



Public Document Pack

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AGENDA

**THURSDAY 1 APRIL 2021 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 31 March 2021**

If you are having problems connecting to the virtual meeting, please phone
the clerk on 01442 228490.

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 member.support@dacorum.gov.uk 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 (Page 5)

- (a) 20/03940/FUL - Temporary Canvas tent to the rear of the public house to provide covered external space for dining and drinking customers only - The Old Mill London Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2NB (Pages 6 - 39)
- (b) 20/03821/FUL - Demolition of 34 residential garages and construction of 2 no dwelling houses and 6 no apartments - Garage Court Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire (Pages 40 - 87)
- (c) 20/00396/FUL - Extension to block a/b to form additional offices above existing ground floor office. - Ver House, 55 London Road, Markyate, Hertfordshire (Pages 88 - 124)
- (d) 20/03878/FUL - Pergola to front entrance (temporary planning permission (2 years) - Boxmoor Coffee & Wine Ltd 67A St Johns Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1QG (Pages 125 - 131)

6. APPEALS UPDATE (Pages 132 - 140)

INDEX TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Item No.	Application No.	Description and Address	Page No.
5a.	20/03940/FUL	Temporary Canvas tent to the rear of the public house to provide covered external space for dining and drinking customers only. The Old Mill, London Road, Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire	
5b.	20/03821/FUL	Demolition of 34 residential garages and construction of 2 no dwelling houses and 6 no apartments. Garage Court, Sleddale, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire	
5c.	20/00396/OUT	Extension to block a/b to form additional offices above existing ground floor office. Ver House, 55 London Road, Markyate, St Albans	
5d.	20/03878/FUL	Pergola to front entrance (temporary planning permission (2 years)). Boxmoor Coffee & Wine Ltd, 67A St Johns Road, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire	

Agenda Item 5a

ITEM NUMBER: 5a

20/03940/FUL	Temporary Canvas tent to the rear of the public house to provide covered external space for dining and drinking customers only.	
Site Address:	The Old Mill London Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2NB	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr Andrew Clarke	
Case Officer:	Elsbeth Palmer	
Parish/Ward:	Berkhamsted Town Council	Berkhamsted East
Referral to Committee:	Due to contrary view of Town Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That a temporary planning permission be granted.

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 A temporary planning permission for a temporary canvas tent to provide covered external space for dining and drinking customers only is considered acceptable in this town location in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS4.
- 2.2 The use of this tent for a 12 month period will not have a negative impact on the amenity of neighbours or the Berkhamsted Conservation Area and the adjacent listed buildings. As such, the proposal will comply with CS12 and CS27.
- 2.3 The use of part of the existing car park for the temporary tent is considered an acceptable way of supporting this business through the COVID restrictions and will still provide adequate parking and safe access to the site. As such, the proposal will comply with CS12.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

- 3.1 The site is located on the northern side of London Road near to the intersection with Bank Mill Lane.
- 3.2 The Old Mill building is a 2 storey brick building with pitched tiled roofs dating from the 18th and 19th century. The mill has been converted to a pub which is grade II listed. Associated with this industrial complex is the surviving Lade, Mill cottage and former wharf buildings. These have been converted into residential. The site in question is a car park area on the small island between the Lade/ river and the canal. On the opposite bank of the canal is the tow path allowing views across into the site.
- 3.3 The site is located within a designated residential area within the Berkhamsted Conservation Area and an Area of Archaeological Significance.

4. PROPOSAL

- 4.1 Temporary Canvas tent (measuring 15 metres by 8.5 metres and 4 metres high at highest point) to the rear of the public house (in the existing car park) to provide covered external space for dining and drinking customers only.
- 4.2 Due to concerns from the Environment Agency regarding the relocation of the toilets this part of the application has been removed.

- 4.3 Hours proposed in the application form include:
Monday to Friday 11am till 11pm
Saturday 11am till 11pm
Sunday and Bank Holidays 11am till 11pm

Background

- 4.4 This scheme is an amended proposal.
- 4.5 The proposal originally submitted included a larger tent (measuring 25 metres by 15 metres and 4 metres tall) for outdoor dining, drinking and entertainment on a permanent basis.
- 4.6 However it is considered in the longer term the tent would have a harmful impact on the setting of the listed building and therefore if this is required for the business in the long term pre application discussions should take place to ensure that a successful and more appropriate long term solution can be arrived at.
- 4.7 Also there are noise implications for the use of the tent for live music performances or audience seating – a noise control scheme would need to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to any approval being given for such a use.
- 4.8 Therefore the proposal being assessed in this application is for a temporary permission (12 months only) of a canvas tent to provide external space for public house dining and drinking customers.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Relevant Planning Applications (If Any):

20/01780/TCA - Works to trees.

Fell silver birches on right hand side of rear car park due to excessive shading on neighbouring property's.

RNO - 17th August 2020

4/00837/18/TCA - Works to trees

RNO - 24th May 2018

4/00640/13/LBC - Internal alterations and repairs to include: replace areas of internal flooring, relocating disabled wc, new timber and fibreglass double doors to private dining area, new decorative timber and glass fixed screens, reduce beam over front bar to improve views

GRA - 3rd June 2013

4/02229/07/RET - Smoking shelter

GRA - 16th November 2007

4/02228/07/LBC - Smoking shelter

GRA - 16th November 2007

4/02802/06/LBC - Internal refurbishment

GRA - 13th February 2007

4/00669/99/LBC - Formation of bottle store in yard

GRA - 25th June 1999

4/00668/99/FUL - Repositioning of bin store in car park, formation of bottle store in yard
GRA - 25th June 1999

4/01941/98/ADV - New 5m illuminated pole sign
REF - 5th January 1999

4/01928/98/LBC - Single storey extension and internal alterations to public house and formation of car park (revised scheme)
GRA - 16th February 1999

4/01927/98/FUL - Two cctv cameras situated on 4m high steel columns positioned in car park
REF - 5th January 1999

4/01555/98/RES - Submission of details of materials pursuant to condition 2 of permission 4/0476/98ful. (single storey extension, demolition of single storey accommodation building and formation of car parking.)
GRA - 16th September 1998

4/01345/98/RES - Submission of details of hard and soft landscaping pursuant to conditions 3 and 4 of planning permission 4/0476/98 (single storey extension demolition of single storey accommodation building and formation of car park)
GRA - 18th September 1998

4/01254/98/LBC - Single storey extension and internal alterations to public house, demolition of single storey accommodation building and formation of car park (revised scheme)
GRA - 24th September 1998

4/01241/98/LBC - Disabled access ramp
GRA - 24th September 1998

4/01240/98/FUL - Disabled access ramp
GRA - 24th September 1998

4/01210/98/RES - Submission of details of archaeological investigation pursuant to condition 14 of planning permission 4/0476/98 (single storey extension and formation of car parking)
GRA - 15th September 1998

4/00488/98/LBC - Single storey extension and internal alterations to public house, demolition of single storey accommodation building and formation of car park
GRA - 11th June 1998

4/00476/98/FUL - Single storey extension, demolition of single storey accommodation building and formation of car Parking.
GRA - 11th June 1998

6. CONSTRAINTS

Area of Archaeological Significance: 21
EA BankTop EPlanning Tool: Banktop 20m Buffer
British Waterways (25m Buffer): GU(S): 25m buffer
British Waterways (25m Buffer): GU(N): 25m buffer
Canal Buffer Zone: Minor
CIL Zone: CIL1

Berkhamsted Conservation Area
EA: Flood Zone 2
EA: Flood Zone 3
Former Land Use (Risk Zone):
Parish: Berkhamsted CP
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Yellow (45.7m)
Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Berkhamsted)
Residential Character Area: BCA3
Parking Standards: New Zone 3

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
CS23 – Social Infrastructure
CS27 – Quality of the Historic Environment
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction
CS32 – Air, Soil and Water Quality

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

DBC Parking Standards (November 2020)

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, impact on the Berkhamsted Conservation Area and adjacent listed building;
- The impact on residential amenity; and
- The impact on highway safety and car parking.

Principle of Development

- 9.2 The site lies within a designated residential area of Berkhamsted, The Berkhamsted Conservation Area and is adjacent to a listed building.
- 9.3 CS 4 – states that non-residential development for small scale social, community, leisure and business purposes is encouraged, provided it is compatible with its surroundings.
- 9.4 Para 196 of the NPPF states that “where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”
- 9.5 CS27 states that “all development will favour the conservation of heritage assets. The integrity, setting and distinctiveness of designated and undesignated heritage assets will be protected, conserved and if appropriate enhanced.” The site is in close proximity to a listed building – a designated heritage asset.
- 9.6 The use of the car park on a temporary basis for a temporary canvas tent to provide covered external space for outside dining would be acceptable in principle subject to it being compatible with the surrounding land uses and an assessment as to its heritage impact.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity/ Impact on Conservation Area/Impact on adjacent listed building

- 9.7 The tent is of a higher standard of design than a standard marquee, is relatively low and a neutral colour. It will not project forward in a way that dominates in the street scene due to its size and being located to the rear of the site. It will not be visually dominant when viewed from the towpath along the opposite side of the canal due to the vegetative screen between the site and the canal.
- 9.8 The Conservation Officer has advised that there would be less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building and the Conservation Area. This harm would be outweighed by the public benefits of keeping the business viable in the current extreme circumstances. (It would not be considered that it would be outweighed were this to be a permanent feature as in the longer term it would have a harmful impact on the setting of the listed building and Conservation Area.)
- 9.9 The benefits of the proposal include:
- keeps the business viable;
 - helps the local economy;
 - provides employment;
 - provides a social meeting place;
 - mental health benefits to the community;
 - enables friends to meet in a safe outdoor, well ventilated environment; and
 - secures the optimum viable use of the building.

- 9.10 In addition to the benefits above a 12 month permission would limit the harms caused by such a proposal.
- 9.11 Based on the above it is considered on balance that the proposal is acceptable and complies with the NPPF para. 196 and CS12 and CS27.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Loss of privacy

- 9.12 There will be no loss of privacy as a result of the temporary approval of the canvas tent as there is a two metre close boarded fence between the tent and the nearest dwelling "Old Mill Cottage".
- 9.13 The land use to the west of the site is an Esso Service Station so this will not be impacted upon by the retention of the temporary tent.

Loss of sunlight and daylight

- 9.14 There will be no significant loss of sunlight and daylight as a result of the proposal as it is relatively low lying and approximately 4 metres high and at closest approximately 11 metres and furthest 14 metres away from the nearest dwelling Old Mill Cottage. The two distances are due to the unusual angle of the site boundary.

Noise

- 9.15 A condition will be placed on this temporary planning permission to ensure that the tent is used solely for the customers of the public house for the purposes of dining and drinking.
- 9.16 A condition will also be placed on the temporary planning permission restricting hours of operation.
- 9.17 Subject to these conditions Environmental Health have no objections to the proposed scheme.
- 9.18 These conditions will help to address the concerns of objectors about anti-social behaviour from customers.
- 9.19 The scheme will comply with CS12 in terms of impact on residential amenity and CS32 in terms of noise pollution.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

Parking

- 9.20 The Old Mill is a public house and restaurant. Part of the existing parking area (approximately 21 spaces) is to be used for a canvas tent to provide covered external space for dining and drinking customers only. There will be 21 car parking spaces remaining.
- 9.21 Based on this being a temporary solution to support the business as they move out of COVID restrictions and the area being used for dining being much smaller than

normally used inside the Pub itself it is considered that the parking provision is acceptable.

9.22 A previous approval conditioned that this area must be retained for parking of vehicles so when the temporary permission has expired the area will return to a car park.

9.23 There are no changes proposed to the existing access so there are no highways implications.

Impact on the Environment and Canal

9.24 The Environment Agency has no objection to the proposal now the relocation of the toilet has been removed from the application.

Other Material Planning Considerations

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.25 No significant trees have been affected by the location of the tents as it is placed within an existing car park.

Flood Risk

9.26 The site of the proposed tent sits between a mapped Main River, the River Bulbourne and a mapped Ordinary watercourse, the Grand Union Canal.

9.27 The Lead Local Flood Authority have no objections to the proposal.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.28 These points have been addressed above.

Petition

9.29 A petition was launched in November with a positive response from 251 people.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.30 Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy 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 was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on 1 July 2015. This proposal is not CIL liable.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 It is considered that a temporary planning permission for a temporary canvas tent to provide covered external space for dining and drinking customers only and relocation of toilets to the other side of the river would be acceptable in terms of CS4.

10.2 The use of this tent for a 12 month period will not have a negative impact on the amenity of neighbours or the Berkhamsted Conservation Area and the adjacent listed buildings. The proposal will comply with CS12 and CS27.

- 10.3 The use of part of the existing car park for the temporary tent is considered an acceptable way of supporting this business through the COVID restrictions and will still provide adequate parking and safe access to the site. The proposal will comply with CS12.
- 10.4 The amended scheme has sought to address the Town Council's concerns with regard to impact on the setting of the listed building, parking and noise. It is considered that a temporary permission with the recommended conditions does successfully address these concerns.

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That a temporary planning permission be granted.

Condition(s):

- 1. This permission is for a limited period expiring 12 months from the date on the decision notice by which time the use of the marquee - temporary canvas tent shall cease and it shall be permanently removed from the site.**

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of neighbours and to preserve and enhance the character of the Conservation Area and to comply with CS12, 27 and 32.

Reason: To safeguard and maintain the strategic policies of the local planning authority as expressed in the Core Strategy and for the avoidance of doubt. Permission would not normally be granted but regard has been paid to the particular circumstances of the applicant.

- 2. The temporary canvas tent shown on Drwg. No. 20011-101 Rev B shall be used for dining and drinking associated with The Old Mill Public House only and shall be used for no other purposes, including, but not limited to, the playing of music and live performances.**

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of neighbours and to preserve and enhance the character of the Conservation Area and to comply with CS12, 27 and 32.

- 3. Customers shall not be permitted in the temporary tent other than within the following times:**

**Monday to Friday 11am till 11pm
Saturday 11am till 11pm
Sunday and Bank Holidays 11am till 11pm**

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of the locality, having regard to Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 127 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

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

**Site Location Plan
Proposed Tent Drwg. No. 20011-101 Rev B
Air photo image showing tent and parking area
Plan showing dimensions of proposed tent**

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

Informatives:

Environment Agency

Flood Risk Activity Permit

The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for any activities which will take place:

- on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal)
- on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culvert (16 metres if tidal)
- on or within 16 metres of a sea defence
- involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert
- in a floodplain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure (16 metres if it's a tidal main river) and you don't already have planning permission.

For further guidance please visit

https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities_environmental-permits or contact our National Customer Contact Centre on 03702 422 549 or by emailing enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk.

The applicant should not assume that a permit will automatically be forthcoming once planning permission has been granted, and we advise them to consult with us at the earliest opportunity.

