipping in the past, any disturbance of the land may contaminate the chalk stream. Putting the wildlife it supports at risk. Not to mention the children that play in the river downstream in Gade Park.</p> <p>I feel this application should be refused. Thank you for your time.</p>
<p>11 George Street Hemel Hempstead HP2 5HJ</p>	<p>I wish to strongly object to any procedure which disturbs the soil on this site, as it has been bought to my notice there is contaminated waste on this site which may contain harmful chemicals of which little was known of effects at the time. I think this is a serious worry with junior school so close , this has in no way been investigated in a professional manner with young lives to be taken into account.</p>
<p>Great Gaddesden C Of E School Church Meadow, Great Gaddesden, Hemel Hempstead HP1 3BS</p>	<p>GREAT GADDESSEN C of E SCHOOL</p> <p>On behalf of Great Gaddesden C of E School I advise that we strongly OBJECT to this application for the following reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the fencing and roadway have been installed without planning consent 2. this is an AONB, conservation area and opposite significant listed structures and therefore we feel that the fence in not in keeping. 3. The reasoning for the fence is sited so as to contain sheep, the fencing across the road is timber post a rail and retains the sheep adequately 4. The road make up is unclear from the application and appears not to be a SUDs specification. This is not in keeping with the conservation area and surrounding sheep fields which have no hard standing at the entrance. Contamination is likely to access the water course. 5. Large scale machinery was being used prior to this application being submitted and is likely to be used again. This causes concern when considering the children's access and egress to the school. It certainly was a concern when the fence was erected and works were being undertaken. <p>We do not feel that the development as it is now, or is planned to be is suitable for the village or the school and therefore would prefer for it to be replaced with something more suitable.</p>
<p>The Old Vicarage Pipers Hill Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire</p>	<p>We strongly object to this application for the following reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The fencing and roadway have been installed without planning consent

<p>HP1 3BY</p>	<p>2. Great Gaddesden is an AONB and also a conservation area. It is opposite significant listed structures and therefore we feel that the fence in not in keeping.</p> <p>3. The applicant claims the fence is for grazing, but the type of security fencing installed without permission is totally inappropriate for grazing and also the location in the village is also not suitable for grazing purposes. The fencing across the main road, of timber post and rail, retains the sheep adequately.</p> <p>We therefore strongly feel that this retrospective application is completely unsuitable for the village and should be rejected.</p>
<p>3 Jubilee Cottages Tring Road Dunstable LU6 2JU</p>	<p>The site in question is section 4 of the Great Gaddesden conservation area as stated in your own 2010 Character Management proposal. As such it brings a number of statutory provisions aimed at assisting the preservation and enhancement of the area. Dacorum Borough Council have an obligation to apply policies vigorously when considering development proposals affecting the area.</p> <p>Mechanisms through which a council can manage the future of the Conservation area is through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application of policy Boundary changes Enforcement!!!!!! <p>Amelioration and improvement to enhance boundaries is an important part of the conservation area. High security industrial fencing is none of these things and is a blot on the landscape. Boundaries need to be made of natural materials as stated in the conservation proposals.</p> <p>Section 4 of the conservation (Bishops field) area also states it is a woodland area and as such does need a high industrial fence. I object on grounds of design, appearance and materials. A high security industrial fence is not in keeping in an area of woodland as stated in your own Great Gaddesden Conservation area Character Appraisal and Management Proposal of 2010 in which it states you should reinforce the village character. Bishops field (part owned by Dacorum) is section 4 of this plan and it is the council's duty to enhance an important node of this conservation area.</p> <p>under this management boundary treatment should use traditional material (pg 35)</p> <p>Section 72 specifies in making a planning decision on an application in this area special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or Enhancing the Character or Appearance of the area. Industrial security fencing is neither! It is next to grade One and two listed properties ?</p> <p>Great Gaddesden conservation area could be one of the most attractive areas in Dacorum and it is stated that it is Very important to maintain the Sylvan aspect of this place. ! Why would planning go against their own studies and grant planning for industrial fencing in this protected area of outstanding natural beauty?</p> <p>Please do not pay lip service to the 1990 planning act section 71 but enforce it and enhance our natural beauty not put a blot on our area by allowing Bishops fencing to stay.</p>

	<p>I would also like to state that I dont think anyone in the area have very seen green waste removed from the area.</p>
--	--

Agenda Item 5e

ITEM NUMBER: 5e

20/02050/FHA	Rear extension, hip to gable roof extension with new dormer. New 2 storey side extension. Replacement windows.	
Site Address:	10 Bunkers Lane Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8AX	
Applicant/Agent:	John Dworakowski	Aurore Baulier
Case Officer:	James Gardner	
Parish/Ward:	Nash Mills Parish Council	Nash Mills
Referral to Committee:		

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be **GRANTED**.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 In accordance with Policy CS4 of the Dacorum Core Strategy, the principle of residential development is acceptable in this area.

The proposal includes some contemporary features, but the design is nonetheless considered to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area, thereby according with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy. There

Residential Amenity of neighbouring dwellings would not be harmed as a result of the proposed development. It follows, therefore, that the development would accord with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy and Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan.

Parking arrangements would be improved and it is considered that sufficient parking would be provided, in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site is located on the northern side of Bunkers Lane, Hemel Hempstead, proximate to the junction with Chambersbury Lane.

The areas to the south-west and north of the application are characterised by dwellings dating to the inter-war era. Common features include clay tiled hipped roofs, two-storey gabled bay windows with timber detailing, brick arched porches and the use of smooth-painted render and pebble-dash.

The application property occupies an elevated position above the highway and comprises one half of a two storey semi-detached pair of 1930s dwellings. It is externally finished in white painted render and has a clay-tiled hipped roof. An attached double garage has been constructed to the side of the property and one approximately two thirds of the front garden is laid to lawn.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the construction of a two-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension, gable feature, roof alterations, construction of a dormer and replacement of existing windows.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications (If Any):

20/01108/FHA - Rear extension, hip to gable roof extension with new dormer on garden slope and new 2 storey extension above an existing side volume (current kitchen and garage). Replacement of windows throughout for double glazed units, and external insulation to all existing structures.
WDN - 18th June 2020

20/01674/LDP - Rear Extension 3.95m. Hip to gable extension with dormer in loft. External insulation and replacement windows.
WDN - 8th July 2020

Appeals (If Any):

6. CONSTRAINTS

Parking Accessibility Zone (DBLP): 4
CIL Zone: CIL3
Highbarns Zone: Highbarns Outer Zone
LHR Wind Turbine
Parish: Nash Mills CP
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Yellow (45.7m)
Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Hemel Hempstead)
Residential Character Area: HCA19
Town: Hemel Hempstead

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)
Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies

Dacorum Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages
CS8 – Sustainable Transport
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Dacorum Local Plan

Appendix 3 – Layout and Design of Residential Areas
Appendix 7 – Small-Scale House Extensions

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (2002)
Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;
The quality of design and impact on visual amenity;
The impact on residential amenity; and
The impact on highway safety and car parking.

Principle of Development

9.2 The application site is located within an urban area of Hemel Hempstead wherein, in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Dacorum Core Strategy, the principle of residential development is acceptable subject to compliance with the relevant local and national planning policies.

9.2.1 The key considerations to the determination of this application relate to the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.3 Policy CS11 of the Dacorum Core Strategy seeks to ensure that, amongst other things, new development respects the typical density in an area, preserves attractive streetscapes, protects and enhances significant views within character areas.

9.3.1 Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy states that development should integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties in terms of: layout, security, site coverage, scale, height, bulk, materials as well as landscaping and amenity space.

9.3.2 Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan promotes good design practice on house. In particular, it states that extensions should harmonise with the original design and character of the house in terms of scale, roof form, window design and external finishes.

9.3.3 This application follows one submitted in June of this year (20/01108/FHA) which was later withdrawn over concerns raised in connection with the design style and the impact this would have had on the character and appearance of the area. The applicant / agent subsequently entered into pre-application discussions with the Council's Pre-Application Officer, culminating in the submission of the application before Members.