Canal and Rivers Trust

The applicant/developer is advised to contact Bernadette McNicholas of the CRT Estates Team on 07920 495745 or Bernadette.mcnicholas@canalrivertrust.org.uk in order to ensure that the necessary licences or agreements are obtained prior to any further works being carried out on Trust owned land.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Canal & River Trust	<p>The main issues relevant to the Trust as statutory consultee on this application are:</p> <p>a) The impact on the historic environment of the site and its surroundings</p> <p>b) The impact on the visual amenity of the canal corridor users.</p> <p>Based on the information available our substantive response (as required by the Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)) is to advise that suitably worded conditions are necessary to address these matters. Our advice and comments follow:</p> <p>The tent and apparent associated items (e.g. horsebox) form a level of undesirable visual clutter that would not be acceptable in the long term</p>

	<p>in this location, as they do not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or the setting of the listed pub building, severing the visual connection between the site and the canal corridor.</p> <p>Whilst the form and colour of the tent is not as damaging as other forms of marquee might be, we could not support it as a permanent feature. We also recognise that it does not attach to any historic fabric and as such does not cause long term harm from its fixings. However, we acknowledge the current circumstances and need for such an installation on a temporary basis, and therefore suggest that if permission is granted, a condition is attached that requires its removal within a reasonable period of time 3 years from installation at most in order to assist in the economic recovery of the local area without prejudicing the long-term character, appearance and setting of the historic environment.</p> <p>We also ask that if permission is granted, any controls over opening and operating hours of the main public house be extended (or more stringent ones considered) to include the tent and external space if this is not already the case, in order to protect the amenity of those on boats and in other surrounding accommodation.</p> <p>Comments as landowner</p> <p>The land contained within both the red and blue lines is wholly within the ownership of the Trust and leased to other parties. However, we note that the Applicant has completed Certificate B but not included the Trust. We advise that no Notice appears to have been served on us by the Applicant. We also note that no agreement with the Trust has been entered into to allow the installation of the tent on the site and advise the applicant that they should make contact with the Trust separately to address this matter.</p> <p>Should planning permission be granted we request that the following informative is appended to the decision notice:</p> <p>The applicant/developer is advised to contact Bernadette McNicholas of the CRT Estates Team on 07920 495745 or Bernadette.mcnicholas@canalrivertrust.org.uk in order to ensure that the necessary licences or agreements are obtained prior to any further works being carried out on Trust owned land.</p> <p>For us to monitor effectively our role as a statutory consultee, please send me a copy of the decision notice and</p>
Archaeology Unit (HCC)	Unlikely to have a significant impact on heritage assets.
Parish/Town Council	<p>Objection</p> <p>While the Committee is sympathetic to the changes businesses adopt to operate while customers maintain social distancing during the Covid Pandemic, it objected to the prospect of this being a permanent location</p>

	<p>for a temporary structure as it compromises the setting of a Listed Building and impacts negatively on car parking and in the adjacent streets. If permission for a temporary structure is granted the Committee request this be for a time-limited period to end on the 31 October 2021. A licence to play music in the Temporary Tent must have due regard for the amenity of residents in George St and Cedar Road and to finish at a suitable time, e.g., 9pm, to minimise disturbance to neighbours. The Committee also objected to the proposed use of amplification and requested that the Environment Officer institute suitable conditions if the application is to be granted.</p> <p>CS12</p>
<p>Lead Local Flood Authority (HCC)</p>	<p>As this is a minor application, we are not statutory consultee, however we are happy to provide advice to the LPA.</p> <p>The site of the proposed tent sits between a mapped Main River, the River Bulbourne and a mapped Ordinary watercourse, the Grand Union Canal.</p> <p>From a review of the Environment Agency's national Risk of Flooding from Surface Water mapping, the site is not at a high risk of surface water flooding, that is an event with a 3.33% chance of occurring in any given year. Due to the position of the site, the site becomes more surrounded at a medium risk of surface water flooding during a 1% event. However, the site itself is shown to be at low risk of surface water flooding (0.1% chance of occurring in any given year event).</p> <p>As the site is bounded by the Grand Union Canal on its northern boundary, which is also designated an Ordinary watercourse, the LPA may wish to consult the Canal and River Trust. The owner of the site also has riparian responsibilities.</p> <p>As the site is bounded by a mapped Main River on its southern boundary, the LPA may wish to consult the Environment Agency. The site does not look to be at risk of Flood Zone 3 or Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>From a review of the Proposed Tent Plan, 20011-101, dated Dec 20, prepared by Rebecca Morgan Associates, the proposed tent is sited on an existing use of Canal Side Parking.</p> <p>We can advise that we would have no objection to the above application.</p> <p>Informative to the LPA</p> <p>Please note, if the LPA decides to grant planning permission, we wish</p>

	<p>to be notified for our records.</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting us on the above application for the Retention of temporary canvas tent to rear of public house, to provide covered external space for public house customers at The Old Mill, London Road, Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire, HP4 2NB.</p> <p>As this is a minor application, we are not statutory consultee, however we are happy to provide advice to the LPA.</p> <p>We previously provided comments on this application in our letter dated 22 January 2021. The applicant has submitted updated/amended plans and drawings. Whilst the position of the tent has changed slightly, this does not change our previous position, included again below for clarity.</p> <p>The site of the proposed tent sits between a mapped Main River, the River Bulbourne and a mapped Ordinary watercourse, the Grand Union Canal.</p> <p>From a review of the Environment Agency's national Risk of Flooding from Surface Water mapping, the site is not at a high risk of surface water flooding, that is an event with a 3.33% chance of occurring in any given year. Due to the position of the site, the site becomes more surrounded at a medium risk of surface water flooding during a 1% event. However, the site itself is shown to be at low risk of surface water flooding (0.1% chance of occurring in any given year event).</p> <p>As the site is bounded by the Grand Union Canal on its northern boundary, which is also designated an Ordinary watercourse, the LPA may wish to consult the Canal and River Trust. The owner of the site also has riparian responsibilities.</p> <p>As the site is bounded by a mapped Main River on its southern boundary, the LPA may wish to consult the Environment Agency. The site does not look to be at risk of Flood Zone 3 or Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>From a review of the Proposed Tent Plan, 20011-101, dated Dec 20, prepared by Rebecca Morgan Associates, the proposed tent is sited on an existing use of Canal Side Parking.</p> <p>We can advise that we would have no objection to the above application.</p> <p>Informative to the LPA</p> <p>Please note, if the LPA decides to grant planning permission, we wish to be notified for our records.</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>30.12.20</p> <p>I have read the supporting statement submitted by the applicant regarding proposed use.</p> <p>Following the installation of the tent at the Old Mill ECP received 12 complaints alleging noise nuisance from outdoor music events. Although the licensee has strongly denied there ever being a problem,</p>

	<p>12 complaints is considered as substantial.</p> <p>I have been subject to part of the pre-application process where it was outlined to the applicant that a noise report would be required to support the application, and for the continued use of the tent to provide entertainment. Due to impact of COIVD-19 and various restrictions imposed on licensed premises the applicant has been unable to commission an assessment. However there is a risk of enforcement action to remove the structure if not regularised by an application to retain the use, and why I understand the application has been made absent a supporting noise report.</p> <p>Therefore I am objecting to the retention of the tent on noise grounds, but only on the basis of the tent being retained to include the provision of entertainment / functions. However I would not maintain an objection on the basis that the tent is approved subject to a condition which prohibits entertainment taking place within the tent, or used for seating of an audience (for example where the entertainer operates from outside the tent, but the audience are placed inside the tent).</p> <p>I have also noted the suggestion (in the supporting statement) of using a Grampian condition that would preclude entertainment from taking place unless the LPA is satisfied that such events can take place without loss of amenity to existing residential neighbours. This would be a practical alternative as it's likely that some form of performance could take place, either due to the nature of performance (which excludes electrical amplification of instrument / voice) and / or limiting restricting outdoor performance in time, duration and frequency each month so as to limit effect. Possibly this could be caught up within a noise management plan?</p> <p>Subject to your consideration of the above, I can work up some conditions in respect of both eventualities.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the above application. We have no objections to the proposed development.</p> <p>Informative - Flood Risk Activity Permit</p> <p>The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for any activities which will take place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal) on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culvert (16 metres if tidal) on or within 16 metres of a sea defence involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood

	<p>defence (including a remote defence) or culvert in a floodplain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure (16 metres if it's a tidal main river) and you don't already have planning permission.</p> <p>The applicant should not assume that a permit will automatically be forthcoming once planning permission has been granted, and we advise them to consult with us at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>Final comments Thank you for contacting us regarding the above application. Our comments are based on our available records and the information submitted to us. Please quote our reference number in any future correspondence. Please provide us with a copy of the decision notice for our records. This would be greatly appreciated.</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.</p> <p>Planning Application The planning application for retention of temporary tent for external covers land rear of the Old Mill Public House.</p> <p>Site and surrounding The application site is Old Mill Public House, London Road, Berkhamsted. The tent, which measures approximately 25 x 15 metres, erected in direct response to the current pandemic, which has required the public house to significantly adapt to the way that it operates. Applicant's intention is to keep it in position for the coming months.</p> <p>Access and Parking There is no proposal to alter the existing access or parking arrangement.</p> <p>Conclusion The Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of consent.</p>
Canal & River Trust	<p>From the information available on your website it does not appear that any detail has been submitted in relation to the elevation of the proposed toilet block. The proposals for foul discharge are also not</p>

	<p>indicated. Prior to our formal response on this consultation please would you be able to provide further detail on these matters? In addition, could you confirm if the intention is for the toilet block to also be temporary?</p>
<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>22.3.21</p> <p>Thank you for consulting us on the above application. We have no objections to the application based on temporary permission being granted. Informative - Flood Risk Activity Permit The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for any activities which will take place: • on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal) • on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culvert (16 metres if tidal) • on or within 16 metres of a sea defence • involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert • in a floodplain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure (16 metres if it's a tidal main river) and you don't already have planning permission. For further guidance please visit https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities_environmental-permits or contact our National Customer Contact Centre on 03702 422 549 or by emailing enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk. The applicant should not assume that a permit will automatically be forthcoming once planning permission has been granted, and we advise them to consult with us at the earliest opportunity. Final comments Thank you for contacting us regarding the above application. Our comments are based on our available records and the information submitted to us. Please quote our reference number in any future correspondence. Please provide us with a copy of the decision notice for our records. This would be greatly appreciated.</p> <p>17.3.21</p> <p>Our Flood risk team require some further info regarding the toilets.</p> <p>Please can the applicant confirm where the toilets were previously? We need to ensure that the flood risk is at least the same and does not increase. And we also require detailed information about the sewage pipe like the size etc?</p> <p>We need this and depending on the information a Flood Risk Activity Permit may not be granted and the change of location of the toilets may not go ahead. The feeling I get from our Flood Risk specialists is that the pipe over the river is a main concern.</p>

	<p>12.3.21</p> <p>We have been re-consulted on this application following the change of plan to place toilets on the other side of the river.</p> <p>We are unable to tell from the plans but are the toilets permanent? If so how is their drainage connected, or are they portaloos?</p> <p>Any information you have would be most useful as these details will affect how we respond to this application.</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>8.3.21</p> <p>The application has not included an assessment of the likely noise impact due to entertainment. The current system of tiering (COVID) restrictions has, for the most part, prevented the Old Mill from hosting events and so understandable why this was not possible.</p> <p>The tent structure itself is not the cause for concern, but the manner in how it will. Complaints have arisen because it has been used for entertainment for pub customers. These were received when the pub started hosting outdoor entertainment. Mostly this has been loud music but some suggested associated PA noise arising from quizzes.</p> <p>Absent a noise assessment the applicant isn't able demonstrate the impact from entertainment. This does not preclude the tent from being retained for other uses, e.g. outdoor dining or additional drinking space, especially non-household groups.</p> <p>There are 2 possible conditions applied as a subject to permission.</p> <p>Option 1: No entertainment is permitted.</p> <p>What do you want the condition to achieve? To prohibit the use of the tent for entertainment or being used to house an audience which could spectate on an event outside the structure, i.e. where a performer sets up on a stage in the garden but the audience remains under the tent, e.g. for shelter.</p> <p>A subsequent application could be made to vary this condition. This needs to be made clear to the applicant that the scope to vary will be an option.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>The tent shall not be used for, or for housing an audience for, the performance / provision of any entertainment</p>

	<p>Option 2: Entertainment is precluded until demonstrated it will not have an adverse impact</p> <p>What do you want the condition to achieve? To prevent the tent being from used for entertainment until such time as it can be demonstrated it will be acceptable in the locality and that suitable controls can be implemented throughout the life of the development.</p> <p>Entertainment could be considered acceptable, for example because it is of such limited frequency and duration (e.g. once month, ends before 21:30, lasts no greater than 2 hours, unamplified single performer, does not occur on consecutive days / weekends), or the nature of entertainment simply does not intrude and there is no impact, e.g. background music, a small play.</p> <p>Controls might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Frequency o Duration o Time of day o Only allowing certain types of act and / or mixing with other less intrusive forms of entertainment o No electronically amplified performances o Use of limiting equipment (unlikely to succeed as limiters operate at volumes likely to be audible off-site) <p>We will not know the impact until the assessment is completed, and a degree of what amounts to reasonable use.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>The tent shall not be used for, or for housing an audience for, the performance / provision of any entertainment until a noise control scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The noise control scheme shall include an assessment of the likely noise impact from entertainment and specify measures to be made for its control, and to be implemented against the development in perpetuity. The noise control scheme shall be compiled by appropriately experienced and competent persons.</p>
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	The Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of consent
Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)	<p>8.2.21 Absent a noise assessment we cannot consent to the proposal of entertainment once a month until further information is submitted.</p> <p>Even with an acoustic guitar set, performers will require microphones for singing resulting in some level of amplification. Similarly a jazz set</p>

	<p>will involve instruments which are naturally amplified and can reach quite high sound levels, e.g. trumpet, saxophone, percussion. Keeping levels below 80 dBA for live music at source would be very difficult to achieve. 80 dBA would be regarded a background level such that it would not intrude with conversation.</p> <p>A measured sound level is distance dependant. At source is vague and whether this means 1m, 2m or 5m from the band or performer. The further away this distance is stated from source the less attenuation (reduction) with distance. At 5m, a level of 80 dBA would reduce to 64 dBA at 35m. This proximity of a residential receptor across the canal and so realistic indication of distance from site. Without measuring other elements of the sound environment this would be an audible sound source and with increasing frequency and duration a potentially intrusive source of sound. I would not want to agree to a sound level which then becomes overly restrictive to the premises.</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>25.1.21 I've drafted some conditions below and expanded upon reasoning for both.</p> <p>The application has not included an assessment of the likely noise impact due to entertainment. The current system of tiering (COVID) restrictions has, for the most part, prevented the Old Mill from hosting events and so understandable why this was not possible.</p> <p>The tent structure itself is not the cause for concern, but the manner in how it will. Complaints have arisen because it has been used for entertainment for pub customers. These were received when the pub started hosting outdoor entertainment. Mostly this has been loud music but some suggested associated PA noise arising from quizzes.</p> <p>Absent a noise assessment the applicant isn't able demonstrate the impact from entertainment. This does not preclude the tent from being retained for other uses, e.g. outdoor dining or additional drinking space, especially non-household groups.</p> <p>There are 2 possible conditions applied as a subject to permission.</p> <p>Option 1: No entertainment is permitted.</p> <p>What do you want the condition to achieve? To prohibit the use of the tent for entertainment or being used to house an audience which could spectate on an event outside the structure, i.e. where a performer sets up on a stage in the garden but the audience remains under the tent, e.g. for shelter.</p>

A subsequent application could be made to vary this condition. This needs to be made clear to the applicant that the scope to vary will be an option.

Suggested wording:

The tent shall not be used for, or for housing an audience for, the performance / provision of any entertainment

Option 2: Entertainment is precluded until demonstrated it will not have an adverse impact

What do you want the condition to achieve? To prevent the tent being from used for entertainment until such time as it can be demonstrated it will be acceptable in the locality and that suitable controls can be implemented throughout the life of the development.

Entertainment could be considered acceptable, for example because it is of such limited frequency and duration (e.g. once month, ends before 21:30, lasts no greater than 2 hours, unamplified single performer, does not occur on consecutive days / weekends), or the nature of entertainment simply does not intrude and there is no impact, e.g. background music, a small play.

Controls might include:

- o Frequency
- o Duration
- o Time of day
- o Only allowing certain types of act and / or mixing with other less intrusive forms of entertainment
- o No electronically amplified performances
- o Use of limiting equipment (unlikely to succeed as limiters operate at volumes likely to be audible off-site)

We will not know the impact until the assessment is completed, and a degree of what amounts to reasonable use.

Suggested wording:

The tent shall not be used for, or for housing an audience for, the performance / provision of any entertainment until a noise control scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The noise control scheme shall include an assessment of the likely noise impact from entertainment and specify measures to be made for its control, and to be implemented against the development in perpetuity. The noise control scheme shall be compiled

	by appropriately experienced and competent persons.
Conservation & Design (DBC)	<p>The old mill building is a pleasant 2 storey brick building with pitched tiled roofs dating from the 18th and 19th century. The mill has been converted to a pub. It is grade II listed. Associated with this industrial complex is the surviving lade, mill cottage and former wharf buildings. These have also now been converted. Together they make a pleasant group. The site in question is a car park area on the small island between the lade/ river and the canal. On the opposite bank of the canal is the tow path allowing views across into the site. Beyond this are modern houses of lesser interest.</p> <p>Historic maps indicate that it seems to have been an orchard/ open space although it has been a car park for some time.</p> <p>We would hope that the current use of the building including public access can be maintained in the long term allowing both local residents and visitors to appreciate this important historic building and its setting. We would therefore support the use as a public house. Given the unusual circumstances, the Covid restrictions and the need for social distancing we would not object to the tent for a short period of time. It is of a higher standard of design than a standard marquee, relatively low and of a neutral colour. As such we would not object to this being in place during the current period to allow the business to continue to survive and operate.</p> <p>However we would have concerns about the structure remaining in position permanently.</p> <p>Were this to come forward as a permanent application this would have an impact on the setting and significance of the listed buildings. The area in question would appear to be in the curtilage and in the main seems always to have been an open area which allowed views through from the canal. The proposal would permanently disrupt these views. This would cause harm to the setting of the listed building. The design would also be somewhat out of keeping with the context. Whilst there may have been some storage on the site it is unlikely to have been permanent and in any event there were other purpose built stores adjacent to the mill.</p> <p>Therefore we believe that there would be less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building. This harm would be outweighed by the benefit of keeping the business viable in the current extreme circumstances but we do not believe that it would be outweighed were this to be a permanent feature. Therefore it would be recommended that following latest government estimates that say a 9 month temporary permission is granted.</p>

	<p>If there is a need in the longer term to have either this or a more permeant development it would be advisable to have a pre application meeting on site to consider location design and detailing. This would also require a heritage impact assessment to be drawn up which is missing from the current submission.</p> <p>Recommendation We would not object to a temporary permission to allow the business to survive in the short term. However in the longer term it would have a harmful impact on the setting of the listed building and therefore if this is required for the business in the long term pre application discussions should take place to ensure that a successful and more appropriate long term solution can be arrived at.</p>
--	---

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
47	32	0	15	17

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
44 Bridgewater Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1JB	<p>The owner of the Old Mill has gone over and above to support the community during the pandemic. He has provided much needed supplies to the town, provided free food to vulnerable families and offered refuge for clinically vulnerable people by way of the tent which enables us to meet with friends in a safe outdoor, well ventilated, sterile environment.</p> <p>Despite temporary concerns from local households, the mental health benefits to the community are second to none. This tent should be allowed to remain until the worst of the pandemic is over to (when permitted) enable residents of Berkhamsted to meet socially and have some semblance of normality AND to allow one of our local businesses to survive!!!</p> <p>To remove this tent Will have a really detrimental effect on a community that has limited options to socialise safely. Would the objectors prefer people to cram inside another local pub and spread the virus some more I wonder????</p>
38 Old Mill Gardens Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2NZ	<p>Brings revenue to the area. Employs many more in the 'food chain' creating more job opportunities.</p> <p>Becomes a hub of the immediate local community while bringing those outside in to the area. Show cases new talent and opportunities.</p>

	<p>Allows access to able and less able people. Show cased live music brings hope and inspiration. Allows vulnerable members of the community to enjoy the space while still feeling safe. Has a positive affect on those with mental health issues. Has the potential to be a great venue for charitable events further helping the wider community. Allows those not wanting to have the smell of alcohol shoved up their noses to enjoy the outdoor space in poor weather. A safe place to be keeping social distancing even after this pandemic. Particularly beneficial to those who do have low immune systems through poor health. Have they not been locked up and confined enough? And the bottom line is this...people don't like change when it happens on their door step. What those people need to realise is that their house was once a field....so I'm pretty sure the wildlife living there before they moved in are a bit pissed about having a concrete fortress dumped on their natural habitat. Move on, enjoy life, help others to enjoy their life to. Live and let live and pop to the tent and have some fun. You're a long time dead.</p>
<p>30 Lombardy Drive Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2LG</p>	<p>Converting part of the public houses car park to an outside venue has resulted in a great increase in noise. Particularly at the weekend when live music events are held. These take place Saturday night and Sunday afternoon. We live 80 meters away and can hear the microphoned music over our tv, even with the windows closed. During the summer and autumn when using our garden the noise drowned out our own conversation. Calls to the pub to request the volume be turned down, were greeted with 'we're allowed to play it this loud' Even without the music events, the noise affects the enjoyment of our own property due to the extra noise emitting from the tent.</p>
<p>9 Castle Hill Avenue Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1HJ</p>	<p>I support this proposal. Local businesses, musicians, entertainers, and pubs / hospitality especially, need to be given every assistance possible to withstand the economic consequences of the Covid lockdowns and associated restrictions.</p> <p>The event covering is a temporary structure and so the permission can be reviewed in the longer term, but for the time being, with social distancing going to be a requirement probably for the rest of 2021 at least, hospitality businesses need to be allowed to expand their floor space as much as they can.</p> <p>I understand parking is cited as one issue, however the landlord has retained I believe sufficient spaces to the side of the tent and also in the parking area nearest the road. The landlord is aware of residents concerns on this and I know asks his customers not to park in side roads. The pub is walkable from town in any case and there are very good taxi services locally which we should also be supporting.</p>
<p>88B High Street Berkhamsted</p>	<p>I support this initiative from the Old Mill because it offers something for the Community at a very difficult time. I understand that the owner has</p>

<p>Hertfordshire HP4 2BW</p>	<p>made provision to further limit any sound impact and is only asking for permission for early evening music events at the weekend.</p> <p>In addition it is essentially a temporary structure - so why not grant them permission for a limited time so that everyone can see how it works?</p> <p>All those working in hospitality have suffered dreadfully in this pandemic and so the prospect of saving 25 jobs must surely be considered seriously in relation to this application.</p> <p>As for the comments about its suitability in the Conservation area, perhaps people should look at former photos of Berkhamsted where awnings and canvas structures can be seen. Or they could go and look at the marquee at Berkhamsted School which is also in the Conservation area.</p>
<p>Lorelei George Street Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2EW</p>	<p>This application, if granted, will inevitably lead to severe noise pollution, which we have already found unacceptable from the Old Mill over the years.</p>
<p>21 Howard Agne Close Bovingdon Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0EQ</p>	<p>I fully support this application, it will bring much needed joy to the local community I fully support this I support this application. It will bring much to the area</p>
<p>15 Verney Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5LB</p>	<p>I fully support this application to retain the tented area. This man has gone to a great deal of expense to erect covering in inclement weather so that people who are desperate for some respite from these Covid restrictions can take part in a well supervised and authorised Covid secure location outdoors to enjoy some music, entertainment and drinks. People have been deprived for so long of these comforting habits that I think the limited times he is proposing should be acceptable to those neighbours who may be affected by this tent. If they buy properties near pubs they must expect a little bit of noise during opening hours. Lots of people are being denied this chance to resume some sense of normality because of the actions of a very few.</p>
<p>34 Valley Road Northchurch Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3PZ</p>	<p>The Old Mill as a business have supported 2 local charities at the beginning of the pandemic. They are always supporting the community and bring something unique to the town.</p>
<p>35 Holly Drive Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2JR</p>	<p>I believe it is good for local. Business and a benefit to the community</p>
<p>5 Cedar Way Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2LD</p>	<p>Good afternoon</p> <p>I would like to oppose this planning application in the strongest terms for the reasons which are detailed below.</p>

	<p>Noise nuisance</p> <p>I have lived approximately 200m from the pub for several years and have never heard any noise whatsoever. Since the tent was erected I can hear the music quite clearly within my garden and house. I cannot sit outside and enjoy my garden when the outdoor music is playing and must keep the windows closed regardless of the temperature. Whilst the live outdoor music stopped at 9pm during the Autumn, which may have been due to government guidelines, it regularly continued until 10.30pm or later prior to this. Music was also played during the afternoons over the weekend.</p> <p>I contacted the landlord to explain that I could hear the music 200m away and asked him to turn it down or off. The landlord suggested I either come down and support a local business or contact Environmental Health if I wanted to complain. He went on to advise that he knows his rights and that he was operating within them with music at 90 decibels - he was not going to turn the music down or off. This response does not suggest a responsible or reasonable landlord. The landlord suggests that he fears for the future of the pub. However, previous landlords have not held live music and events outdoors, yet the pub has been incredibly popular and busy and employed a full complement of staff.</p> <p>Live music and events outdoors in a residential area are completely inappropriate. The effect of the noise and disturbance to local residents is incalculable in terms of their mental health and well-being. If I can clearly hear the music 200m away, it must be awful for those living closer to the pub.</p> <p>If this noise disturbance continues it will ultimately have an adverse effect on the town and also on property prices in the area. Who wants to live in a neighbourhood where they have to listen to loud music and events every weekend and possibly during the week?</p> <p>Parking</p> <p>The landlord has suggested the tent is located in a 'large unused space to the rear of the public house'. This is not true. The tent is located in part of the pub car park. Historically there was plenty of parking, now there is just a small car park to the front. If the tent receives planning permission customers will have to park in the surrounding residential streets which are already congested at times.</p> <p>Customers would likely use Bank Mill Lane which is unsuitable for parked cars and will become dangerous for motorists, walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>The application shows cars parked in the rear car park by the tent. This is inaccurate. The rear car park is accessed via a bridge which has a mobile coffee/drinks bar on it so cars cannot get across. Also, tables and chairs are often located in this area since the tent was erected.</p> <p>The pub already has plenty of outside space for eating and drinking within its grounds under normal circumstances. The tent needs to be removed and the car park should be reinstated as soon as the current Covid restrictions are removed. In the interim, no live outdoor music or events should be permitted at any time.</p> <p>Conservation Area / Wildlife</p> <p>The Old Mill is located in the conservation area of Berkhamsted. The</p>
--	--

	<p>stretch tent does not enhance the character or appearance of the pub or the local area as required within a conservation area. The canal provides a wonderful habitat for all kinds of wildlife. Outdoor live music and events would likely have a very negative impact on this.</p> <p>Many local residents and those from further afield enjoy walking along the canal in Berkhamsted and value the peace and quiet. There is much evidence to suggest that being near water and walking brings a range of health and well-being benefits. It also benefits local businesses as walkers often stop at the local pubs, restaurants and so forth.</p> <p>Permanent / Temporary Application</p> <p>It is unclear whether the landlord is making a permanent or temporary application for the stretch tent. Once the Covid restrictions are lifted there is absolutely no reason to retain the tent.</p> <p>Flood Risk Assessment</p> <p>The landlord suggests that the site does not flood and that the tent will not affect the flow of water should a flood occur. Presumably all appropriate Flood Risk Assessments will take place as required?</p> <p>Environmental and Community Protection (DBC) Comments</p> <p>I note that the Environmental and Community Protection (E&CP) have added comments advising that 12 complaints as at Monday, 11 January 2021 was '...considered as substantial'. The author focuses on the noise issues and proposes drafting conditions limiting the noise through time, duration and frequency each month so as to limit effect.</p> <p>Clearly many local residents are upset and angered by the noise and other issues. Why are the E&CP looking at ways to limit the effect of the noise rather than stopping it completely?</p> <p>Also, is there a reason why the E&CP have focused on the noise nuisance when there are clearly many other issues at play, including protecting a Conservation Area, Health and Safety and ultimately what sort of place we want Berkhamsted to be amongst others. Are these not also the remit of the E&CP?</p>
<p>27 Tresco Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3LA</p>	<p>The landlord at the Old Mill has been instrumental in the help that has been provided to multiple residents of Berkhamsted since COVID began. He has had many issues due the rules changing yet he is always up beat and always looking out for his community, staff and patrons.</p> <p>This tent in the garden area is a lifeline for him. It helps to keep his business afloat and keep 30 plus people in work.</p>

	<p>It would be a shame if he was not allowed to have this structure in his pub.</p>
<p>18 Admiral Way Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1TE</p>	<p>I am supporting Andy's planning for the canopy as I feel this is a great addition to the venue. There are very few substantial outside eating/drinking venues in Berkhamsted and Andy has worked really hard to improve the reputation and look of the Old Mill. We were incredibly fortunate last year to have our wedding reception under the canopy and have seen first hand what a beautiful space it is. The canopy will provide shelter outside during the cooler months and shade during the hotter times, ultimately meaning they can serve the community more efficiently. During this past year the Old Mill has supported our community with their shop, food and service, I feel they deserve something back from us, and realistically us customers are the ones to really benefit....</p>
<p>Berrystead Cottage George Street Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2EW</p>	<p>Re: 20/03940/FUL Old Mill, Berkhamsted. HP4 2NB</p> <p>NOISE This very large, circus type tent is nearer to neighbours than to the Old Mill and takes up most of a large car park. Its main use is music and events and has been positioned with no consideration to any neighbours quality of life. Live music has been played every weekend - and sometimes during the week - including quizzes by microphone and karaoke, and the sound is amplified as the Old Mill area is at the bottom of a valley. This noise from music AND customers means that use of our outdoor space to pursue normal, peaceful activities with family has been impossible. The noise can still be heard indoors with windows and doors shut.</p> <p>ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR A live music event on 12 Dec 2020 was accompanied by social behaviour unacceptable at anytime, in or outside licensed premises. Men were urinating into the canal, clearly visible from the towpath. Their reaction was 'F--- Off' when seen. Young girls have also been seen vomiting into the canal. It is only a matter of time before someone falls into the canal after dark and the police etc possibly having to search for a body.</p> <p>CAR PARKING This is NOT an unused space as stated in the Planning Application. Approximately 30 car parking spaces have been lost causing the surrounding lanes to be congested and obstructed. The lanes are narrow, especially Bank Mill Lane, which has no footpath and a blind bend - accidents waiting to happen.</p> <p>CONSERVATION/HISTORICAL AREA How does a 21st Century circus type tent compliment and have a positive impact adjoining a Grade 2 listed building? The Old Mill and Wharf are part of Berkhamsted's history - an area mentioned in the Domesday Book. The Grand Union Canal is a Wildlife Corridor welcoming visitors to the town and the towpath is well used by residents. At the main entrance to the tent at the Old Mill, is a large</p>

	<p>toilet block and refreshment van, which now dominate a listed building in a Conservation area. Both of these are temporary but have been permanent since June 2020. Is this another Planning Issue when Covid restrictions are lifted?</p> <p>COMMENT Personal outdoor space should be a place of peace and enjoyment. These are being denied us by the noise of the events and the behaviour of those attending.</p>
<p>Frerdos George Street Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2EW</p>	<p>My family's house backs on to the Grand Union Canal, not far from the Old Mill pub garden.</p> <p>Since erecting the tent, over the summer, the Old Mill pub has held very loud outdoor events with loud music as well as a live compere using a microphone. The quiz nights are so loud that we can answer the questions from inside our home with the windows closed! The tent appeared to be packed with people on the weekends, despite the need for social distancing, which also created a roar of loud conversation that travels to all surrounding homes. The impact on us is as follows: 1) The sound levels are so loud that our children (one aged 9) struggle to get to sleep at their 8:30pm bedtime. 2) The noise continues late into the night sometimes affecting adult sleep also. 3) We have tried to have limited guests over to socialise safely in our garden but we struggle to hold a conversation owing to the loud music and compere. 4) The new outdoor layout/tent has taken over most of the pub car park. The old car park always used to be full so since the new layout, especially over the summer, Bank Mill Lane can become packed with the parked cars of pub customers. This is a narrow road with a blind corner and no pavement. Pedestrians (some with pushchairs/prams) must walk in the middle of the road and take their chances with oncoming cars. It is just not safe - the pub needs to provide more parking for its customers. 5) The structures that they have erected next to the canal are unattractive and a blight on the beautiful Berkhamsted canal-side as they are completely visible to those living or walking along the canal towpath. The tent is also out of character with the attractive pub buildings.</p>
<p>Birchwood George Street Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2EW</p>	<p>We OBJECT to the application for the retention of the tent for following reasons:</p> <p>Noise Nuisance The application states "prior to the recent second lockdown, live music was provided on Saturday night, on a strict time-limited basis, 6pm - 9.30pm only". This is not true. During the summer the Old Mill had amplified live music events, quizzes and karaoke every Saturday and Sunday, often from midday until 11pm and on regular weekday evenings. The sound and atmosphere was not that of the chatter of a local beer garden but more</p>