9.3.4 The proposal seeks to reinstate an original feature of the house – i.e. the recessed porch typical of 1930s dwellings – while marking the corner of Bunkers Lane and Chambersbury Lane with an innovative and contemporary design which respects the original character of the dwelling.

9.3.5 The relevant policy wording refers to development “*harmonising*” and “*integrating*”; it does not, however, say that development must be identical. It is acknowledged that, where a row of dwellings forms an attractive group, there can be merit in seeking to retain common characteristics deemed important to the local area. These have been identified as:

- Two-storey bay windows with gable features.
- Clay-tiled hipped roofs.
- Rendered front elevations.

9.3.6 It is considered that these characteristics are appropriately referenced in the proposed design. With the exception of the hip-to-gable roof alterations (which can generally be carried out under permitted development), the original part of the dwelling would largely retain its appearance and architectural features. By contrast, the extended area to the side of the original flank would utilise a mixture of both contemporary (expanded cork facing boards) and traditional (clay tiles) materials to enliven the street frontage and provide a pleasing visual contrast between the different periods of development.

9.3.7 It is important to note that Bunkers Lane contains a wide variety of dwellings. Whilst the section of road between Belswains Lane and Chambersbury Lane is characterised by semi-detached inter-war dwellings, to the north-east of the site there are examples of more modern housing, including chalet bungalows. It is therefore considered that the contemporary extension should be seen as book-ending the row of inter-war dwellings, taking them into the new century.

9.3.8 Additional windows are proposed to be constructed on the new flank wall, and would help to give the impression of a more active frontage, allowing the house to visually engage with both the Bunkers Lane and Chambersbury Lane street scenes.

9.3.9 To the rear, a gable feature clad in clay tiles is proposed at first floor and roof level. It would not project outward further than the existing rear wall and thus would not be prominent, and is considered an effective and aesthetically pleasing way of providing accommodation within the roof space, negating the need to construct a large box dormer across the entire width of the rear roof slope. A dormer is also proposed, but would be modest in scale, centrally located and set in from the boundary. The single-storey rear extension would be of modest proportions has a contemporary influence, as evidenced by the use of the cork panels. Overall, this design approach is considered acceptable. Although the rear elevation is visible from Chambersbury Lane, it is considered that the design would not be discordant or adversely impact the character and appearance of the area.

9.3.10 Proposed alterations to the garden / frontage would maximise the amount of available off-road parking. Appendix 5 of the Dacorum Local Plan states that the achievement of parking provision at the expense of the environment will not be acceptable, and that all parking must be adequately screened and landscaped. Policy CS11 echoes this and advises against large areas dominated by car parking. On the whole, most of these inter-war dwellings have converted their front gardens to hardstanding, many of which benefit from very little, if any, soft landscaping. In the case of the application site, it is proposed to excavate the front garden in order to provide a level parking surface, and to supplement this with soft landscaping above the retaining wall, as shown on drawing no. 100 (Rev. A). On balance, given the proximity of the extensive parkland directly opposite, which imbues the area with a verdant and pleasant character, and the fact that the current landscaping makes only a negligible contribution, it is considered that the parking area would not be to the detriment of local character and would not be harmful to the streetscape character.

9.3.11 In light of the above assessment, it is considered that the development would comply with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy and Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan.

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.4 Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy states that, inter alia, development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to surrounding properties.

9.4.1 Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan states that residential development should be designed and positioned in such a way that a satisfactory level of sunlight and daylight is maintained for existing and proposed dwellings, with a 45-degree angle of light being maintained as a basic minimum to all significant windows of habitable rooms.

9.4.2 No. 9 Bunkers Lane already benefits from a part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension, and as such, there would be no breach of the 45-degree rule as it relates to its ground floor windows. Although not demonstrated on the plan, it is evident that there would be a breach of the 45-degree rule as it relates to the nearest first floor window. However, since no new development is proposed at first floor level, there would, in reality, be no adverse impact (light would continue to be received over the top of the development at ground floor). The proposed rear extension varies in depth across the rear of the application site, the effect of which is that it would be of lesser depth when in close to the neighbouring property, before slightly increasing (by approximately 1 metre) further in to the site. As a result, it is unlikely that the extension would be visible from the nearest ground floor window of the neighbouring property.

9.4.3 There are no obvious implications for privacy arising from the alterations to the rear elevation. Whilst it is proposed to create habitable accommodation in the roof space, views from these rooms would not afford views materially different from those already available from the existing first floor windows of the dwelling. The first floor windows on the flank elevation have been annotated as being fitted with obscure glazing, and would be located over 21 metres away from primary windows on the flank elevation of no. 11 Bunkers Lane. There is no defined separation distance for instances where side facing windows directly face one another. Regard has also been given to the fact that the windows would serve bedrooms; which, although a habitable space, are unlikely to be used as intensively as, say, a living room or kitchen. On this basis, notwithstanding that there would be greater views of the flank windows of no. 11 Bunkers Lane, it is considered that, on balance, given the use of the rooms and the distance involved, which is not dissimilar to instances where dwellings are located opposite one another, the inclusion of a planning condition requiring the windows to be permanently fitted with obscure glazing is not justified.

9.4.4 The development would therefore comply with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy and Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.5 Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy states that development should provide sufficient parking, sufficient space for servicing and a safe and satisfactory means of access for all users.

9.5.1 Whereas the property currently only benefits from off-road parking for one vehicle (excluding the garage), the proposal would provide three parking spaces with independent access; that is to say, all three spaces would be accessible without the need for another car to move. This therefore represents an improvement on the current situation.

9.5.2 In order to achieve the increased level of car parking, it is necessary to widen the existing access to the highway. Hertfordshire Highways have not raised any objections to the proposal subject to the inclusion of a number of conditions and informatives with any grant of planning permission.

9.5.3 Amended plans have subsequently been provided to demonstrate that the required vehicular visibility can be achieved. Adjustments will, however, be required to the existing boundary wall in

order to achieve the required pedestrian visibility splays. A suitable worded condition will be included with any grant of planning permission to ensure that this takes place prior to first use of the access.

Other Material Planning Considerations

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.6 There are no trees in close proximity to the proposed extension.

Ecology

9.7 It is understood that the roof of the dwelling has already been removed; therefore, any bat roosts, should they have existed, will have been destroyed. As a result, it is not necessary for any further surveys to be carried out.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.8 This application is not CIL liable.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 The proposal would be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the surrounding area. Consideration has been given to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, and, overall, it is not considered that there would be any significant adverse impacts. The level of parking has increased and is considered to be commensurate with the size of the dwelling. Hertfordshire Highways have raised no objections to the application.

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission/listed building consent be **GRANTED**.

Case Officer Check List	Officer Check/Comments
Has the consultation letter/site notice/advert period expired?	Yes
Was a site notice posted and if so, was the date entered into Uniform?	N/A
Is the Article 35 Statement included?	Yes
Is the CIL box ticked/un-ticked in Uniform?	Yes
Are all plans, documents, site photographs and emails saved to DMS?	Yes
If applicable, please give the reason why the application is overtime.	Re-consultation with Parish
Does the application involve the demolition of any buildings that are currently in use?	No
Is there a Legal Agreement?	No
Has the Uniform Legal Agreement box been filled in?	N/A
Is a copy of the agreement on DMS (both redacted and non-redacted versions)? Has the agreement been published on the website?	N/A

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

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

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

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

00A
000
100 (Rev B)
101
200 (Rev A)

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

3. **The vehicular access hereby approved (indicated for improvement on drawing number 100 rev A) shall not be brought into use until it has been upgraded / widened to a maximum double width of 7.2 m metres.**

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory access and in the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

4. **Prior to first use of the access hereby approved, arrangements shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

5. **Prior to first use of the vehicular access hereby approved, a visibility splay measuring 2.4 x 43 metres shall be provided to each side of the access where it meets the highway and such splays shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction between 600mm and 2m above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.**

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

6. **The vehicular access hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the pedestrian visibility splays shown on drawing nos. 000 and 100 (Rev. B) have been provided. The visibility splays shall thereafter be permanently maintained to each side of the access free of all obstructions between a height of 0.6 metres and 2 metres above the level of the carriageway.**

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway pedestrian safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage and during the

determination process which lead to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

2. It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence.
3. It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway.
4. The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence.
5. The Highway Authority requires the alterations to or the construction of the vehicle crossovers to be undertaken such that the works are carried out to their specification and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.), the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. The applicant may need to apply to Highways (Telephone 0300 1234047) to arrange this, or use link:- <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/droppedkerbs/>

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Parish/Town Council	<p>Following consideration at our recent council meeting. Nash Mills Parish Council wish to object to the revised, proposed plans. Under planning policy CS12 (quality of built design) we object to the lack of parking provision on site.</p> <p>Policy CS12 states that 'development should provide sufficient parking and sufficient space for servicing'.</p> <p>Whilst the plans show a proposed 3 parking spaces we contest whether this is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) a feasible proposal on this frontage? b) an accurate reflection of the likely need both now and in the future for a 5 bedroom property and the number of inhabitants that a property of this scale would reasonably be expected to accommodate?

	<p>Policy CS12 also states that ' on each site development should provide a safe and satisfactory means of access'.</p> <p>The proposal shows that three cars will only be accommodated if one car effectively 'blocks in' the other two vehicles. We believe that there is insufficient safe ingress/egress to accommodate the three vehicles in this manner. It is our view this should not be considered a practical solution, even more so with the property being situated on a busy road in very close proximity to a busy junction. In addition if parking onsite was insufficient and pushed vehicles to the pathway outside the property this would cause a dangerous obstruction to any clear sight lines from the junction.</p> <p>Nash Mills suffers from significant recent development that has failed to provide sufficient parking provision and we feel that this proposal failing to address matters of such local concern will exacerbate the issue.</p>
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	<p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>CONDITIONS</p> <p>1. Prior to the first occupation / use of the development hereby permitted the proposed on-site car parking area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).</p> <p>INFORMATIVES</p> <p>1. Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx or by telephoning 0300 1234047.</p>

2. Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

3. Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

COMMENTS

This application is for: Rear extension, hip to gable roof extension with new dormer. New 2 storey side extension. Replacement windows.

The proposal includes creating an extended, level hard standing in the front garden of the property. The site is located on the corner of Bunkers Lane with Chambersbury Lane, both of which are unclassified local access roads with a 30 mph speed limit. There have been no accidents involving personal injury in the vicinity of the site in the last 3 years.

ACCESS

No new or altered vehicular or pedestrian access is proposed and no works are required in the highway.

PARKING

Two additional parking spaces will be created on the proposed front garden hard standing.

CONCLUSION

	<p>As Highway Authority HCC considers that this application will not have a severe residual impact on the safety or operation of the surrounding network, subject to the conditions and informative notes above.</p>
Parish/Town Council	<p>NMPC OBJECT to the revised application under the following categories;</p> <p>CS11 Quality Of Neighbourhood Design. and CS12 (g)</p> <p>a) Overdevelopment</p> <p>CS12 Quality of Site Design</p> <p>b) Insufficient usable parking provision</p> <p>a) Insufficient access to proposed parking area due to size of dropped kerb and lack of space, insufficient space for servicing.</p> <p>a) Unsafe egress/ingress due to proximity to busy junction.</p>
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	<p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>CONDITIONS</p> <p>1. Prior to the first occupation / use hereby permitted the vehicular access (indicated for improvement on drawing number 100 rev A) shall be upgraded / widened to a maximum double width of 7.2 m metres, in accordance with the Hertfordshire County Council residential /industrial access construction specification. Prior to use arrangements shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory access and in the interests of highway safety, traffic movement and amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).</p> <p>2. Prior to the first occupation / use of the development hereby permitted a visibility splay measuring 2.4 x 43 metres shall be provided to each side of the access where it meets the highway and such splays shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction between 600mm and 2m above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).</p>

3. Prior to the first occupation / use of the development hereby permitted 0.65 metre x 0.65 metre pedestrian visibility splays shall be provided and permanently maintained each side of the access. They shall be measured from the point where the edges of the access way cross the highway boundary, 0.65 metres into the site and 0.65 metres along the highway boundary therefore forming a triangular visibility splay. Within which, there shall be no obstruction to visibility between 0.6 metres and 2.0 metres above the carriageway.

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway pedestrian safety in accordance with Policies 5 and 7 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

4. The gradient of the vehicular access shall not exceed 1:10 for the first 5 metres into the site as measured from the near channel edge of the adjacent carriageway.

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

5. No development shall commence until the developer shall have complied fully with the requirements of the Department for Transport's DMRB Standard CG 300: Technical Approval of Highway Structures. The Approval in Principle and Design and Check Certification, accompanied by full structural details, shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works shall proceed in accordance with the details submitted and Construction Compliance certification and documentation submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

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

INFORMATIVES

1. Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website

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

2. Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

3. Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

4. Construction standards for new/amended vehicle access: Where works are required within the public highway to facilitate the new or amended vehicular access, the Highway Authority require the construction of such works to be undertaken to their satisfaction and specification, and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.) the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission, requirements and for the work to be carried out on the applicant's behalf. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/changes-to-your-road/dropped-kerbs/dropped-kerbs.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

COMMENTS

This application is for Rear extension, hip to gable roof extension with new dormer. New 2 storey side extension. Replacement windows. This

	<p>amendment submits drawing no 100 rev A - Site Plan, showing revised parking provision.</p> <p>PARKING</p> <p>Three perpendicular parking spaces will be provided on an extended hard standing in the front garden. Drawing no 10 rev A Site Plan shows that this will involve levelling the ground to street level and constructing a new retaining wall. Since this will abut the Highway, the applicant is required to comply fully with the requirements of the Department for Transport's DMRB Standard CG 300, as specified in condition 4 above.</p> <p>ACCESS</p> <p>Drawing no 10 rev A Site Plan shows that the proposal is to extend the parking area to over 8m wide, which requires the widening of the existing single vxo (not shown on the documents submitted). The applicant is reminded that the maximum width of vxo that is allowed is a double width, constructed of 6 kerbstones of 0.9=5.4m + 1.8 transitions = 7.2 metres in total.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority considers the proposal would not have a severe residual impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways, subject to the conditions and informative notes above.</p>
--	---

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
4	3	0	3	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
8 Bunkers Lane Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8AX	<p>The proposed development uses fascia materials that are completely alien to those found in the 3 roads of similar housing.</p> <p>The Demolition was completed with what appears to be little regard for the stability of the adjoining property when the roof and first floor walls attached to No 9 were removed, apparently daylight was visible at loft level at one stage.</p> <p>The Construction and demolition have been relentless with excessive daily noise with few breaks showing little regard to surrounding neighbours, some who are working from home.</p>

	<p>Work has started before 6.30 am, on one occasion to dump rubbish brought to the site, from a waggon into the front garden, On Saturday the 1st of August work continued past 6.00pm. I noticed after a day of constant steel cutting/grinding the work carried out during the day was transported from site on a roof rack. I am deeply concerned that there appears to be no council authority with the power to influence or regulate what is happening or any structural check to establish that the works are safe for the adjoining property and the general public, work continues despite as I understand an enforcement order being issued.</p>
<p>3 Chambersbury Lane Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8AY</p>	<p>The plan although slightly modified from the previous version still seems to cause challenges in a number of areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Size of development seems to be bigger than should be allowed based on original footprint of the house and much bigger than has been approved for any other style of this house in the surrounding area. 2. The use of materials to finish are not in keeping with the surrounding properties and although these have been modified from the initial plan will still look significantly different to surrounding houses. 3. Parking is a massive concern and although I see the plan shows space for 3 parking spaces which is the minimum requirement for a 5 bedroom house, these are not usable spaces as they cross over each other effectively only giving 2 spaces at best. Parking in this area is already under massive pressure since the new developments have been built with both bunkers lane and chambersbury lane taking the brunt of this overflow with cars parked badly on pavements blocking footpaths and often causing heavy traffic issues especially during term time.
<p>3 Chambersbury Lane Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 8AY</p>	<p>Huge concern over a 5 double bedroom house providing parking for only 3 vehicles on front drive with a spillover into Chambersbury Lane (as already observed by all their construction staff blocking the pavement at the bottom of Chambersbury Lane) Hope was that additional parking in the rear via the access they have already installed might be in the plan but clearly it is not. If this plan goes ahead the desire for double yellow lines on the corner of Chambersbury's would be desirable as the local community already cause pavement parking issues on what is a dangerous blind bend for pedestrians, buggies and wheelchairs as they block the pavement.</p>