	<p>like a large party; drunken voices shouting to be heard above loud music, swearing and shrieking.</p> <p>The landlord feels the impact of the noise is "negligible". We totally dispute this and during one music event in July 2020, I could hear the music clearly standing by the Boat pub which is a considerable distance away. This total disregard of neighbours rendered the use and enjoyment of our garden impossible.</p> <p>Account needs to be taken of the topography of the site. The already loud, amplified noise is further amplified by the water and the natural bowl of the valley.</p> <p>If this is to go ahead, it must be done with a strict maximum decibel rating. The Old Mill is a pub not a concert venue.</p> <p>Temporary or permanent? It is unclear whether permission is being sought for this tent to remain indefinitely or until the end of COVID restrictions.</p> <p>Therefore, when Covid restrictions cease, there is no basis for this tent to remain.</p> <p>If any permission is contemplated it should be strictly temporary and directly linked to Covid restrictions being in force that affect the normal use of the pub. Amplified music and other events need to be limited.</p> <p>Vehicle Parking Question 9 on the application asks "Does the site remove any parking spaces?" The applicant has responded 'NO'. It is described as an 'unused space'.</p> <p>The truth is the Tented music venue has been erected in the main car park of the Old Mill. In another planning application (Ref. No: 20/01780/TCA) seeking permission to fell trees on the same site, the applicant has described this area as the 'car park'.</p> <p>This Tent removes the majority of the Old Mill's parking spaces with the knock-on effect of vehicles being parked in Bank Mill Lane. On busy evenings at the Old Mill parked vehicles were bumper to bumper in Bank Mill Lane. This is a narrow lane with no footpath and minimal lighting; large number of parked cars are a danger to pedestrians and other road users. We feel unsafe walking on the lane in that situation.</p> <p>Conservation Area The applicant states that the tent "has a positive impact on the setting of the grade 2 listed public house, complementing its setting." In a Conservation Area proposed developments "must preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic character of the conservation area". This tent may be functional under Covid restrictions but long term, but is clearly unacceptable in normal circumstances.</p> <p>Flood Risk Assessment</p>
--	---

	<p>All recent planning proposals on neighbouring sites to the Old Mill e.g. loft conversions, Garden studios etc. have required a Flood Risk Assessment due to the area being in Flood Zone 2 and 3. The Old Mill Application suggests that this is not required. Why not? We OBJECT to the application for the retention of the tent for following reasons:</p> <p>Noise Nuisance The application states "prior to the recent second lockdown, live music was provided on Saturday night, on a strict time-limited basis, 6pm - 9.30pm only". This is not true. During the summer the Old Mill had amplified live music events, quizzes and karaoke every Saturday and Sunday, often from midday until 11pm and on regular weekday evenings. The sound and atmosphere was not that of the chatter of a local beer garden but more like a large party; drunken voices shouting to be heard above loud music, swearing and shrieking.</p> <p>The landlord feels the impact of the noise is "negligible". We totally dispute this and during one music event in July 2020, I could hear the music clearly standing by the Boat pub which is a considerable distance away. This total disregard of neighbours rendered the use and enjoyment of our garden impossible.</p> <p>Account needs to be taken of the topography of the site. The already loud, amplified noise is further amplified by the water and the natural bowl of the valley.</p> <p>If this is to go ahead, it must be done with a strict maximum decibel rating. The Old Mill is a pub not a concert venue.</p> <p>Temporary or permanent? It is unclear whether permission is being sought for this tent to remain indefinitely or until the end of COVID restrictions.</p> <p>Therefore, when Covid restrictions cease, there is no basis for this tent to remain.</p> <p>If any permission is contemplated it should be strictly temporary and directly linked to Covid restrictions being in force that affect the normal use of the pub. Amplified music and other events need to be limited.</p> <p>Vehicle Parking Question 9 on the application asks "Does the site remove any parking spaces?" The applicant has responded 'NO'. It is described as an 'unused space'.</p> <p>The truth is the Tented music venue has been erected in the main car park of the Old Mill. In another planning application (Ref. No: 20/01780/TCA) seeking permission to fell trees on the same site, the applicant has described this area as the 'car park'.</p> <p>This Tent removes the majority of the Old Mill's parking spaces with the knock-on effect of vehicles being parked in Bank Mill Lane. On busy</p>
--	---

	<p>evenings at the Old Mill parked vehicles were bumper to bumper in Bank Mill Lane. This is a narrow lane with no footpath and minimal lighting; large number of parked cars are a danger to pedestrians and other road users. We feel unsafe walking on the lane in that situation.</p> <p>Conservation Area The applicant states that the tent "has a positive impact on the setting of the grade 2 listed public house, complementing its setting." In a Conservation Area proposed developments "must preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic character of the conservation area". This tent may be functional under Covid restrictions but long term, but is clearly unacceptable in normal circumstances.</p> <p>Flood Risk Assessment All recent planning proposals on neighbouring sites to the Old Mill e.g. loft conversions, Garden studios etc. have required a Flood Risk Assessment due to the area being in Flood Zone 2 and 3. The Old Mill Application suggests that this is not required. Why not?</p>
<p>Old Mill Cottage Bank Mill Lane Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2NT</p>	<p>We are objecting to the permanent nature of this planning application.</p> <p>Our house is located directly next door to the Old Mill pub, with our garden boundary neighbouring the entire width of the carpark with only a timber fence for separation. Being in such close proximity to the Old Mill pub, this application raises significant concerns. Our objections to this application are:</p> <p>The structure is not in keeping or sympathetic with the historic Old Mill site: The character and history of the entire Old Mill development is utterly compromised by this structure, which bears no resemblance to its surroundings. We disagree that the structure 'complements its grade 2 setting'.</p> <p>The structure damages the natural beauty and wildlife of this conservation area: The north west views from our property no longer look upriver and over the canal, instead, these areas of natural beauty are obscured by the sheer height and scale of the tent structure. We would normally expect to see ducks, swans, moorhens and geese within the carpark, particularly during mating season, all of which will be displaced should this structure become more of a permanent fixture on the site.</p> <p>An increase in noise: Whilst efforts may have been taken to dampen the sound, we have still experienced a considerable increase in noise during the live events. As the permanent structure is intended for 'live music and other functions', we have major concerns about the associated increase in noise and disagree that the increased noise levels are 'negligible'. Whilst we appreciate that we live next door to a public house, there is already provision internally for live music within the building-which outside of government COVID-19 restrictions comfortably facilitate the pub's requirements, without the need for an additional permanent structure. We have 2 young children, and this is a residential area, therefore it is unreasonable that loud music and other functions would be permitted 7</p>

	<p>days a week in a festival type structure.</p> <p>Problems with parking on Bank Mill Lane: The tent both increases the Old Mill's seated capacity, whilst reducing its ability to accommodate adequate parking for customers. As we are already seeing, there is considerable overflow onto Bank Mill Lane. This will be exacerbated in future when COVID-19 related government measures are relaxed/removed and the capacity at the Old Mill increases. We are already directly affected by this with the only access to our property being regularly blocked by cars from customers visiting the Old Mill pub. As no additional provision or plans for parking are being considered, approving this application will make Bank Mill Lane more congested and as a result, more dangerous.</p> <p>Anti-social behaviour concerns: Prior to the current management's occupancy, we have witnessed a number of anti-social events from drunken customers at the Old Mill pub. People being loud and aggressive, trespassing, glasses being thrown into our garden and smashing and multiple customers urinating against our fence from within the carpark. Whilst we haven't witnessed such events under the current management, the permanent nature of this application raises the possibility of more events such as these in future and significant concerns regarding our security.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the perpetuity of this application: The permanent nature of this application raises concerns as to how future landlords may choose to utilise this asset. We have chosen to live next door to a public house, not a festival style music venue.</p> <p>In summary, we appreciate that the last 12 months have been extremely difficult for everyone along with many businesses, not least those operating within the hospitality sector. We have supported the management of the Old Mill pub during this period and commend their efforts and ingenuity to remain open whenever possible as they fight to keep their business alive.</p> <p>Therefore, we have no objection to this temporary structure being used whilst significant government restrictions make it impossible for the Old Mill pub to run their business using the indoor resources available to them-in the way they operated pre-pandemic. Therefore, we have no objection to the structure being present for the remainder of 2021. Prior to the pandemic, patrons had always used the carpark and picnic benches within this beautiful setting-we have no objection to this continued use once the structure has been removed.</p> <p>However, we categorically object to this structure becoming a permanent fixture available at the management's disposal for the reasons stated herein. When the normal operation of the Old Mill can be restored, the tent structure should be removed.</p>
<p>The Old Cottage Bank Mill Lane Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2NS</p>	<p>I have lived on Bank Mill Lane for over 38 years so I know the Old Mill very well. For several years my husband and I would walk up to the Old Mill at least once a week for an excellent lunch, dinner or just for a coffee. It was a thriving, bustling and well-loved gastro pub. We felt lucky to have</p>

	<p>the Old Mill on our doorstep - it was a welcome and welcoming asset to the community. It was also a great place to meet friends who lived further afield as the Old Mill has, or rather had, plenty of parking.</p> <p>The Old Mill no longer has sufficient parking because the large tent has taken over the Car Park. Subsequently the customers now park in the surrounding streets - on some weekends last summer Bank Mill Lane was absolutely choked with parked cars. It is already a narrow lane with a dangerous corner and since the increase of parking caused by the loss of parking in the grounds of The Old Mill, pedestrians cannot walk in the lane safely. This is dangerous and a public nuisance especially for the elderly like myself or people with dogs or pushchairs who frequently have to take refuge between the parked cars.</p> <p>The 'circus' tent needs to be removed and the car park reinstated. The Old Mill already has plenty of attractive outside space (beer garden) that it can use for quiet dining and drinking and once the pandemic is over it will hopefully be able to return to the welcoming venue it was before the present chaotic events took place.</p>
<p>3 Chalet Close Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3NR</p>	<p>I'd like to support this application. I have not experience the music, but it's only on 2 days, and I hope some compromise can be found to limit its impact on neighbours' amenity. The tent was a godsend when we were allowed to eat outside during the summer - either to get out of the sun or shelter from the rain. Businesses have had to think on their feet during the pandemic to stay afloat, and we should not be putting obstacles in the way of that in these difficult times, even if that means a measure of compromise. The tent is about as far away as possible from the listed building, and, is in any case not unattractive. Although it does reduce on site parking, The Old Mill is walkable from almost any part of Berkhamsted (I manage it from the top of the valley at the other end of town !), and on street parking exists throughout the town.</p> <p>Can I add that the Old Mill did much for the community during the first lock down, when supermarket shelves were empty and delivery slots unavailable buy buying in from their wholesalers and delivering across the town.</p>
<p>Bulbourne, Bank Mill Lane Berkhamsted HP4 2NT</p>	<p>You will note from our address above that we are very close to the Old Mill and therefore thank you for your letter dated 21st December 2020 informing us of the application to temporarily retain the tent to the rear of the restaurant and pub.</p> <p>This matter is of great interest to us as we have been suffering from late night disruption caused by customers of the Old Mill parking in front of our house. This is because the tent occupies the majority of the former parking area.</p> <p>These customers typically generate noise and disturbance and since our bedrooms face Bank Mill Lane, we are often awoken around midnight.</p> <p>In addition, the tent is hardly an appropriate feature in this prominent canal side location within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Having said the above, we understand that the current circumstances</p>

	<p>with regard to the Covid-19 pandemic are forcing those in the hospitality industry to consider every possible solution to allow them to financially survive the ever changing Government restrictions. Given this unique situation we feel that the choice between a temporary inconvenience and the permanent loss of yet another hospitality facility in the town demands a degree of flexibility in the planning constraints to allow the continued use of the tent, along with the loss of off street parking, for so long as the trading restrictions are imposed. The application does seem to be for a temporary period, possibly for one year or perhaps 6 months. In any case, it would be required for the duration of the current restrictions if it were to provide the essential business survival benefits.</p> <p>In view of this we would support the application, despite our preference for refusing it based on the short term inconveniences.</p> <p>If not already covered by licencing requirements, it would be good to impose some conditions with any prospective approval with regard to the usage hours and noise levels, along with the fixed term to be determined.</p>
<p>great moat barn buckland aylesbury HP22 5hy</p>	<p>This should be allowed to go ahead. At a time when many pubs within the country are struggling we should be doing all we can to support local business. This individual has supported local residents through lockdown by providing delivery of essential goods. By erecting this tent he is following government guidelines in trying to get users to sit outside and follow government guidelines. Removal of this may mean an inability to run a business and then leave a building empty. At a time when this country is on its knees we should be supporting locals who support our community not stopping them</p>
<p>The Base 15B Middle Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3EQ</p>	<p>I support this application.</p> <p>If I understand things correctly, there are two key considerations, the tent and the music. These can be dealt with separately.</p> <p>The tent is small, low and discreet. Noticably more so than the vast frame tent Berkhamsted School have erected within their Castle Site behind their Sixth Form Centre. If one is permitted in clear view of St Peters I can see no objection to this much smaller structure on the edge of the town.</p> <p>As far as music is concerned the applicant is proposing a curfew at a fairly early hour and I can see hay bales providing sound deadening around the periphery where the stretch tent comes close to the ground.</p>
<p>Marchbank Shenstone Hill Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2PA</p>	<p>Given the extended lockdown affecting businesses in the town, it is vital that efforts being made to operate be given every possible support. Pubs were already under stress before the pandemic, but The Old Mill has gone above and beyond in its efforts to support the local community. Allowing this application will help protect jobs, enable an important business to get back on its feet and generate income to pay local rates and other taxes. A reasonable compromise has been offered to minimize the number of nights of live music and possible disturbance to neighbours. Anyone who buys or moves into a home near a pub that has been there for years, should expect some level of</p>

	<p>business activity that can cause extra noise. This planning application is a valid request for for a licensed premises, and should be approved.</p> <p>Given the extended lockdown affecting businesses in the town, it is vital that efforts being made to operate be given every possible support. Pubs were already under stress before the pandemic, but The Old Mill has gone above and beyond in its efforts to support the local community. Allowing this application will help protect jobs, enable an important business to get back on its feet and generate income to pay local rates and other taxes. A reasonable compromise has been offered to minimize the number of nights of live music and possible disturbance to neighbours. Anyone who buys or moves into a home near a pub that has been there for years, should expect some level of business activity that can cause extra noise.</p> <p>This planning application is a valid request for for a licensed premises, and should be approved.</p>
<p>8 Long View Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1BY</p>	<p>Great asset to the local community where locals can meet in a safe area.</p> <p>I strongly support this application.</p>
<p>3 Curlew Close Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2HZ</p>	<p>It's the only pub in the area that I feel safe in to sit and eat in at the moment its been a life line during the pandemic. The tent has brought fantastic uplifting and feel good contribution to my mental health. I was able to sit outside feel safe warm fed and entertained. The owners has been on top of everything with covid and community support. Please please don't take tent down</p>

Agenda Item 5b

ITEM NUMBER: 5b

20/03821/FUL	Demolition of 34 residential garages and construction of 2 no dwelling houses and 6 no apartments	
Site Address:	Garage Court Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr Ian Johnson	Mr I Morrison
Case Officer:	Martin Stickley	
Parish/Ward:	Hemel Hempstead (No Parish)	Highfield
Referral to Committee:	The application is referred for the consideration of the Development Control Committee as the site is owned by the Borough Council.	

1. RECOMMENDATION

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The application site is located within the residential area of Hemel Hempstead. It is not an allocated housing site and is a 'windfall site'. Dacorum's Core Strategy directs residential development to the towns and established residential areas (see Policy CS4 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013)).

2.2 This application proposes eight new dwellings on land currently occupied by four rows of terraced garages. These Council-owned garages served the local residents, however, over time the garages have become either disused or underused. The garages have limited widths and are unsuitable for most modern vehicles. This application offers the opportunity to create high quality affordable housing in their place, improving the local environment and security through new landscaping and increased natural surveillance.