ITEM NUMBER: 5f

20/02549/FHA	Two storey side/rear extension with a single storey rear extension and front porch (amended scheme)	
Site Address:	24 Finch Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3LH	
Applicant/Agent:	Anneke Laux	Chris Hlaing
Case Officer:	Natasha Vernal	
Parish/Ward:	Berkhamsted Town Council	Berkhamsted West
Referral to Committee:	Contrary view of Berkhamsted Town Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

1.1 That planning permission be granted with conditions.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The principle of residential development in this location is acceptable. The proposed two storey side extension with a single storey rear extension and a single storey front extension will integrate with the existing dwelling and surrounding area by virtue of its sympathetic design and scale. Whilst visible from the surrounding area, the proposal will not detrimentally impact upon the living conditions of surrounding properties nor will it impact upon local parking provision.

2.2 The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendices 3 and 5 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS4, CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), the NPPF (2019) and the Durrants (BCA16) Residential Character Appraisal Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The site is occupied by a two storey detached dwelling located on the south side of Finch Road in Berkhamsted. The site is predominately residential in character. Finch Road is characterised by detached dwellings but hosts a variety of styles, designs and finishes such that there are no common design features or uniformity to the street scene.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 The proposal seeks full householder planning permission for the construction of a two storey side extension with a single storey rear extension and a single storey front extension.

4.2. It should be noted that this planning application is an amended scheme from the previous scheme under LPA ref: 20/00758/FHA.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications (If Any):

20/00758/FHA - Two storey side and single storey rear extensions
REF - 17th July 2020

Appeals (If Any):

20/00047/REFU - Two storey side and single storey rear extensions
VALID -

6. CONSTRAINTS

Parking Accessibility Zone (DBLP): 4
CIL Zone: CIL1
Parish: Berkhamsted CP
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: RAF HALTON: DOTTED BLACK ZONE
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Red (10.7m)
Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Berkhamsted)
Residential Character Area: BCA16
EA Source Protection Zone: 3
EA Source Protection Zone: 2
Town: Berkhamsted

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)
Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (2002)
Planning Obligations (2011)
Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)
Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)

Durrants (BCA16) Residential Character Appraisal (2004)
Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (2002)
Planning Obligations (2011)
Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)
Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;
The quality of design and impact on visual amenity;
The impact on residential amenity; and
The impact on highway safety and car parking.

Principle of Development

9.2 The application site is located in a residential area of Berkhamsted. Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS4 states that appropriate residential development is encouraged in the towns and large villages.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.3 Core Strategy (2013) Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 highlight the importance of high quality sustainable design in improving the character and quality of an area, seeking to ensure that developments are in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of scale, mass, height and appearance. This guidance is supported by Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Local Plan (2004). In addition, the Durrants (BCA16) Residential Character Appraisal (2004) states that extensions should normally be subordinate in terms of scale and height to the parent building and the use of architectural features be simple, with a general lack of detailing on buildings to provide a strong design pattern characterised by red brickwork and hipped roofs.

9.4 The Durrants (BCA16) Residential Character Appraisal states that spacing within the medium range (2 m to 5 m) should be maintained. The proposed two storey side extension would be sited approximately 1.4 metres from the north-west boundary and the neighbouring property at No.22 would be sited approximately 0.6 metres from the common boundary resulting in a 2 metres separation distance between the two properties. It is considered that there would be adequate separation between the subject property and the neighbouring property at No.22 to avoid a terraced effect in the street scene. There is also adequate space on the eastern side of the existing dwelling and the neighbouring property at No.26 to avoid it appearing cramped within the street scene. Therefore the proposed two storey side extension complies with the Durrants (BCA16) Residential Character Appraisal (2004)

9.5 The surrounding area is characterised by detached dwellings but hosts a variety of styles and designs, many of which show evidence of extension / alteration.

9.6 The existing garage would be demolished. The proposal seeks the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension with a single storey front porch extension. The proposal would comprise a pitched roof to the two storey side extension and a flat roof to the rear extension and front porch. It is noted that properties within the street scene such as Nos. 17, 19, 21, 26 and 35 benefit from two storey side extensions.

9.7 The proposed ground floor development would measure approximately 3.8 metres from the rear elevation, 2.7 metres from the side elevation and 1.2 metres from the front elevation. The ground floor development would have a maximum height of approximately 2.7 metres. One roof light would be inserted within the proposed flat roof ground floor rear extension.

9.8 The proposed first floor development would extend approximately 2.1 metres from the rear elevation, 2.8 metres from the side elevation and 0.3 metres from the front elevation. The proposed

two storey development would have a maximum height of approximately 7.5 metres and the proposed first floor rear extension would have a maximum height of approximately 3.6 metres.

9.9 Alterations to fenestration is proposed to the existing dwelling with external works to the front elevation involving the infilling of the existing front door and window with brickwork to match the existing dwelling and the insertion of a window to the ground floor front elevation. The proposed fenestration would be in keeping within the surrounding area.

9.10 The proposed front and west flank elevation would be rendered at first floor to match the existing dwelling. The proposed single storey rear extension and front porch would feature timber cladding in black. A parapet wall is proposed on the ground floor west flank elevation and would have facing brickwork to match the existing dwelling and the surrounding environment.

9.11 It is noted that the proposal introduces contemporary materials at the front and rear elevation, however these materials would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area.

9.12 Although some elements of the proposed development would be visible from the public realm, the proposal would be set back from the public highway by approximately 7 metres and therefore the proposal would be less prominent when viewed along Finch Road. Furthermore, the proposal is considered to harmonise with the existing dwelling and the surrounding street scene as the proposed two storey side extension and front porch allows visual reading of the original front elevation and therefore it is not considered to result in a massing that would be unduly prominent or out of keeping within the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area.

9.13 It is considered that the design, layout and scale of the proposed development respects that of the existing and surrounding dwellings. The architectural style is sympathetic to the surrounding area and the proposal will not have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore complies with Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2019).

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.14 The NPPF outlines the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy, seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact upon the neighbouring properties and their amenity space.

9.15 The neighbouring property at No.26 benefit from a two storey side and single storey front extension and pitched roof over existing rear extension granted under LPA ref. 4/00331/11/FHA.

9.16 The proposed front extension would extend beyond the neighbouring property at No.26's principal elevation by approximately 1.2 metres. However the proposed extension would be on the opposite side of the existing dwelling and would be sited approximately 7.5 metres from the east boundary. The proposed two storey side extension and single storey rear extension would not project beyond No.26's rear elevation. The proposed first floor extension would be sited approximately 5.8 metres from the east boundary and the proposed single storey rear extension would be sited approximately 0.7 metres from the east boundary. Due to the position of No.26, the orientation is favourable and therefore this neighbour would experience no loss of sunlight. Furthermore, due to the orientation being favourable to No.26 and the absence of side fenestration towards No.26 there are no concerns in terms of overlooking, loss of light or overshadowing.

9.17 It is noted that formal objections have been received from neighbouring property at No.22. The neighbouring property at No.22 has objected on the grounds of the proposed development causing

potential overshadowing, loss of light and not in keeping with the surrounding area. However the plans indicate the proposed first floor development would not breach the 45 degree rule.