2.3 The redevelopment of this site provides Dacorum Borough Council (DBC), as a provider of housing, with the opportunity to complement the existing housing stock in the area and to meet its own objective of providing affordable housing. DBC's affordable housing studies have identified a strong need for new homes for local people. As such, and given that the development would be located in a sustainable location (being near to local facilities and public transport links), the proposal is found to be in accordance with Policies CS1, CS4, CS17 and saved Policy 10 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site relates to four blocks of garages situated at Sleddale and Wensleydale, Hemel Hempstead. The northern garage court hosts two of the garage blocks, comprising 14 garages. This area is accessed from Sleddale. The other two garage blocks to the south, contain the remaining 20 garages. This part of the site is accessed directly from Wensleydale. The land levels drop as you move in a north-easterly direction, meaning that garages generally sit lower than the properties on Ribblesdale to the west. There are two areas of grassed amenity land that separate the garages from Wensleydale. These areas both comprise one mature tree.

3.2 The Highfield residential area is a large New Town neighbourhood comprising typical 1960's housing. However, there are also subsequent developments from later periods. The area is characterised by its regular, angular spatial layout. Design is varied throughout the Highfield area but parts do have distinct identity and character. The application site is located in an area primarily characterised by terraces of two-storey dwellings and three-storey townhouses, all with flat roofs.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of 34 residential garages and the construction of eight residential units made up of two 3-bedroom semi-detached units and an apartment block comprising 3 x 1-bedroom and 3 x 2-bedroom units with associated, balconies, amenity areas and parking. This application forms part of a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) that encompasses seven garage sites.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

None

6. CONSTRAINTS

CIL Zone: CIL3

Parish: Hemel Hempstead Non-Parish

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)

Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Hemel Hempstead)

Residential Character Area: HCA20

Smoke Control Order

Parking Standards: New Zone 3

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

National Policy Guidance (2019)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

Dacorum's Core Strategy (2006-2031)

NP1- Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS2 - Selection of Development Sites

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages

CS8 - Sustainable Transport

CS9 - Management of Roads

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS17- New Housing

CS18 - Mix of Housing

CS19 - Affordable Housing

CS26 - Green Infrastructure

CS29- Sustainable Design and Construction

CS31 - Water Management

CS32 - Air, Soil and Water Quality
CS35 - Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Dacorum Borough Local Plan (Saved Policies) (1999-2011)

Policy 10 - Optimising the Use of Urban Land
Policy 18 - The Size of New Dwellings
Policy 21 - Density of Residential Development
Policy 51 - Development and Transport Impacts
Policy 99 - Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands
Policy 100 - Tree and Woodland Planting
Policy 111 - Height of Buildings
Policy 129 - Storage and Recycling of Waste on Development Sites
Appendix 1 - Sustainability Checklist
Appendix 3 - Layout and Design of Residential Areas

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Area Based Policies: HCA20 (Highfield) (May 2004)
Manual for Streets (2010)
Planning Obligations (April 2011)
Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)
Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)
Affordable Housing (January 2013)
Parking Standards (November 2020)

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The key considerations relating to this application include:

- The principle of development;
- The quality of residential development and living conditions of existing and future residents;
- Highway safety and car parking; and
- Any other material planning considerations.

The Principle of Development

9.2 The application site is located within the residential area of Hemel Hempstead. It is not an allocated housing site and is a 'windfall site'. Dacorum's Core Strategy directs residential development to the towns and established residential areas (see Policy CS4). The Area Based Policy HCA20 (Highfield) highlights that there is scope for the redevelopment of garage blocks but only if alternative provision is made for displaced vehicle parking.

9.3 The proposal would contribute to the Borough's housing stock (in accordance with Policy CS17). As such, and given that the development would be located in a sustainable location, the proposal is in accordance with Policies CS1, CS4, CS17, saved Policy 10. Considering this, there is no compelling objection to the principle of the proposed development.

Quality of Residential Development / Living Conditions

9.4 The impact on the established residential amenity of neighbouring properties is a significant factor in determining whether the development is acceptable. Policy CS12 states that concerning

the effect of a development on the amenity of neighbours, development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of privacy. Paragraph 127 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (henceforth referred to as the 'Framework') requires development to create safe, inclusive and accessible places that promote health and well-being and a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

9.5 HCA20 identifies a number of development principles for the area. These include:

“Design: Should respect the characteristics and architectural themes of nearby and surrounding development. Alternative designs may be acceptable in cases where a clear distinction in design can be drawn from nearby and surrounding development, for example on sites clearly separated from other dwellings. Such alternative designs are unlikely to be acceptable on infill plots for single dwellings.

Type: All types of dwelling are acceptable.

Height: In most cases, should not exceed two storeys. Three-storey development may be permitted where adjacent to buildings of a similar or greater height, dependent on its impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Size: Small to medium sized dwellings are acceptable.

Layout: Development proposals are strongly encouraged to make use of the existing layout structure as a basis for new layouts. The feature of dwellings grouped around landscaped amenity greens is encouraged. Prevalent building lines should be followed. Spacing in the medium range (2 m to 5 m) is expected.”

Layout / Residential Amenity / Living Conditions

9.6 The proposed layout is deemed acceptable. Garden spaces of approximately 10m x 5.5m would be provided for the proposed semi-detached units. These garden sizes are considered functional for the property sizes and commensurate with the surrounding plots. The balconies on the apartments are of a reasonable size, measuring 3.5m x 1.6m (around 4.8m²). It was requested that some defensible space be provided for the ground-floor flats. Amended drawings were received, which included hedging to provide an outdoor area for these flats, separating it from the public realm.

9.7 In terms of spacing between buildings, the proposed apartment block would be sited roughly 6.5m from the townhouses to the south (24, 26 and 28 Wensleydale). This separation distance would provide some visual relief between the buildings and would exceed the guidance set out in HCA20. There are no side-facing windows on these neighbouring townhouses that would be affected in terms of light or privacy.

9.8 There are a number of two-storey buildings sited to the front (east) of the proposed apartments. 25 Wensleydale is sited directly in front of the proposed block. The section plan (drawing 0200) reveals that there would be no breach of 25-degree lines drawn from the mid-points of the neighbouring ground-floor windows. This includes the neighbours at Ribblesdale to the rear. The building would be sited approximately 21.8m from No. 25. A three-storey building fronting this neighbour is likely to increase overlooking to some degree, however, there is no specific policy that would warrant a refusal due to this front-to-front relationship, as this is a common association seen between buildings in residential areas such as this. A similar relationship can be seen throughout Wensleydale e.g. between 16-22 (even) and 9-17 (odd). It should be noted that the mature tree to the south is being retained. This would act as a visual buffer between the 1st and 2nd floors of the proposed apartment building and No. 25. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan highlights an acceptable back-to-back distance of 23m. A distance of around 29m would be provided between the proposed block and main rear walls of the properties on Ribblesdale. The proposed building would

sit higher than some of the properties on Ribblesdale (around 1.4 above 37 Ribblesdale), but considering the distances between them, it is unlikely that this increased height would result in a significant adverse impact on privacy.

9.9 Turning to the proposed semi-detached units, no concerns with regards to the relationship with the adjacent townhouses i.e. 19-23 (odd) Wensleydale, as the front-to-front distance would measure around 21m to protect privacy. There is a flank window at first-floor level on 16 Sleddale to the rear of these proposed units that would give views towards the proposed windows and gardens. Although the proposed properties would sit slightly lower than 16 Sleddale, the window is sited close to the rear walls of the proposed properties, some 11.3m. The window appears to serve a landing hallway (non-habitable room) and therefore it is unlikely that the existing residents would spend a large amount of time looking out of it. The existing residents are likely to pass this window on a daily basis and therefore some harm is identified. However, it is not felt that the harm is significant and therefore the proposal would not warrant a refusal on privacy grounds.

9.10 The proposed semi-detached units would not conflict with the Building Research Establishment's (BRE) guidance with regards to site layout planning for daylight and sunlight. The site section (drawing 0200) shows that there would be a breach between a first-floor flank window in the proposed semi-detached units and the proposed block of flats. However, it is noted that the 25-degree line is taken from an obscure glazed bathroom window and therefore the slight reduction in light is considered acceptable to this room.

9.11 In terms of demolition and construction, if this application were approved, these aspects would be controlled by Dacorum's Environmental Protection Team. Various informatives would be added regarding construction hours, etc. if the application is approved. The proposal would provide a high quality living environment for future occupiers and would not result in significant adverse impacts on the neighbouring properties. The quality of residential development and the impact on the living conditions is considered acceptable in accordance with the aforementioned policies.

Quality of Design / Impact on Character and Appearance of Area

9.12 Wensleydale and the surrounding estate hosts uniform sets of buildings. The vast majority of buildings are characterised by flat roofs, red/green tile hanging and simple fenestration. The street scenes comprise rows of two-storey terraced properties and rows of three-storey townhouses.

9.13 The overall scale and shape of the proposed semi-detached properties and their plots is similar to the surrounding area. The height of the apartment block would exceed the neighbouring townhouses by roughly 1.7m. This would increase the prominence of the building, however, it is not felt that it would appear overtly prominent within the context of its surroundings, noting the number of three-storey buildings present on the road. The designs would differ to some degree, for example, the use of standing seam cladding and the window details. However, it is not felt that these modern additions would add an unpleasing aesthetic to the streetscape. The original proposals (now superseded) included pitched roofs on the buildings. These were considered as alien additions to the street scene. Dialogue with Dacorum's Principle Urban Designer lead to some design improvements, including the removal of the pitched roofs; balancing of the heights/levels of the buildings; including of a brick 'set back' to show a visual divide between the semi-detached properties; and other improvements such as a parapet wall to mask the plant on the apartment block roof.

9.14 The proposed external materials comprise red/brown brick, standing seam cladding, grey windows, timber doors and timber effect cladding. The drawings highlight that some of the materials are still to be confirmed e.g. the roof tiles. Therefore, it is considered necessary to condition materials if the application is approved.

9.15 In summary, the proposed scheme would have a high quality of design that would preserve the attractive streetscape and contribute to local character in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS13, subject to the imposition of the materials condition.

Impact on Trees

9.16 There are a number of trees within close proximity to the site that must be considered. The submitted Arboricultural Report (ref: S236-J1-IA-1) identifies that no trees of significant landscape value or amenity would be detrimentally affected by the development. Dacorum's Trees and Woodlands Department have reviewed this document and raised no objections to the application.

9.17 The drawings found in the Appendices of the Arboricultural Report illustrate the root protection area of the sycamore tree (T1) and measures to protect it during the preparation, demolition, construction and landscaping phases (see S236-J1-P1 Rev 2 and S236-J1-P2 Rev 3). These details would be conditioned if the application were approved. It is likely that the sycamore tree would need to be heavily pruned and thereafter maintained to ensure no significant encroachment on the apartment block building. Fortunately, the main living areas in the apartments are triple-aspect and therefore future residents would not suffer from an unacceptable loss of light due to the tree.

9.18 A smaller whitebeam tree (T2) would be removed. This tree is a category U tree due to its poor form and bark loss, with an anticipated life expectancy of under 10 years. As compensation, the proposed site plan includes three new semi-mature trees around the site. As the site is limited in scale, it is not felt that any further tree planting is required. If approved, details of the tree sizes and species will be conditioned. The Trees and Woodlands Team would be consulted at discharge of condition stage to ensure that the proposed trees are suitable for the location.

9.19 Taking all of the above into account, it is concluded that there would be a limited impact on existing vegetation in accordance with saved Policy 99 and new trees would be provided as per Policy CS29.

Parking and Highway Safety

9.20 Policy CS12 seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision. The Framework states that if 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. The Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides policy guidance for the amount of parking provision required for new developments. It highlights the following (per residential unit) in this area:

- 1 bedroom dwellings – 1.25 allocated spaces or 1 unallocated spaces
- 2 bedroom dwellings – 1.5 allocated spaces or 1.2 unallocated spaces
- 3 bedroom dwellings – 2.25 allocated spaces or 1.8 unallocated spaces

9.21 The proposed layout provides 12 allocated spaces (two per unit) and six visitor spaces (total of 18). This meets the parking standards for allocated spaces and provides six additional spaces for visitor parking. The proposal is therefore acceptable in this regard.

9.22 The SPD requires the provision of electric vehicle (EV) charging points. As illustrated on the proposed site plan (drawing 0100), all parking spaces except the two roadside visitor spaces would be provided with EV charging points. In line with the SPD, 50% of the points would be active (8) and 50% passive (8). A condition would be imposed, if approved, to ensure that these are installed prior to the occupation of the units.

9.23 Policies CS8, CS9 and saved Policy 51 seek to ensure developments have no detrimental impacts in terms of highway safety. Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') states, "*Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.*"

9.24 Concerning highway safety, the access and turning areas are considered sufficient and safe. The buildings are situated within close proximity to the road and could therefore be easily accessed by refuse and emergency vehicles. Hertfordshire County Council as the Highway Authority have assessed the highway impacts and raised no objection to the proposals.

9.25 In summary, it is felt that the proposed parking and access arrangements are considered acceptable and policy compliant.

Other Considerations

Loss of Garages

9.26 HCA20 states that the redevelopment of garage blocks will only be acceptable if alternative provision is made for displaced vehicle parking. The widths of the existing garages are generally unsuitable for modern vehicles except motorcycles. It appears that residents mainly park on their driveways, on the street, or on the garage forecourt (between Nos. 23 and 25 Wensleydale). These areas would generally not be impacted by the development proposals. The strip of road fronting the proposed apartment block would be converted into two parking bays. These spaces would be unallocated and could potentially be used for existing residents, although it would be preferable if these were used as visitor spaces for the apartments.

9.27 Dacorum's Verge Hardening Team have been contacted to determine whether there would be scope to enhance existing parking areas or provide further parking areas in the area. They responded with the following: "*It has been agreed with Trees and Woodlands that we could extend the existing parking in Ribblesdale down onto the amenity green removing 1 tree stump but keeping away from the large mature tree in the centre of the green providing a net gain of 8 additional bays. Subject to planning permission approval.*" At this stage, these details have not been finalised, but it is worth noting that additional parking on Ribblesdale may be brought forward in the future.

9.28 Dacorum Borough Council's garage management team will provide the appropriate notice to each garage tenant if the planning application is approved. As per Agenda Item 14 (Page 3 of 6) of Cabinet dated 16th September 2014 (Update on Garage Disposal Strategy), all of those residents who currently rent a garage in a block earmarked for disposal will be offered an alternative garage. An informative would be added to the decision notice if this application is approved to ensure that letters are sent out in this regard.

Landscaping

9.29 The proposed site plan details planting around the site, which should help to soften the visual impact of the development and create an attractive site. The boundary treatment (1.8m timber fencing) and surfacing materials (block paving and bound gravel) is considered acceptable. Full details of landscaping would be requested by condition if the application is approved.

Ecology

9.30 An Ecological Survey and Bat Report has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority as part of the application submission. The report provides an adequate assessment of the impact of the proposals and is based on appropriate survey methods. The likelihood of an adverse ecological impact is negligible-low. Hertfordshire County Council's Ecology Department have raised no

objection but advised that a precautionary approach is taken and informatives relating to birds and bats be added if consent is given.

9.31 The planning system should aim to deliver overall net gains for biodiversity where possible as laid out in the Framework. As such, the County Ecologist requested that a 'Landscape and Ecological Management Plan' (LEMP) is secured by planning condition if approved. Simple measures to achieve this could be put forward in this plan, for example, the planting of native trees, fruit/nut trees, hedgerows; sowing of wildflower areas for pollinators and species diversity; provision of roosting opportunities through the integration of bat bricks/units within the design of the buildings; and the inclusion of bird boxes for common garden bird species and/or nest box terraces on buildings for swifts and house sparrows. This condition would be added if approved and can subsequently be monitored/signed off by the County Ecologist.

Refuse

9.32 Developers are expected to provide adequate space and facilities for the separation, storage, collection and recycling of waste (see Dacorum's 'Refuse Storage Guidance Note').

9.33 The site plan indicates where bin storage for the properties is located. A large bin store would be provided to the rear of the apartment block, next to the car park. A separate area has been provided to the front of the semi-detached units, behind the hedging. These areas would be somewhat obscured from Wensleydale. If the application is approved, the landscaping plan will capture details of bin stores to make sure the bins are satisfactorily disguised from the public realm. Taking the above into account, no concerns are raised about refuse storage and collection.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.34 Policy CS35 requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. The Charging Schedule clarifies that the site is in Zone 3 within which a current charge of £131.50 per square metre is applicable to this development.