9.18 Although the proposed front extension would project beyond the neighbouring property at No.22's principal elevation, the proposed extension would be on the ground floor and would be sited approximately 1.7 metres from the north-west boundary. The proposed two storey side extension and single storey rear extension would extend beyond the neighbouring property at No.22's rear elevation by approximately 3.8 metres at ground floor level and 1.3 metres at first floor level. The proposed development would not breach the 45 degree rule and would be sited approximately 1.4 metres from the north-west boundary, it is not considered therefore that the proposed extension would result in loss of light to No. 22 to warrant refusing the application. Furthermore, the scheme has been reduced in scale in comparison to the previous scheme under LPA ref 20/00758/FHA in order to address some of the neighbour's concerns. Overall the proposed extensions would not therefore affect sunlight to No. 22 due to the separation distance and absence of side fenestration from the first floor development there are no concerns in respect of visual intrusion or loss of privacy.

9.19 The neighbouring property at No.15 (Finch Road) raised an objection on the grounds of the proposed front porch would be out of keeping within the surrounding area and could potentially result to loss of sunlight/daylight to the adjoining neighbouring properties.

9.20 The proposed front porch would be sited approximately 38 metres from No.15 and is considered to be visually less prominent when viewed from No.15. Furthermore no fenestration from the proposed porch is proposed to face towards Nos. 22 and 26. Therefore there are no concerns in terms of loss of sunlight/daylight, overshadowing or overlooking.

9.21 The proposed first floor extension may result in overlooking towards the rear elevations of neighbouring property at Nos 14 and 16 (Orchards Close). However the proposed first floor rear extension would be sited approximately 23 metres from Nos. 14 and 16 and therefore there are no concerns regarding overlooking.

9.22 Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposal will be acceptable with respect to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and the NPPF (2019).

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.23 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF (2019) states that when setting local parking standards authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport; local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles. Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policies 57, 58 and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004) promote an assessment based upon maximum parking standards.

9.24 The existing dwelling comprises three bedrooms, the maximum parking requirement for which is two off-street parking spaces, according to Saved Appendix 5. As a result of the proposed development there would be four bedrooms. The existing garage would be demolished and therefore the proposal would result in the loss of one internal parking space. However, the loss of the parking space will not affect the local parking capacity as this four bedroomed detached dwelling has a substantial area of hardstanding located to the frontage of the subject property that can accommodate at least two vehicles. In addition, there are local public transport routes situated in close proximity to the application site.

9.25 It is considered that the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on local parking provision, nor will it have a severe impact to the safety and operation of the adjacent highway. Thus, the proposal meets the requirements of Policy CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004).

Berkhamsted Town Council Objection

9.26 Berkhamsted Town Council has objected on the grounds of the scale, mass and bulk of the first-floor extension being overbearing and would adversely impact the amenity of the neighbour at number 22.

9.27 The proposed first floor rear extension is considered to be modest in scale. The width of the first floor allows visual reading of the original rear elevation and therefore it is not considered to result in a massing that would be unduly prominent or out of keeping within the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area. In regards to impacts on neighbour amenity, the first floor rear extension demonstrates subservience by setting back the rear walls to 2.1 metres. Furthermore, the proposed first floor rear extension would not breach the 45 degree rule and therefore it is not considered that the proposal would read as a visually intrusive form of development when viewed from the neighbouring property at No.22's rear elevation.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.28 The neighbouring property at Nos. 15 and 22 has objected on the grounds of the proposed development causing potential overshadowing, loss of light and not in keeping with the surrounding area. These points have been addressed in the impact on residential amenity assessment.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.29 Policy CS35 requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on the 1st July 2015. The application is not CIL liable as it would result in less than 100 square metres of additional residential floor space.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 The proposed development through its design, scale and finish will not adversely impact upon the visual amenity of the immediate street scene or the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendices 3 and 5 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS4, CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2019).

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

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

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

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

- 3068.02.04
- 3068.03.00
- 3068.04.05
- 3068.05.03
- **Site Location Plan**

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

3. **The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the materials specified on the application form.**

Reason: To make sure that the appearance of the building is suitable and that it contributes to the character of the area in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Parish/Town Council	<p>Objection</p> <p>The scale, mass and bulk of the proposed rear extension would lead to a material loss of amenity to the adjoining neighbour.</p> <p>CS12, Appendix 3</p>

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
8	2	0	2	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
<p>22 Finch Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3LH</p>	<p>I write in regards to the amended plans for 24 Finch Road dated 2 September 2020 which do not address our concerns and would continue to result in an overbearing development which would cause a loss of amenity to our property, as per the previous decision for planning application 20/00758/FHA.</p> <p>I wish to OBJECT strongly to the amended plans regarding the proposed two storey rear extension and the porch as indicated on View F, G, H in '20_02549_FHA-EXISTING_AND_PROPOSED_ELEVATIONS-1107932.pdf'.</p> <p>I wish to OBJECT strongly to the two storey rear extension as indicated on the plans, for the below reasons.</p> <p>Loss of light and overshadowing</p> <p>A double storey rear extension would lead to an unacceptable loss of light and overshadowing for 22 Finch Road. The particular concern is that the neighbouring property, 22 Finch Road, does not have an extension all the way along the back of the house (see 'F Proposed Block Plan' on '20_02549_FHA-EXISTING_AND_PROPOSED_PLANS-1107934.pdf'). Notably, there is a pond and small patio in the area that will be over-shadowed and double doors to the dining room which is the main source of natural light for the room. The light has been uninterrupted in this way for 36 years, I understand a right to light is acquired when there has been an uninterrupted period of 20 years</p> <p>Specifically comparing the amended plans (20/02549/FHA) to the previous plans (20/00758/FHA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The 'Design and Access Statement' refers to similar precedents on the road, where there has been a two storey side extension projected rear of the existing building. This is not accurate having looked at those planning applications and viewed the houses myself. A two storey side extension has never been allowed to extend beyond the back wall of the original blueprint of a house where the houses are so close like ours. o For number 30 Finch Road (outlined in paragraph 2.2 p3 of 'Design and Access Statement'), the two storey side extension did not go beyond the line of the original ground floor plan of the house (see page 4 of 'Design and Access Statement', bottom right). Also the distance between number 28 and number 30 Finch Road is nearly 3m. There is 2m between 22 and 24 Finch Road. o For number 32 Finch Road (outlined in paragraph 2.3 p3 of 'Design and Access Statement'), these documents are not available to view online, however looking from the road and on Google earth, we know that the two storey element of the side extension did not go beyond the original ground floor plan of the house also. o The orientation of both 22 and 24 Finch Road mean that the rear of each plot is South West facing, so the two storey rear extension would significantly impact natural light when the sun rises. Note that the 'Design and Access Statement' makes a comparison to 30 Finch Road (paragraph 2.2 p3 of 'Design and Access Statement'), however the impact on natural light is not comparable, as there were already trees in between 30 & 28 Finch Road which can be seen on p4 of the design and access statement (on the right hand side) and also by looking on

	<p>Google earth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Whilst the second storey part of the extension has been amended to be moved back by 0.79m from the back of the house, we do not believe that this has gone far enough to address our concerns. We would like to point out that: o the single storey rear extension in the amended plans has been extended to 3.8m compared to application 20/00758/FHA. See Pic 2 line 'B'. o also the dotted line representing the rear of 22 Finch Road in view F in '20_02549_FHA-EXISTING_AND_PROPOSED_ELEVATIONS-1107932.pdf' has been extended too far in the diagram. See Pic 1 line 'A' showing more accurate line of the rear of 22 Finch Road. <p>These two items, taken together, mean that the amended plans seem to show that the size and bulk of the proposed second storey extension has been reduced further than it actually has. We would appreciate the planning officer bearing this in mind when assessing the amended proposal.</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate that the site at 24 Finch Road is in need of refurbishment, we feel that the amended plans still do not go far enough to address our concerns and that the development takes an unacceptable amount of light from our property, 22 Finch Road. We would be fine with the proposal if a simple adjustment was made so that the height of the rear extensions was reduced so that it is single storey all the way along the back of the house (in line with other houses on the road). We would also be comfortable with the proposal if the second storey part of the extension does not extend beyond the rear of 22 Finch Road, reducing the impact of the overshadowing.</p> <p>I wish to OBJECT strongly to the front porch as indicated on the plan (View F in "AMENDED_EXISTING_AND_PROPOSED_FLOORPLANS-1080018.pdf"), for the below reasons.</p> <p>Loss of light and overshadowing</p> <p>We believe that the proposed front porch single storey extension would lead to an unacceptable loss of light and overshadowing for 22 Finch Road. In particular, the front bay window impacted at 22 Finch Road is the main source of natural light for the living room.</p> <p>We would also like to highlight a discrepancy, as paragraph 3.3 in the 'Design and Access Statement' states that the proposed side extension will not project further than the line of the existing bay windows to the front elevation. However, the single storey element of the side extension will extend beyond the existing bay windows at the front of the house which is the element of the proposal that we are objecting to. See Pic 3 line 'C'. We would be comfortable with the proposal if the side extension, front porch, will not project further than the line of the existing bay windows to the front elevation as stated in the 'Design and Access Statement' and as shown by line 'C' on Pic 3.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p>
<p>15 Finch Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3LH</p>	<p>Front porch appears to extend out further than needed. Potentially obstructing light from neighbouring bay window. Not in line with front line of houses down hill along Finch Road.</p>

PLANNING ENFORCEMENT FORMAL ACTION STATUS REPORT (October 2020)

HEADLINES

1. Since the last update (July 2020) a total of 3 Enforcement Notices, 2 Listed Building Enforcement Notices, and 1 Temporary Stop Notice have been served. A total of 2 cases have been removed from this list since the last update.
2. Works due to commence at NCP car park, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, which will significantly improve the appearance of this important town centre building, which contains the listed mosaic.
3. The appeal against the enforcement notice at Smallgrove Farm has been dismissed (date of decision 01.10.20). The appellant now has 12 months to remove the 75m long bund from the site.

	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION
1	E/06/00470	Land at Hatches Croft, Bradden Lane, Gaddesden Row	Stationing of a mobile home for residential purposes on the land.	12 Sep 08	20 Oct 09	20 Apr 10	No	N/A	Not complied	Successful prosecution, however mobile home remains on site and no land reinstatement has taken place. p/p granted for new dwelling with compliance of EN to follow.
2	E/07/00257	Gable End, Threefields, Sheethanger Lane, Felden	Construction of new dwelling and hardstanding; construction of boundary wall more than 2m high; MCU of land from agriculture to garden	26 Feb 10	09 Apr 10	09 Apr 11	Yes, appeal dismissed 01 Oct 10	01 Oct 11	Not complied	Crown Court appeal partly successful. Mr Pitblado convicted on one count, Mrs Pitblado discharged. *Part II report heard. Further report required*.
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE	EFFECTIVE	COMPLIANCE	APPEAL	NEW	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER

				ISSUED	DATE	DATE		COMPLIANCE DATE		ACTION
3	E/07/00257	Birch Cottage, Threefields, Sheethanger Lane, Felden	Construction of new dwelling and hardstanding; MCU of land from agriculture to garden	26 Feb 10	09 Apr 10	09 Apr 11	Yes, appeal dismissed 01 Oct 10	01 Oct 11	Partly complied	The dwelling has been demolished and the garden use ceased. However, the hardstanding remains. Action dependent on the result of that at Gable End.
4	E/09/00128	The Granary, 49 New Road, Wilstone	The installation of uPVC windows and doors	11 Jan 11	18 Feb 11	18 Feb 13	Yes, appeal dismissed 17 Jun 11	17 Jun 13	<u>Complied</u>	*Photos of new windows and doors sent July, case to be closed and removed from list – complied*
5	E/11/00228	342a High Street, Berkhamsted	Construction of rear dormer	19 Mar 12	26 Apr 12	26 Oct 12	No	N/A	Not complied	Latest application to regularise matters (646/17) refused 09 May 17. No appeal submitted. Inspection to take place to understand current position.
6	E/12/00354	Meadow View, Threefields, Sheethanger Lane, Felden	Construction of first floor extension, dormer windows and hardstanding. MCOU of agricultural land to residential garden.	30 Jan 13	11 Mar 13	11 Mar 14	Yes, appeal dismissed	20 Jan 15	Not complied	Enforcing the works required to the building are dependent on action at Gable End. Review of other breaches needs to take place.
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION

								DATE		
7	E/12/00354	April Cottage, Threefields, Sheethanger Lane, Felden	Construction of first floor extension, dormer windows and hardstanding. MCOU of agricultural land to residential garden.	30 Jan 13	11 Mar 13	11 Mar 14	Yes, appeal dismissed	20 Jan 15	Partly complied	Enforcing the works required to the building dependant on action at Gable End. Review of other breaches needs to take place.
8	E/12/00354	Woodside, Threefields, Sheethanger Lane, Felden	Construction of first floor extension, dormer windows and hardstanding. MCOU of agricultural land to residential garden.	30 Jan 13	11 Mar 13	11 Mar 14	Yes, appeal dismissed	20 Jan 15	Not complied	Enforcing the works required to the building are dependent on action at Gable End. Review of other breaches needs to take place.
9	E/14/00494	Land at Hamberlins Farm, Hamberlins Lane, Northchurch	MCOU of land from agriculture to construction / vehicle / storage yard.	11 May15	11 Jun 15	11 Dec 15 (for all steps)	Yes, appeal dismissed	17 Dec 16	Partly complied	All vehicles, materials, machinery have been removed. Works now taken place to remove bund. Need to consider Offence.
10	E/15/00301	Land at Piggery Farm, Two Ponds Lane, Northchurch	MCOU of land from agriculture to non-agricultural storage yard; MCOU of building to private motor vehicle storage; construction of raised hardsurface	15 Jul 16	15 Aug 16	15 Feb 17 (for all steps)	Yes, appeal dismissed (other than use of building)	25 Nov 17	Partly complied	Most vehicles removed from the land. Visit confirmed that hard surfaced area has been removed, bund of material arising still on site awaiting removal. Planning granted: 1937/19. Further site visit needed to check material removed and to check compliance with conditions of permission.
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION

<u>11</u>	E/14/00453	Land at Barnes Croft, Barnes Lane, Kings Langley	Construction of brick garage, brick link extension, and rear sun room.	17 Nov 16	19 Dec 16	19 Dec 17 (for all steps)	Yes, appeal dismissed	19 Jan 19 (for all steps)	N/A	Rear sun room has been demolished. P/P refused for alterations to and retention of detached garage block (3177/18/FHA). Appeal also dismissed. *New app. received (20/02400/FHA)*
12	E/16/00449	Farfield House, Chesham Road, Wigginton	Construction of side and rear extension and detached double garage.	23 Jan 17	22 Feb 17	22 Aug 17	No	N/A	Not complied	Planning permission for amended scheme (844/17/FHA) granted. Need to ensure implementation.
13	E/16/00052	Land at Hill & Coles Farm, London Road, Flamstead	MCOU of land to commercial compound/storage of materials and plant, & creation of earth bund.	08 Mar 17	07 Apr 17	07 Oct 17	No	N/A	Partially Complied	EN has been broadly complied with. Land has now been restored, but some elements of material storage have returned. Site visit required to confirm compliance and to continue investigation at other locations within site.
14	E/17/00103	55 St.John's Road, Hemel Hempstead	The insertion of uPVC windows and doors in a Listed Building.	05 July 17	05 Aug 17	05 Nov 17	No	N/A	Not complied	DBC owned property. Contractors are in discussion with the Conservation Officer to confirm final details of replacement fenestration.
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION

15	E/17/00104	59 St.John's Road, Hemel Hempstead	The insertion of uPVC windows and doors in a Listed Building.	05 July 17	05 Aug 17	05 Nov 17	No	N/A	Not complied	DBC owned property. Contractors are in discussion with the Conservation Officer to confirm final details of replacement fenestration.
16	E/16/00161	Lila's Wood, Wick Lane, Tring	MCOU – use of woodland for wedding ceremonies; creation of tracks; erection of various structures.	27 July 17	25 Aug 17	25 Nov 17 (for all steps)	Yes, appeal dismissed	12 July 18 (for all steps)	Not complied	Requirements not met in full. Permitted development rights being used as 'fall-back' position but items not being removed between events. Planning application 19/02588/MFA not yet determined.
17	E/17/00296	68 Oak Street, Hemel Hempstead	Construction of raised concrete parking platform.	28 July 17	29 Aug 17	29 Nov 17	Yes, appeal dismissed	28 Nov 18	Not complied	Appeal dismissed. Correspondence sent to owner 20.01.20 to request application/compliance. Application received Feb 2020, invalid at the moment.
18	E/17/00382	Markyate Cell Park, Dunstable Road, Markyate	Excavation / landscaping works at Historic Park. Storage of tyres and cement mixers.	21 Sep 17	21 Sep 17	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	TSN period expired. *New case set up E/20/00321/LBG dealing with various issues similar to this case. This formal action has expired – to be removed from list*
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION
19	E/17/00266	Land at Red Lion	Untidy land, left over	24 Nov 17	24 Dec 17	24 Jan 18	N/A	N/A	Partly	Site cleared. Some

		Lane (Sappi), Nash Mills, Hemel Hempstead	from building works.						complied	grass seeding work required. Also need to seek removal of Heras fencing.
20	E/17/00407	Land at The Hoo, Ledgemore Lane, Great Gaddesden	Construction of new road, turning area and bund.	29 Nov 17	29 Dec 17	29 Jun 18 (for all steps)	Yes, appeal dismissed	29 Apr 19 (for all steps)	Partly complied	Bund removed. Period of compliance for track has passed, but no compliance. Application for smaller track (373/19/FUL) – refused & appeal dismissed. *Site visit undertaken and further application being drawn up for ‘twin track’ access*
21	E/17/00220	17 Langley Avenue, Hemel Hempstead	Construction of raised decking, timber steps and associated fencing and supports.	17 Jan 18	17 Feb 18	17 Apr 18	Yes - appeal allowed (ground g) notice upheld subject to variations	03 July 19	N/A	Appeal allowed in respect of ground (g) (time limits) & Notice upheld subject to the variations. Planning application 01117/19 Granted for re-configuration. Site visit delayed due to COVID 19 restrictions.
22	E/16/00104	40 Tower Hill Chipperfield	MCOU of land from residential garden to commercial car parking/storage and associated laying of hardstanding.	06 Mar 18	05 Apr 18	05 Apr 18 (for all steps)	No	N/A	Partly Complied	Enforcement Notice compliance period has passed. Cars have been removed from the site. Hardstanding not removed. In discussions with executor of estate.
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION
23	E/18/00151	14 The Coppins,	Construction of	26 Apr 18	26 May 18	26 Aug 18	Yes -	06 Nov 19	N/A	Appeal dismissed-

		Markyate	raised parking pad.				appeal dismissed			application 19/02822/FHA received and granted for different scheme. Additional compliance period has now passed, however this is due to COVID – 19 lockdown. Progress has been made and witnessed by officers. Continued liaison - likely to result in successful implementation of the new permission.
24	E/11/00153	Field adj. New Lodge, London Road, Berkhamsted	Untidy condition of land.	14 Sep 18	14 Oct 18	14 Dec 18	Yes	N/A	N/A	S.215 Notice served. Notice was challenged at Magistrates Court. Court outcome was that the 215 notice was quashed, but a court order was handed down to the defendant for them to comply with. Some items could remain on the site, but needed to be re-positioned. This has not been complied with. Further action to be considered.
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION
<u>25</u>	E/18/00341	55 High Street, Markyate, AL3 8PJ	Installation of an external ACU (air	12 Feb 19	14 Mar 19	14 Sep 19	Yes - withdrawn	02 Apr 20	<u>Complied</u>	*Planning application (20/00415) granted

			conditioning unit) to the rear.							for repositioning and retention of ACU. Repositioning undertaken – to be removed from the list. Compliance achieved*
<u>26</u>	E/16/00007	Land lying to the northwest of Hill Farm, Markyate, AL3 8AU (known as Swaddling Wood)	Parking of vehicles, siting of mobile home and erection of gate in woodland.	15 Feb 19	18 Mar 19	18 Jun 19	Yes	27 Aug 20	N/A	This notice was appealed – PINS issued their decision on 27.05.20 and upheld the Enf notice (subject to variations). *High Court appeal dismissed*.
<u>27</u>	E/18/00385	Site of Smallgrove Farm, Windmill Road, Pepperstock	Creation of a large bund using imported material.	11 Mar 19	11 Apr 19	11 Apr 20	<u>Yes – appeal dismissed</u>	<u>01 Oct 21</u>	N/A	This notice was appealed. *Appeal dismissed*
<u>28</u>	E/18/00166	Honeybrook, St Margarets, Great Gaddesden, HP1 3BZ	Formation of level terraces and construction of brick and stone retaining walls in rear garden.	22 Mar 19	22 Apr 19	22 Oct 19	Yes - withdrawn	29 May 20	N/A	This notice was appealed, but appeal withdrawn. *Application 20/00141 granted – retention of terracing with changes to design and new landscaping proposal. Final compliance check required*
<u>29</u>	E/18/00166	Honeybrook, St Margarets, Great Gaddesden, HP1 3BZ	Non-compliance with condition 12 p/p 4/02874/15/FUL.	22 Mar 19	22 Apr 19	22 Oct 19	Yes - withdrawn	29 May 20	N/A	*Variation application 19/02721/ROC granted. Compliance check required*
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION
30	E/15/00238	6 Sarum Place, Hemel Hempstead	Untidy land	21 May 19	21 Jun 19	21 Dec 19	No	N/A	N/A	S215 untidy land notice served in

										relation to the garden, windows, gate and shed at this property. Previous S215 was complied with following direct action by DBC. Property fallen into disrepair again. Final deadline given to tidy up the site.
31	E/18/00436	68 Tring Road, Wilstone	Erection of a fence in excess of 1m adjacent to a highway	11 Jun 19	09 Jul 19	09 Oct 19	Yes	23 Jun 20	N/A	Retrospective planning permission refused – EN served and notice appealed. Appeal dismissed. Further planning application refused. No compliance – further action being considered. *Second planning application refusal dismissed*
32	E/19/00010	Boxmoor Lodge Hotel, London Road, Hemel Hempstead	Erection of a marquee	25 Jun 19	06 Aug 19	06 Aug 20	Yes	31 Mar 21	N/A	Appeal dismissed – new compliance date 31 March 2021.
33	E/18/00408	28 Boxwell Road, Berkhamsted	Demolition of wall and creation of parking area	09 Sep 19	09 Oct 19	09 Dec 19	Yes	30 Jul 20	N/A	EN served following dismissal of planning appeal regarding same development. Appeal dismissed – new compliance date 30 July 2020. *Compliance check required*
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION
34	E/19/00321	Land at Featherbed Lane, Hemel	Change of use to residential, siting of	11 Sep 19	09 Oct 19	09 Jan 19	Yes	N/A		Status quo injunction sought and granted