9.35 Depending on the tenure of any affordable housing units, these may be exempt from the payment of CIL. It is recommended that any exemption requirements are discussed with the CIL team prior to the submission of the proposals and that relevant paperwork is completed expediently upon any issue of planning permission.

Contamination

9.36 The Environmental and Community Protection Team have confirmed that they have no objection to the proposed development. However, it is judged that the recommendation for an intrusive land contamination investigation is made. As such, it has been recommended that two conditions be included in the event that permission is granted.

Drainage

9.37 The drainage strategy comprises of unlined permeable paving for car parking areas with an outflow into the proposed network. It is noted that surface water drainage calculations have been provided to support the scheme and ensure sufficient storage has been provided for the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event. Based on the information, the Lead Local Flood Authority have confirmed that the site can be adequately drained, raising no objection subject to the inclusion of a final drainage scheme condition.

Crime Prevention and Security

9.38 Hertfordshire County Council's Crime Prevention Design Advisor was consulted and has raised no concerns. However, they suggested a number of recommendations to improve crime prevention and security on the site. These are listed in their consultation response in Appendix A. These were passed to the Applicant and they highlighted that *"Our landscaping design and Employers Requirements will address the comments from the Crime Prevention Officer. These will be included in the contract requirements."*

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.39 The majority of the concerns raised have been discussed previously in this report. However, as these concerns were raised by numerous neighbours, it is felt that they should be expanded on. The key points will be discussed in turn below.

Parking Stress

9.40 Numerous residents have highlighted that they are often unable to park near their homes. In particular, the residents at Ribblesdale raised concerns that there is not enough parking on the surrounding roads. As discussed earlier, the Verge Hardening Team are looking to enlarge the Ribblesdale parking area by an additional eight bays. The proposed site plan also identifies that the existing access (through Sleddale) to one of the parking areas used by Ribblesdale residents would be retained. It appears that the existing issue is caused by the number of properties on Ribblesdale without private off-street parking areas. Many of the properties on Wensleydale, on the other hand, have driveways. This proposal would remove around 4-5 on-street spaces from Wensleydale, but it would not have an adverse impact on the Ribblesdale parking areas. This application has prompted the Verge Hardening Team to help resolve the current issue at Ribblesdale and drawings are currently being commissioned by Ringway to provide the additional parking bays.

Road Safety

9.41 Several of the residents raised concerns over highways implications that could arise from the development. The proposal would make use of an existing access road and would provide adequate visibility splays. Hertfordshire County Council, as the Highway Authority, have assessed the scheme and do not feel that there would be an unacceptable impact on the surrounding road network. The proposal is therefore deemed to comply with the Framework, Paragraph 109.

Height of Apartment Block

9.42 Residents have raised concerns over the height of the proposed apartment block, stating that it would look out-of-character and result in overlooking and loss of light. The building is policy compliant in terms of distances to protect privacy and light. There may be some loss of early morning sunlight to Ribblesdale, as the block would be sited to the east of these properties, and some afternoon sunlight to 25-31 (odd) Wensleydale (to the west). However, the proposal adheres to the Building Research Establishment's guidance in terms of light and it is not felt that it would therefore warrant a refusal on these grounds. Mutual overlooking to garden areas is common in residential areas and the proposed relationship would not be dissimilar from other properties on the street.

9.43 However, to alleviate the concerns raised, the height of the building was reduced by removing the pitched roof element (see superseded drawings). This reduced the height of the building from approximately 12m to 10m. This also reduced the height of the windows by around 0.6m. The proposed alterations would reduce the visual impact of the building and the impacts on the neighbours in terms of overlooking and loss of light.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 The principle of redeveloping the garage blocks into affordable housing is deemed acceptable and in accordance with local and national policies. The proposals would satisfactorily integrate with the surrounding area. No significant adverse impacts are identified concerning residential amenity. The impact on trees is acceptable.

10.2 The redevelopment of this garage site would provide the Council, as a provider of housing, with the opportunity to complement the existing housing stock in the area and to meet its own objective of providing housing. The scheme would provide high quality affordable housing and provide other benefits such as improved landscaping and visual benefits. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 It is recommended that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to 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. **No development shall take place until the final design of the drainage scheme is completed and sent to the LPA for approval. The surface water drainage system will be based on the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy reference M03001-04_DG04 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting. The scheme shall also include:**

1. **Limiting the surface water run-off rates to a maximum of 2l/s for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event with discharge into the Thames surface Water sewer.**
2. **Provide attenuation to ensure no increase in surface water run-off volumes for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.**
3. **Implement drainage strategy to include permeable paving and attenuation tank.**
4. **Detailed engineered drawings of the proposed SuDS features including their location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features including any connecting pipe runs and all corresponding calculations/modelling to ensure the scheme caters for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + 40% allowance for climate change event, with a supporting contributing area plan.**
5. **Demonstrate appropriate SuDS management and treatment for the entire site including the access road. To include exploration of source control measures and to include above ground features such as permeable paving.**
6. **Maintenance and management plan for the SuDS features**

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of and disposal of surface water from the site in accordance with Policy CS31 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

3. **(a) The Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the Preliminary Investigation Report submitted at the planning application stage (Document Reference: RSK Preliminary Risk Assessment 1921152-06(00) March 2020) indicates a reasonable**

likelihood of harmful contamination and so 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.**
- (b) 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 (a), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.**
- (c) 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 (b) 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 risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with Policy CS32 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraphs 178 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

- 4. All remediation or protection measures identified in the Remediation Statement referred to in Condition 3 above shall be fully implemented within the timescales and by the deadlines as set out in the Remediation Statement and a Site Completion Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted.**

For the purposes of this condition: a Site Completion Report shall record all the investigation and remedial or protection actions carried out. It shall detail all conclusions and actions taken at each stage of the works including validation work. It shall contain quality assurance and validation results providing evidence that the site has been remediated to a standard suitable for the approved use.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with Policy CS32 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraphs 178 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

- 5. 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 do not send materials to the Council offices. Materials**

should be kept on site and arrangements made with the Planning Officer for inspection.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the area in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

- 6. The dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied until the Electric Vehicle Charging Points and associated infrastructure has been provided in accordance with drawing DBC-IW-WEN-00-DR-A-0100 (Revision P1). The Electric Vehicle Charging points and associated infrastructure shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made for the charging of electric vehicles in accordance with Policies CS8, CS12 and CS29 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and the Car Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020).

- 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:**
- o soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs; and**
 - o minor artefacts and structures (e.g. bike stores, street furniture, play equipment, signs, refuse or other storage units, etc.).**

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 three 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).

- 8. Prior to commencement of the development, a Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), shall be prepared, detailing how biodiversity will be incorporated within the development scheme. The plan shall include details of native-species planting, and/or fruit/nut tree planting, as well as the location of any habitat boxes/structures to be installed. The plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To ensure that the development contributes to and enhances the natural environment in accordance with Policy CS26 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). These details are required prior to commencement to ensure that an overall on-site net gain for biodiversity can be achieved before construction works begin. The LEMP should include details of when the biodiversity enhancements will be introduced and this may be reliant on the construction process/timings.

9. **Prior to the first occupation/use of the development hereby permitted the proposed access/on-site car and cycle parking/servicing/loading, unloading/turning/waiting area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.**

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way, in accordance with saved Policies 51 and 54 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS8 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraphs 108 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). The details are required prior to commencement to ensure that the construction of the development does not result in any risks to highway safety.

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

DBC-IW-WEN-00-DR-A-0100 (Revision P2) - Proposed Site Plan
DBC-IW-WEN-XX-DR-A-0200 (Revision P4) - Sitewide Sectional Elevations
DBC-IW-WEN-XX-DR-A-2208 (Revision P2) - Proposed 3B Dwelling Plans & Elevations
DBC-IW-WEN-XX-DR-A-2212 (Revision P2) - Proposed 1B + 2B Dwelling Plans & Elevations
S236-J1-IA-1 - Arboricultural Report by John Cromar's Arboricultural Company Limited (dated 4th September 2020)
S236-J1-P1 Rev 2 - Tree Value Assessment
S236-J1-P2 Rev 3 - Tree Retention & Tree Protection Measures

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 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. Thames Water

Waste Comments

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such we have no objection. In the longer term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable surface water strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such we have no objection. In the longer term

Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

With regard to SURFACE WATER drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services>

Thames Water would advise that with regard to WASTE WATER NETWORK and SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.

3. 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 - 07:30 to 17:30 on Monday to Friday, 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturday and no works are permitted at any time on Sundays or bank holidays.
4. Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or 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.
5. 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.
6. All wild birds, nests and eggs are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The grant of planning permission does not override the above Act. All applicants and sub-contractors are reminded that site clearance, vegetation removal, demolition works, etc. between March and August (inclusive) may risk committing an offence under the above Act and may be liable to prosecution if birds are known or suspected to be nesting. The Council will pass complaints received about such work to the appropriate authorities for investigation. The Local Authority advises that such work should be scheduled for the period 1 September - 28 February wherever possible. If this is not practicable, a search of the area should be made no more than 2 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.
7. If bats, or evidence for them, are discovered during the course of roof works, work must stop immediately and advice sought on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England to avoid an offence being committed.
8. Contamination

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.

9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. As per Agenda Item 14 (Page 3 of 6) of Cabinet dated 16th September 2014 (Update on Garage Disposal Strategy), all of those residents who currently rent a garage in a block earmarked for disposal will be offered an alternative garage. The Garage Management Team will wherever possible, offer a garage to rent in another garage site owned by Dacorum Borough Council in the vicinity of the development site.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Herfordshire Building Control	No comment.
Affinity Water - Three Valleys Water PLC	No comment.
Thames Water	<p>Waste Comments</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such we have no objection. In the longer term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable surface water</p>

	<p>strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such we have no objection. In the longer term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network</p> <p>There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes. https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes.</p> <p>With regard to SURFACE WATER drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website. https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services</p> <p>Thames Water would advise that with regard to WASTE WATER NETWORK and SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.</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 access /on-site car and cycle parking / servicing / loading, unloading / turning /waiting 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>

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

Demolition of 34 residential garages and construction of 2 no dwelling houses and 6 no apartments. The development site occupies two plots, accessed from Wenslydale and connected by Sleddale, which are both unclassified local access roads with a speed limit of 30mph and highway maintainable at public expense.

ACCESS

Current vehicle accesses to the site are from Sleddale, and

	<p>Wensleydale. These accesses will remain unchanged. A pedestrian way through the site will be maintained.</p> <p>PARKING</p> <p>Allocated car parking provides 12 spaces plus 7 visitor parking spaces; 19 in total). Secure cycle parking will be provided for each property.</p> <p>EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS</p> <p>The proposed dwellings are within the recommended 45m distance from emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>REFUSE / WASTE COLLECTION</p> <p>Arrangements have been made for the storage and collection of waste.</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 highway, subject to the conditions and informative notes above.</p>
Hertfordshire Ecology	<p>Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Ecology on the above. I apologise for the delay with this reply. Roosting bats are known to be in close proximity.</p> <p>I am pleased to see an ecological report has been submitted in support of this application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment (Bernwood Ecology, 1 September 2020); <p>The site was visited on 13 August 2020 and comprises two blocks of terraced garages on hardstanding with some amenity grassland. There are two mature trees on site, which are being retained and should be protected from damage (including roots and overhanging branches) during construction. The report provides an adequate assessment of the impact of the proposals and is based on appropriate survey methods and effort. The likelihood of an adverse ecological impact is negligible-low; however as bats and nesting birds are likely to be in the area, I advise the following precautionary approach Informatives are added to any consent given:</p>

"Demolition of the garages and work near trees 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."

"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 to avoid an offence being committed."

The planning system should aim to deliver overall net gains for biodiversity where possible as laid out in the National Planning Policy Framework and other planning policy documents. It would be appropriate for this development to enhance the site for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. Simple measures to achieve this could include the planting of native trees, fruit/nut trees, hedgerows; sowing of wildflower areas for pollinators and species diversity; provision of roosting opportunities through the integration of bat bricks/units within the design of the buildings; the inclusion of bird boxes for common garden bird species and/or nest box terraces on buildings for swifts and house sparrows; hedgehog homes and gaps in fencing to allow free passage of small animals.

Consequently, I would like to see details of how biodiversity will be included in the development scheme to address the expectations of NPPF in achieving biodiversity net gain. This should be provided in a Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) or Biodiversity Gain Plan (or similar) secured by Condition and I can suggest the following wording:

"Prior to commencement of the development, a Landscape Ecological Management Plan, shall be prepared, detailing how biodiversity will be incorporated within the development scheme. The plan shall include details of native-species planting, and/or fruit/nut tree planting, as well as the location of any habitat boxes/ structures to be installed. The plan shall be submitted to the LPA for written approval and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA."

Reason: to demonstrate the expectations of NPPF in achieving overall net gain for biodiversity have been met in accordance with national and local policies."

I trust these comments are of assistance.

<p>Lead Local Flood Authority (HCC)</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the above application for the demolition of 34 residential garages and construction of 2 no dwelling houses and 6 no apartments.</p> <p>As it is a minor application the Lead Local Flood Authority is not a statutory consultee. However, we can offer advice to the Local Planning Authority to place them in a position to make their own decision regarding surface water and drainage. We have reviewed the following documents submitted in support of the above application;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flood Risk Assessment reference M03001-04_FR04 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting - Drainage Strategy reference M03001-04_DG04 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting <p>Following the review of the Environment Agency maps for surface water flood risk, the proposed development itself is at a predicted low risk of flooding from surface water however the road adjacent to the site is shown to be at risk. We do not have any records of flooding in this location.</p> <p>The drainage strategy states that the ground conditions may not be suitable for infiltration. We note that there are no watercourses within the vicinity of the site however there is Thames Water surface water sewer located in Dione Road. A pre-development enquiry has been submitted to Thames Water and have agreed a discharge rate of 2l/s into their network.</p> <p>The drainage strategy for new development comprises of unlined permeable paving for car parking areas with an outflow into the proposed network. The site will drain to below ground attenuation tank with discharge at 2l/s into the Thames sewer. We note surface water drainage calculations have been provided to support to scheme and ensure sufficient storage has been provided for the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event. Based on the information provided we can confirm that the site can be adequately drained and recommend the following condition to the LPA.</p> <p>Condition 1</p> <p>No development shall take place until the final design of the drainage scheme is completed and sent to the LPA for approval. The surface water drainage system will be based on the submitted the Flood Risk Assessment reference M03001-04_FR04 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting and Drainage Strategy reference M03001-04_DG04 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting. The scheme shall also include:</p>
---	--

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limiting the surface water run-off rates to a maximum of 2l/s for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event with discharge into the Thames surface Water sewer. 2. Provide attenuation to ensure no increase in surface water run-off volumes for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event. 3. Implement drainage strategy to include permeable paving and attenuation tank. 4. Detailed engineered drawings of the proposed SuDS features including their location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features including any connecting pipe runs and all corresponding calculations/modelling to ensure the scheme caters for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + 40% allowance for climate change event, with a supporting contributing area plan. 5. Demonstrate appropriate SuDS management and treatment for the entire site including the access road. To include exploration of source control measures and to include above ground features such as permeable paving. 6. Maintenance and management plan for the SuDS features <p>Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of and disposal of surface water from the site.</p> <p>Informative to the LPA</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>Crime Prevention Design Advisor</p>	<p>Dear Martin,</p> <p>Thank you for sight of planning application : 20/03821/FUL, Demolition of 34 residential garages and construction of 2 no dwelling houses and 6 no apartments, Address: Garage Court Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire .</p> <p>In relation to security and crime prevention I have no concerns regarding this proposed development however I would ask that it is built to the Secured by Design standard.</p> <p>Physical Security (SBD)</p> <p>Communal door sets: Certificated to BS PAS 24: 2016, or LPS.1175 SR2 Access Control to block of flats:</p>