		Hempstead	mobile homes and operational development including laying hard standing and erection of fencing							23 Aug 2019 (made final 20 Sep 2019). EN served following refusal of planning permission on 11 Sep 19. Refusal and EN appealed and likely to be linked inquiry. Council's statement of case submitted to PINS 26.06.20 – awaiting Inquiry date.
35	E/17/00442	Land north of Home Farm, Flaunden Bottom	Extension to building and construction of new building	12 Sep 19	12 Oct 19	12 Dec 19	No	12 Apr 20	<u>Part compliance</u>	EN issued. No appeal made. Compliance delayed due to owner's ill health – short, informal time extension granted. *Compliance partially obtained. Retaining wall remaining. Public interest test to be applied to requiring full compliance*
36	E/19/00302	Lock Cottage, Ravens Lane, Berkhamsted	LBEN: Demolition of wall within curtilage of listed building	13 Sep 19	12 Oct 19	12 Jan 20	Yes	N/A		LBEN served – notice appealed on basis that wall was not listed and that permission was previously granted under 4/01580/15/LBC. Statement submitted to PINS. Awaiting PINS decision.
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION
37	E/19/00302	Lock Cottage, Ravens Lane, Berkhamsted	EN: Demolition of a wall in a conservation area	13 Sep 19	12 Oct 19	12 Jan 20	No	N/A		EN served – not appealed. Required to comply with the

			and creation of a raised parking area							notice by 12.01.20. No compliance – next steps to be considered in line with LBEN appeal outcome.
38	E/19/00492 BOC	Bovingdon Market, Chesham Road, Bovingdon	Breach of conditions 4, 5 and 19 of planning permission 4/01889/14/MFA	05 Dec 19	05 Dec 19	02 Jan 20	N/A	N/A		Breach of condition notice issued in respect of breaches pertaining to vehicular access points and approved plans. Application 20/00339 refused – further action being considered.
39	E/18/00558	123 George Street, Berkhamsted	Breach of condition in relation to approved drawings 4/01759/16/FHA.	31 Jan 20	31 Jan 20	30 April 20	N/A	N/A		Breach of condition notice issued following unsuccessful negotiations. Additional roof lights causing negative impact.
40	E/20/00023/ MULTI	Haresfoot Farm, Chesham Road, Berkhamsted	Construction of unauthorised buildings, hard surfaces and importation and processing of waste materials.	19 Feb 20	20 Mar 20		Yes	N/A		EN issued in relation to the construction of 7 unauthorised buildings, construction of hard surfacing, change of use of buildings and change of use of land for waste importation and processing. Notice appealed – awaiting start letter from PINS.
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION
41	E/20/00023/ MULTI	Haresfoot Farm, Chesham Road, Berkhamsted	Construction of buildings and provision of	19 Feb 20	19 Feb 20		YES	N/A		Stop notice issued with enforcement notice in order to

			hardstanding, operation of waste transfer/recycling and importation of waste.							cease the continued building work and importation and processing of waste materials at this site.
<u>42</u>	E/20/00101/ NPP	121 High Street, Markyate	Construction of an unauthorised structure to the rear of this Listed Building.	04 Mar 20	04 Mar 20		N/A	N/A		Temporary stop notice issued in relation to the building work. *Structure subject to TSN removed, EN issued in respect of other breach – this case will be removed from the list*
<u>43</u>	E/19/00439/ LBG	NCP Car Park, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead	Condition of building	13 Mar 20				N/A		S215 notice issued in relation to the condition of this car park building (external condition). *Works commencing 5 th October to paint, clean and tidy the building, including the listed mosaic*
<u>44</u>	E/20/00088/ NPP	Land East Of Watling Girth, Old Watling Street, Flamstead	Construction of unauthorised structure, hardstanding, internal access road.	31 Mar 20	31 Mar 20		N/A	N/A		Temporary stop notice issued in relation to construction of unauthorised structure on this land. Planning application submitted prior to expiration of TSN – Refused. *EN issued, this action will be removed from this list*
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION
<u>45</u>	E/20/00147/ NAP	35 Parr Crescent, Hemel Hempstead	Breach of condition 3 of planning permission	29 Apr 20	29 Apr 20		N/A	N/A		TSN issued: Contamination condition had not

			19/03084/FHA (contamination)							been discharged which related to this property specifically due to the previous land use. *TSN expired - required info submitted 20/01268/DRC. To be removed from list*
46	E/19/00444/ NAP	Plot 1, Cupid Green Lane, Great Gaddesden	Material change of the use of the land from agricultural to use for agricultural research with associated development.	29 Apr 20	24 Jun 20	N/A	Yes			Enforcement notice issued. Tents and fencing erected on this sensitive site which lies in the Green Belt. *Notice appealed, start letter issued and statement submitted 30.09.20*
47	E/20/00136/ NPP	Trout Lake, Station Footpath, Kings Langley	Importation and deposition of soil and other materials.	07 May 20	07 May 20		N/A	N/A		TSN issued: unauthorised importation of large quantities of soil to this site (deposited in/stored adjacent to the lake). Commercial plant and machinery and other materials are being stored on the soil. *TSN expired and application due to be submitted – to be removed from list*
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION
48	E/20/00163/ NAP	The Walled Garden, Stocks Road, Aldbury	Breach of condition 17 of permission 4/02488/16/FUL.	27 May 20	27 May 20	27 Aug 20	N/A			Breach of condition notice issued: approved plans. The

										garage at this site had not been built in accordance with the approved scheme - loss of features such as bug hotels and flint elevations. *Variation application 20/01656/ROC not yet determined*
49	E/19/00492/ BOC	Bovingdon Market, Chesham Road, Bovingdon	Breach of conditions 1 & 2 of planning permission 4/01889/14/MFA	27 May 20	27 May 20	24 June 20	N/A			Breach of condition notice related to the breach of conditions 1 and 2 of the permission (market layout and parking).
50	E/20/00104/ NPP	The Water Gardens Telecoms Mast, Leighton Buzzard	Installation of telecommunications mast.	04 Jun 20	30 Jul 20		<u>Yes</u>			Enforcement notice issued in respect of unauthorised telecommunications mast near Water Gardens Car Park. 18-month 'emergency' PD right period has passed and the mast was not removed. *Notice appealed – start letter issued and statement submitted 08.10.20*
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION
51	E/20/00214/ CONSRV	307-309 High Street, Berkhamsted	Construction of decking area to the front of the premises.	17 Jun 20	17 Jun 20		N/A	N/A		Temporary stop notice issued: decking built to the

front of the 2 x premises. *Planning application 20/01795/FUL not yet determined, but TSN expired, so will be removed from the list*

THE FOLLOWING CASES HAVE BEEN ENTERED ONTO THE LIST FOR THE FIRST TIME

	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION
52	E/20/00088/ NPP	Land east of Watling Garth, Old Watling Street, Flamstead	Construction of a building, gabion walls, widening of an existing access, formation of two vehicular access points and roadways within the site.	17 Jul 20	28 Aug 20		Yes			Enforcement notice issued: construction of a building, gabion walls, widening of an existing access, formation of two vehicular access points and roadways within the site. Notice appealed - awaiting start letter.
53	E/19/00398	Land at Berry Farm, Upper Bourne End Lane, Hemel Hempstead	Pig breeding enterprise with associated development.	17 Jul 20	14 Aug 20		Yes			An enforcement notice issued: pig breeding enterprise on this Green Belt location. The development comprised fencing, caravan, pig shelters and other hard standing and paraphernalia. Notice appealed – awaiting start letter.
	CASE REF.	LOCATION	BREACH	DATE ISSUED	EFFECTIVE DATE	COMPLIANCE DATE	APPEAL	NEW COMPLIANCE DATE	RESULT	NOTES / FURTHER ACTION
54	E/19/00359	Land adj. The Willows, Potten End Hill, Water End	Installation of 2 x solar panel arrays.	12 Aug 20	10 Sep 20	10 May 21	No			An enforcement notice was issued in respect of x2 solar

										panel arrays installed on this Green Belt field, adjacent to a residential property.
55	E/20/00311/ NAP	13 Chambersbury Lane, Hemel Hempstead	Construction of raised patio and garden store to rear of dwelling.	10 Sep 20	10 Sep 20	N/A	N/A			A temporary stop notice was issued in respect of the construction of a large raised patio and garden store at this residential address. Following a site visit, further action is being considered.
56	E/20/00249/ LBG	57 St Johns Road, Hemel Hempstead	Installation of UPVC windows in listed building.	25 Sep 20	27 Oct 20	27 Oct 23				A listed building enforcement notice was issued in respect of a residential property which had UPVC windows and doors installed without listed building consent.
57	E/20/00101/ NPP	121 High Street, Markyate	Installation of extraction system and flue on listed building.	05 Oct 20	02 Nov 20	02 March 21				A listed building enforcement notice was issued in respect of an extraction system and flue which was installed on the flat roof part of this listed building, without consent.