	<p>Audio Visual. Tradespersons release buttons are not permitted.</p> <p>Postal delivery for communal dwellings (flats)</p> <p>Communal post boxes within the communal entrances or through front doors</p> <p>Individual front entrance doors (flats and houses)</p> <p>Certificated to BS PAS 24:2016</p> <p>Windows: (flats and Houses)</p> <p>Ground floor windows and those easily accessible certificated to BS PAS 24:2016 or LPS 1175 French doors for balconies:</p> <p>Dwelling security lighting :</p> <p>Communal entrance hall, lobby, landings, corridors and stairwells, and all entrance/exit points. (Dusk to dawn lighting).</p> <p>Car Parking:</p> <p>Adequate parking allocated , good surveillance</p>
<p>Conservation & Design (DBC)</p>	<p>Architectural Character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal is out of character with the local context (Highfield new town district) which comprises of 2-3 storey flat roof terraces of modernist design. - The proposal's pitched gable roof is out of character and inappropriate for this context - a flat roof would be more <p>Further comments received 08.03.21</p> <p>Comments on revised drawings as below:</p> <p>Houses:</p> <p>Top of roof parapet and façades should be on a level datum so the houses read as a pair. This is the character of the typical houses of the street, generally set out in groups of 2/3 and are not stepped</p> <p>3B Apartment Block:</p> <p>Can defensible space be added to the ground floor units (planting, front garden, fencing etc) this is particular important in front of bedrooms on the ground floor to provide privacy - attached a sketch with marked areas the red is requiring the most privacy and would be suitable location for a front garden.</p> <p>The two ground floor units also should have private amenity space which isn't currently marked on the site plan and should help with the privacy issues</p> <p>Proposed plant seems to be much higher than previous design, could this be reduced or incorporated behind a parapet?</p>

	<p>Other than that no further comments.</p> <p>Further comments 09.03.21</p> <p>Houses: noted feedback on level change - can the parapet be levelled so the two units read as one block?</p> <p>Apartment: A small parapet could help in screening the plant, would this be achievable without interfering with the sight lines for 25-31?</p> <p>Further comments 17.03.21</p> <p>Good to see updates on parapet and defensible space - no objection in principal on design. Presuming the 0200 site elevations will be updated to show revised parapet line?</p> <p>Would also recommend some kind of planter / footing detail to be added to the newly proposed hedge boundaries in particular the apartment block (could be conditioned?)</p> <p>Think is important to ensure set boundary condition particularly along primary frontage and for the apartment blocks where this will be defining their main amenity space.</p> <p>Will also help tie into the design of the building to provide an overall high quality of design and should raise the hedge more than 450mm off the ground (as specified) to provide increased privacy for the main amenity space.</p>
Waste Services (DBC)	No comment.
Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)	<p>No objections on noise or air quality grounds.</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 is on land which has 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 end use to the presence of any contamination means that the following planning conditions should be included if permission is granted. Please note condition 1 acknowledges existence of an adequate phase 1 report.</p>

Contaminated Land Conditions:

Condition 1:

(a) The Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the Preliminary Investigation Report submitted at the planning application stage (Document Reference: RSK Preliminary Risk Assessment 1921152-06(00) March 2020) indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination and so 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.

(b) 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 (a), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

(c) 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 (b) 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

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Informative:</p> <p>The above conditions are considered to be in line with paragraphs 170 (e) & (f) and 178 and 179 of the NPPF 2019.</p> <p>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.</p>
Conservation & Design (DBC)	
Strategic Planning & Regeneration (DBC)	No comment.

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
21	28	1	30	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
4 Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TN	I strongly object to this project. Currently the parking around this area is completely inadequate for the amount of properties and to take away some of the very few spaces along kerbside etc would be ridiculous. The fact the new spaces would only be available to the new tenants would leave the existing tenants in a very difficult situation. I find that the current parking along the kerbside of Wensleydale/Sleddale is already at the point of being dangerous. Barely 1 car can get through this area of the street due to sheer amount of cars parked on both sides of the street. All you have to do is come to our area at 5:30-6pm on a normal working day and you can see many people struggling to find an

	<p>area to park near their home. Some with disabilities or other health issues. Please reconsider the planning of this project to make it beneficial to all its effects.</p>
<p>10 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>We have a car garaged at 24 Wensleydale. As yet we have not been offered a garage on an alternative local site.</p>
<p>8 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>Parking in Ribblesdale is already impossible to find a space near your house even though more spaces were made available previously but the result from that is even more people who do not live in Ribblesdale come to park their vehicles because there is not enough parking in all surrounding roads.</p> <p>My objection against the build is I don't not wish to look out at a block of flats and nor do I wish to lose even more ability to be able to park my vehicle in my street. As a resident who pays council tax and road tax I should be able to park near my dwelling and this new build will make a bad situation even worse.</p> <p>As previously stated the revised plans still do not state provisions for the new developments parking and as a long standing resident of Ribblesdale who is frustrated daily that she cannot always park in her street due to non-residents parking in the facility, I do not wish this problem to become an even larger problem that it already is by more non residents of Ribblesdale using it as their means to park. Ribblesdale's parking already supports enough surrounding roads of residents. With street lights turned off at midnight it is more important than ever to be able to park in your own cul-d-sac and not streets away.</p> <p>When I purchased my resident over 30 yrs ago I didn't buy it to look out to a tall building opposite.</p> <p>I would like to see plans for parking that do not include the use of Ribblesdale before any plans are put forward to be granted.</p>
<p>35 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>The proposed block of flats is 3-storeys high with a pitched roof (effectively making it a 4-storey building). This makes the building very out of character with the rest of the community which is made up of 2-storey buildings with flat roofs.</p> <p>As the 4-storey building will only be 25m from the back of our homes, the residents nearby will be majorly overlooked, with a lack of security from residents being able to see into our homes & gardens.</p> <p>The excessive height of the proposed building will mean there will be loss of natural light. However there is likely to be an increase in light pollution from the flats and communal areas of the proposed building.</p> <p>Reducing the parking options in the neighbourhood, along with the additional car owners in the flats, is likely to result in inadequate parking provisions.</p> <p><i>Further comments following amendments</i></p> <p>Even though the pitched roof has been removed the height of the block of flats is still really concerning considering the close proximity to</p>

multiple 2 storey houses. This would cause a considerable loss of privacy and sunlight for the surrounding houses. In particular for the local residents in Ribblesdale for which the new development backs on to, the loss of privacy and sunlight would be significant and any new residents would have clear sight into our gardens and into the backs of our houses.

Another major issue as mentioned by other local residents is the parking. To be told that the proposed development would have allocated parking that could not be used by the current local residents, but any residents of the new development would have free reign to park anywhere in the surrounding areas is unacceptable. The current parking in the local area is already not good enough and is becoming more of a problem. The council have a duty to improve the current parking standards for the current residents before allowing more residents and cars into the already congested area.

Based on these 2 major issues I completely object to the current proposal. These issues were raised previously but were not considered in the revised proposal. If the council do not seriously consider the issues raised, this would be disheartening for the local residents.

We very much object with this planning proposal.

Although the pitched roof has been removed from the proposal, the bock of flats will still be 25% higher than the next-door townhouse on Wensleydale and twice the size of the new houses! This will result in a complete lack of privacy for the surrounding residents along with a loss of sunlight, especially for those along Sleddale where the flats are being 'built up'. The CGI photo uploaded to the website is also very misleading as it does not show this difference in height very clearly.

I have been informed that the initial plan was to have a block made up of 4 flats instead of 6. Why can this not be done? We believe local residents would be more accepting of this as this would in keeping with the surrounding properties and much less of an eyesore.

Another issue we have with the proposed development is the parking. The proposal currently includes several parking spaces allocated to the new homes. We have been told existing residents will not be able to use the new parking spaces as they will be strictly be for the residents of the new development only. This is ridiculously unfair on existing residents and it is shocking to hear the council is happy with this. Parking is already inadequate with many residents parking on pavements far from their home. This development will just make the situation worse for existing residents. How is this fair?

It's very disappointing to hear the council is considering digging up the green area in Ribblesdale to turn into parking spaces. This would only result in a loss of amenity area, loss of green and only a few additional parking spaces. There is little benefit in this. If additional parking is to be provided, please can the large garage site on Wensleydale (opposite the development site) be used? The council were previously planning to demolish the majority of these to build three houses. If it

	<p>cannot be used for housing, could it not be used for parking? This would generate more parking for local residents, reduce congestion caused by the school run, and reduce the loss of biodiversity. Please consider this.</p> <p>We have also been extremely disappointed by the council's communication of this project. Its sad to hear many local residents haven't been made aware of the project by the council because they are not classed as 'neighbouring'. These residents will still be highly impacted by this project and deserve to be informed and given the opportunity to comment.</p>
<p>36 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>I own 36 Ribblesdale and I have looked at the planning application for Garage Court Sleddale and I am not too happy with what has been proposed.</p> <p>Mainly Due to the height of the proposed dwelling. My Garden would almost certainly be over looked by upper floor of the dwelling. It would also impact my view from the back bedroom.</p> <p>I would also potentially loose an hour or two of direct sunlight each day during certain months. Especially with the proposed Apex roof.</p> <p>I'm not against the development of the garages, It makes sense for the land to be put to good use and would tidy the area up. I just feel a 2 story apartment block with a flat roof would be more suited to the estate.</p>
<p>33 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>Although we empathise with the need for new homes within the council due to growing population, we object to the proposal and have a number of concerns in regards to the development.</p> <p>The most apparent concern is the location. The existing garage function of the site serves as a buffer zone between the neighbouring houses, road and our gardens on Ribblesdale, therefore protecting our amenity spaces. A three-storey block of flats will undoubtedly cause overlooking into our gardens contributing to loss of privacy and light. Interior and exterior spaces that are overlooked lack privacy, which will affect the quality of life for all the occupants on Ribblesdale. The visual amenity currently enjoyed by the residents of Ribblesdale will also be lost. The proposed three storey block of flats will appear dominant and overbearing ruining the enjoyment of our properties and creating overcasts during the morning where we currently enjoy a beautiful eastern rising sun from the morning to midday. The local plan aims to protect human health and amenities, this begs to differ from that aim. There is no report in the documents demonstrating that the amount of daylight and sunlight currently experienced is being protected. There is also a legal right to light requirement that our properties acquire which does not appear to have been considered.</p> <p>The proposal will also cause loss of parking spaces which we already struggle with in the area. The plans suggest the proposed parking spaces are private. This takes away from the already restrictive number of spaces available to the local residents that do not have private</p>

	<p>parking. This is counter intuitive to the needs of existing residents.</p> <p>There is no evidence of a construction management plan in the documents which raises concerns about noise/air pollution and highway safety and management during the construction phase. The area is generally quiet and safe and residents are respectful towards one another ensuring an existing environment that is peaceful and pleasant. The construction of the flats and houses will impede on this current state. We are also pregnant and due to have a baby in the near future and the construction will be adjacent to the room where our child will sleep. This will mean we cannot open windows due potential air and noise pollution coming from the site. The council has a legal duty to protect residents from the effects of noise and other environmental issues affecting amenity, which could result from construction activity.</p> <p>In conclusion we do not feel that this proposal is sympathetic to its surroundings and the local residents that live in the area. Considering Dacorum's local plan aims to protect and enhance its environments a less invasive proposal might be welcomed. Such as upgrading the existing garages or providing more parking rather than squeezing in homes/flats into sites which as a result take away from its residents and environment.</p>
<p>37 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>I object to this development.</p> <p>The Council has confirmed the flats will be 50% taller than the adjacent three storey town houses (12m vs 8m) so how much higher will they stand in relation to the houses facing the site in Ribblesdale and Wensleydale? Where are the architect site elevation plans for this? They are missing from the uploaded documents.</p> <p>Three storey flats built 13.3m from the rear gardens of 33-37 Ribblesdale will result in them being completely overlooked and having no privacy whatsoever. It will also have a marked affect on the amount of sunlight that will reach these properties at certain times of the day.</p> <p>The Council have confirmed that all the parking bays on the plan (21?) are for the sole use of the residents and visitors of the 8 new dwellings. These bays are being built where existing residents currently park. Where are they supposed to go? There is already an acute shortage of parking in the area. This development will just exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>The planning documents all state that the larger of the two trees in Wensleydale should, and can, be kept however conversations with Council Officers indicate that it will be cut down. Why is this? Can residents ask for a TPO for it?</p> <p>Night lighting for a three storey block of flats and the adjacent car park is likely to be very intrusive for rear of 33-37 Ribblesdale.</p> <p>The elevation of the flats will dominate the skyline of the estate and they are not in keeping with the properties around it. Houses are</p>

needed but why can't it be a less intrusive two story development? Why does the pitch of the proposed roof need to be so steep?

Light:

Residents in Nidderdale will be overlooked and will lose sunlight. Yesterday I took interval photos of the shadow cast by the existing town houses. The flats, 50% taller, would have completely removed direct afternoon sunlight for most of the town houses on the opposite side of the road plus the houses in Nidderdale - including those bordering Cambrian Way. Residents in Ribblesdale will lose hours of direct morning sunlight. All of these houses have had uninterrupted sunlight since they were built in 1970's.

Parking:

I object to the location of the parking for the two new houses in Wensleydale. I spoke to the Council's Senior Project Manager and was told that the current shortage of parking would be partially alleviated if houses in Wensleydale converted their front gardens to parking (many of them have already done so); each conversion could take two cars off the road. This is true. So why isn't the Council following its own advice and putting driveways outside the front of the new houses?

This change to the plans would free up 4 spaces in Sleddale for existing residents/tenants. In addition, new tenants' cars would be more secure on a driveway and much closer if tenants had mobility issues.

I understand that investigations are underway to dig up the green in Ribblesdale, fell the mature trees and make it into car parking. Why destroy a beautiful amenity area that is well used when there is a large eyesore of garages and hard standing opposite the proposed development site? The garages clearly aren't all needed because the Council were recently planning to put houses on the site.

A minimum of 20 new parking spaces could be easily created if just some, not all, of the garages were demolished and the small patch of grass located to the side of no.23 (which isn't overlooked by anyone and is regularly used for dog fouling/discarded drinks containers) were used to create a car park.

There is already lighting installed in this area to serve the garages. Drains already exist but could be aided if Grasscrete were used as a surface. A sizeable parking area in this location would satisfy local demand and would also provide a safe, and much needed, area for parents at the start and end of the school day. The current congestion and chaotic parking by Hammond Academy traffic is an accident waiting to happen. There would still be garages available on the site for people to rent from the Council and it would mean that the Ribblesdale green and trees could be preserved. I am sure local residents would support this idea.

Bins:

Documents describe a communal bin storage structure for the flats being near to a road. However, it is not shown on the plans. If it is similar to the one built in 2020 at Howe Grove it is quite large. Does the Council propose to build it close to the back gardens of 33/34 Ribblesdale (on the spot where there is currently a new tree illustrated

on the plan)? The store is likely to attract vermin and wasps if left open.

Deadlines:

Why did residents in Nidderdale get the first letter from the Council notifying them of a forthcoming planning application but not the second one which gave details of the development and how to object to it? The first letter told residents the Council would commence the formal consultation process "directly after submission of the planning application" but it gave no date nor reference number. The deadline for objections is tomorrow. Nidderdale residents should have had at least 14 days opportunity to comment on the proposal since they will be directly affected by the new buildings.

Further comments following amendments

Height of buildings - a possible compromise: I was informed by a Council Officer that the original proposal was for a block of four flats but it was amended to six flats at the request of an elected Member? I appreciate the need for social housing, and do not object to dwellings being built at the end of my garden, however, the height of six flats is out of keeping with ALL surrounding buildings, it will be intrusive, dominating and will lower the quality of life for every resident who borders the site. I believe a two storey block of flats is a sensible compromise for both residents and the Council. Two storey flats will be very close to the height of the existing three storey town houses, so would not impact the skyline or streetscape as much.

I dispute DBC's assertions that the proposed development will "integrate well" with its immediate surroundings; it will tower over its surroundings! "The flats will be 10.6m tall and stand 12m above the road junction of Sleddale/Wensleydale. This will be double the height of the new two-storey houses and 50% taller than the nearest town houses in the lower part of Wensleydale (which are 8m tall). The flats will also be 25% taller than the adjacent townhouse (no.24).

The plans state that the flats continue "the 3-storey nature of the adjacent properties" and that they have "been developed to respond to the specific context in terms of scale". What it doesn't mention is that a 'storey' in a town house is far shorter than a 'storey' in a block of flats; they will not look similar. In short, the flats will dominate the skyline and will destroy, not integrate with, the character of the area.

Privacy:

In my previous comment I mentioned that a three-storey block of flats will remove all privacy from the rear gardens of 33-37 Ribblesdale. The rear gardens of 24&26 Wensleydale will also be overlooked. I am disappointed that great attention is being given to protect the privacy of new tenants (a surrounding hedge, new trees, opaque glass), and yet the removal of ALL privacy from some existing residents' outside space is being ignored. Why is this? What are the DBC regulations for loss of privacy caused by new buildings? There aren't even plans to plant a row of trees between our boundaries and the flats which would at least give us some privacy (although I see that trees have been included on the artist's impression of the development!).

I note comments made by residents in Wensleydale that the balconies and full length window of the flats opposite them will mean that new tenants will be able to look DOWN into their bedrooms! Surely this is unacceptable! A building with four flats rather than six would alleviate some of this gross intrusion and invasion of privacy.

Parking

I note and agree with the comments made by 23 Nidderdale regarding parking and road usage. I would like to add this question to their list: Why have residents have been told that they will not be able to use any of the parking spaces created by the development? The plans confirm that the 18 spaces are "in excess of the 13-space policy requirement, in order to provide space for existing casual parking observed at the proposal sites." So are the new spaces available for existing residents or not?

I believe DBC must bear some responsibility for creating the existing parking problems; you have granted planning permission for so many town houses to be converted to two flats or HMOs. Where did you think all the vehicles would park when you approved the creation of so many additional dwellings on this estate?

You have an opportunity to ease parking problems by creating two parking spaces in front of each of the two new houses. This would be in keeping with the planning aim of "integrating well" with the surrounding properties since most other houses in the road have converted their frontage to parking. You could also demolish some of the garages on the large site opposite (that has been deemed inappropriate for dwelling development) and create a sizeable car park.

Biodiversity of the Development:
The Ecology Report specifies the development must add to biodiversity on site. However, the plans will necessitate the provision of additional parking for local residents. If your argument for not putting parking in front of the two houses is to protect an existing tree and create a lawn area, then I object strongly to this on the grounds that you are currently investigating the removal of several mature trees and the grass amenity area in Ribblesdale to create a car park.

The Planning Application states that the development will "improve the local environment". Therefore, additional parking sites must be considered as part of this application; to destroy an amenity area in the heart of the community, while claiming that the development has led to a 'net gain' of biodiversity, would be very wrong. It would also go against specific environmental protection targets in the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2006 - 2031).

Planting low hedges and wildflower areas, rather than grass, is great for biodiversity but it does nothing to help "integrate the development" with its surroundings. There is nothing like that in the roads near the site so it will stand out, rather than blend in.

Lighting:

I am concerned that lighting for the flats and the car park will illuminate

	<p>the back gardens and windows of adjacent properties in Ribblesdale throughout the night; the Police have recommended dawn to dusk lighting in their comments. The car park will be 1.5m from our rear fences. I think that constant lighting will make our properties more vulnerable and will also disturb those who sleep in their back bedrooms.</p> <p>The Ecology Report states that there "must be no additional lighting on site that will spill artificial light onto any habitats of ecological value (e.g. trees)". How is this possible with a large sycamore tree immediately outside the flats?</p> <p>Information about the Development: I am disappointed that residents' requests for information made in January (including elevation plans and revised cgi's) had still not been acted on when the new plans were uploaded on 8th March. I only received answers to some questions on the last working day before the objection deadline (e.g. the full height of the flats, 10.6m not just the 9.9m as shown on the plans).</p> <p>The revised elevation plans are STILL not on the Portal for residents to view and residents haven't been notified that there have been changes to the original documents. When revised versions of documents have been uploaded, I've noticed that the date has not been changed. This is very misleading - it doesn't indicate that there is anything new to look at.</p> <p>I appreciate that the Planning Officer doesn't think the new information is worth re-consulting about, however, the information should have been available online to those affected (33-37 Ribblesdale) BEFORE the end of the 14 day consultation period. Some residents have not seen it and don't know it exists.</p>
<p>24 Nidderdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TE</p>	<p>Good evening.</p> <p>We have been living here for more than 3 years and have seen an increase in traffic, poor parking and accidents due to this problem. As the end of Terrace house in Nidderdale we would suffer greatly the loss of sunlight in our back garden. We already don't have much sunlight coming through the front due to the apartments on Wensleydale, we certainly do not wish to not enjoy the sun in our back garden.</p> <p>I am and I work as a Herbalist/ Holistic Therapists and rely very much on the sun to nourish the herbs and plants that I keep and use in my practice. This change would affect my business especially in these difficult times we are in.</p> <p>I also value my privacy as I am a mother to a 9 year old and I certainly do not appreciate the lack of privacy this would mean if the buildings look into our back garden, especially if as a family we are enjoying our afternoons outside.</p> <p>Also I don't think that it's fair that those who have lived here are penalised with the parking adjustments after being residents for many years, in favour for the new builds, specially if we consider when schools are open and the roads are full of cars obstructing vision and space. I have witnessed not long ago a child being run over by a speeding car during school run on Wensleydale. It doesn't make the</p>

	<p>neighbourhood feel safe.</p> <p>These are our concerns and hope you would also consider our opinions in this regard.</p> <p><i>Further comments</i></p> <p>I am not happy at all by the proposal, there still is the lack of privacy and the fact that the parking will be reduced. Lack of sunlight is nefarious in a place that already we suffer the lack of , especially under mental wellbeing and plants and trees. Also we bought this house as it was perfect to support my Herbalist practice (very new) where I grow my own herbs. It would be a significant loss to me as I wouldn't be able to use my herbs due to pollution and fine particles. This is simply put,pure greed as we are slowly losing such a big amount of green belt land and now you are building more apartments which affects the environment. I ask you to reconsider and adjust the project, creating more parking for us residents that have lived here longer and have the same right to parking and not to be subjected to traffic and increased air pollution which would mean also an increase in respiratory problems, stress on both humans and ecology. Thank you.</p>
<p>22 Nidderdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TE</p>	<p>As a resident of nidderdale I am very concerned about the planning application, we have no parking apart from cambrian way or down by the proposed site , it is already a huge struggle to park as it is on a normal day and impossible to get parked during school drop off and pick up times , some of the 3 story houses have multiple residents and sometimes have 8 vehicles parked down there , I witnessed a school boy getting hit by a car recently , as the road was so busy with cars double parked . Also a lot of people use their garages for storage due to the fact we do not have lofts. I think this is going to be a big mistake if it goes ahead</p>
<p>23 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>New build will be out of character with the surrounding estate and will dominate the skyline.</p> <p>Parking is already limited and residents are already parking elsewhere. This will only increase the pressure with parking.</p>
<p>28 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent communication which we received on the 5th January 2021.</p> <p>This is the first communication we have had from you although you state in your letter you had connected us in December 2020 ~ nothing received and talking to neighbours, no one have received any letters from you?</p> <p>We strongly object to this development which we will be able to see over the roof tops of 35/36/37 Ribblesdale. With the big development taking place in Grove Hill West from the Link Road, we do not see that trying to fit in a small group of houses / apartments and</p>

	<p>over-crowding the area will help the community at all. All of Highfield 14 have flat roofs, so adding buildings with pitched roofs will stand out and make the area look over crowded and very untidy. We are encouraged to take pride in our community, but how can we do that when you are insisting in overcrowding small areas.</p> <p>Also parking, which I know is not your priority, but is such a big problem and an issue which should be taken into account, you only have to walk around in the early evening to see that cars are parked on the grass verges, on the corners, parked on pavements all around this area. In Ribblesdale we have 37 houses (with flats) and mosthouseholds have at least two cars, and there is certainly not enough parking. In Ribblesdale we have many cars parked who live in Sleddale, Lonsdale and the other blocks and many a time we cannot park in our parking areas. Adding more houses will make this big problem even more unbearable even though they will have parking allocated which is never enough, and should be taken into account as this does effect the residents and their daily life and commitments which are all part of the Dacorum community and their life styles.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing back from you and hope that the responses for this development prompts you to arrange a meeting where this proposed new development can be discussed as it does affect our area and home life.</p> <p>thank you</p> <p><i>Further comments following amendments</i></p> <p>The houses/flats are far taller than the existing town houses i live at no 28 ribblesdale and will look out to see these buildings in the sky line instead of trees and woods that i can see now. If 2 storey houses were built we would not have this problem.Then we come to the major problem of parking for the vehicles that park where these buildings will be.Ribblesdale allready has cars vans etc used for parking by people from other estates where are all these vehicles going to park.We have heard the green space in front of our house is going to be considered for extra parking this cannot happen felling mature trees and digging up green space where children play i strongly object to this happening WHERE ARE THE CHILDREN GOING TO PLAY there is ample parking space in the area opposite in Wensleydale where the garages are.I object to these plans because these houses/flats will be totally out of character with the rest of the area they will be an eyesore and dominate the skyline.</p>
<p>31 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>We have lived in Ribblesdale for 25 years and have always had a parking problem which has got significantly worse over the years due to the lack of spaces for residents of Ribblesdale and the constant parking of residents from adjoining roads here too. I personally leave for work in the middle of the night and my vehicle has been blocked in on numerous occasions by vehicles due to the overpacked car park and under marked parking bays, which has forced me to pay for a taxi to Hatfield and back at my expense. I also return from work mid afternoon usually around the time the local school finishes and all the parents have parked on this estate to pick their children up which is already an</p>

	<p>accident waiting to happen and will become more dangerous for those children when the garaged and kerbside spaces are taken away to build these new properties and the parking becomes more congested around school drop off/pick up times. we feel the parking of the existing residents was not taken into consideration and should be looked into before planning is agreed.</p>
<p>19 Nidderdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TE</p>	<p>This area already has a significant parking issue and whilst there may be parking provided for the new properties, this new development will take away a number of spaces used by other residents - especially at school times.</p> <p>In addition to the loss of parking, these new properties will be able to look directly into my back garden.</p>
<p>10 Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TN</p>	<p>I am writing to you about the planned proposal to develop the garages on Sleddale into 2 houses and 6 apartments.</p> <p>Although I can appreciate the need to develop more houses in the local area I feel that the development of the local garages is not the way to do it.</p> <p>Our local roads are already congested by people trying to park near their homes and by developing on ground such as the garages will only exacerbated the problem further.</p> <p>As it stands it is very unlikely that a fire engine or ambulance would be able to get to the top of the road as the bin truck struggles weekly.</p> <p>The area would be better suited for demolition and redevelopment as a car park. This planning application has also given me the ability to raise the concern that with the current parking situation the footpaths in the local area are impassable, this is highly concerning as the route is used by school children daily that need to walk down the middle of the road, you also WOULD NOT be able to use wheelchair in the area due to impassable paths and no drop curbs.</p> <p>I would greatly appreciate the opportunity to raise these concerns if a planning meeting is possible.</p>
<p>12 Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TN</p>	<p>I hope you are well in these times and your Christmas and new year were as good as they could be.</p> <p>I live at 12 Sleddale with my wife, and two young sons.</p> <p>As we spoke about in December when I emailed you and you replied you will remember that I support the development of the garage sites as they are an eyesore and a fly tipping hot spot.</p> <p>However, in the correspondence we had you assured me the parking for Sleddale would not be affected by the build and the new build had their parking included.</p> <p>Now that people have been able to see the plans and study them a</p>

document has been produced and given out highlighting the bad points.

My objections are:

1) The proposed parking for the new development

2) The height of the new builds on a privacy point of view for residents of Sleddale.

3) The pitched or sloped roofs that will be used

Objection 1 - I worked out initially and said to you I think there could be potential for 23 cars from the new builds if families move in with children who drive etc. 19 spaces aren't far off but these other cars where will they go? the plans specifically say Sleddale residents cannot use the new developments parking. Is the same respect going to be shown the other way? (the new builds cannot use Sleddale parking?) how will this be policed? Are the 4-6 spaces that Sleddale will lose going to be made up somewhere else? like opening the green up in Ribblesdale or similar?

Objection 2- The height of the proposals is quite unreasonable. The residents of Sleddale will have people with a birds eye view into their back gardens (and the rest of the area). A complete invasion of privacy. I think this should be reconsidered.

Objection 3- As we spoke back in December and I mentioned this to you, and you quite rightly said that all new build will have the pitched roofs as they are more efficient in every way (cost and thermal). But having the whole estate in flat roof but a number in pitched roof will look very odd and not in keeping.

Could you please tell me why when the new build (of the old garage site) in Westerdale in 2019/2020 have flat roofs? when by your own admission pitched roofs are a better choice? (they may have been built by a third party? and not Dacorum, but surely the council would have had to sign the plans off?)

Now I realise the garage site is the property of the council and they shall do what they feel, as I have stated I support the development but a compromise has to be reached on the objections please.

We, the residents, didn't ask for the new development so I do not see why we have to be penalised for it. Instead of making Sleddale fit to the new development, surely the new development should fit to Sleddale.

The great thing about life is change but change for the better. Once all the work has been done and the new builds are a few years old and blend in I'm sure it will have a positive impact on Sleddale but only if you listen now to the people that live here.

I do not wish to make your life hard Mr Stickley and I'm guessing you have had lots of questions regarding this but please take on board what

	<p>the residents say about the whole plans.</p> <p><i>Further comments following amendments</i></p> <p>I'm sorry I am a touch late on my response I have been busy.</p> <p>Unfortunately again I will have to object to the proposed development of the garage sites for Sleddale for the issue of parking again</p> <p>As stated before I fully support the sites being developed but Sleddale shouldn't lose out on the kerbside parking for the sake of the new development. The parking, by my reckoning about 4-5 spaces, for Sleddale will be lost.</p> <p>These need to be made up and I find the councils attitude of it isn't up to us to offer parking solutions laughable, maybe if this situation was on the powers that be door step(s) they may not be so flippant!?</p> <p>As stated before the new development should fit Sleddale. Not Sleddale fit the new development.</p> <p>I'm sorry to be a pain in backside by objecting again and thank-you for the compromises made with the pitched roofs and the 1 less parking space but more needs to be done please.</p> <p>I hear that part of Ribblesdale grassed area be made into parking has been tabled? Hopefully not all of it as i play on it with my children but this is a step in the right direction.</p> <p>If the parking issue isn't sorted out and the council go ahead you (the council) will make for a very miserable place to live because of the fighting for parking spaces that will be caused and this could lead to neighbour situations and resentment on both sides and development will have the reverse effect what it is intended.</p> <p>Please do not look at this as a quick buck to be made and 'you can get on with it'. Please consider these objections seriously.</p> <p>The new developments parking can not be used by current Sleddale residents? Will the same be said for the new development residents about Sleddale parking? How will this be policed?</p> <p>The height of the buildings and privacy are not of a major concern to me but it is the parking.</p>
<p>5 Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TN</p>	<p>I am writing this letter to you to object against the development, I feel that Sleddale and the area around it isnt looked after atall the flat block i live in has a number of things wrong with it, these problems are pulled up by me and im sure other people that live here and there is no change.</p> <p>The parking here is minimal, i have lived here for two years and rarely have places to park which sometimes forces me to park in the garages.</p> <p>For the amount of houses/flats there are around here and i personally</p>

	<p>think its disgusting that you wouldn't then allow residents to use the new parking spaces if available.</p> <p>As you can tell i dont agree with this development and would be gutted to see more of the space taken up and money being spent on these properties instead of making ones in the area better places to live.</p>
<p>23 Nidderdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TE</p>	<p>OBJECTIONS</p> <p>The proposed pitched roofs are out of character with all the surrounding buildings that have flat roofs.</p> <p>The pitched roofs increase the height of the proposed buildings significantly and disproportionately to adjacent buildings.</p> <p>The ridge height of the apartment block in particular would overwhelm the existing street character, and would significantly obscure the view to the western skyline and sunsets that have been enjoyed for many years by residents to the east of Wensleydale.</p> <p>Any new dwellings should ideally be either 2 or 3 storey with flat roofs, and have floor levels that step down to follow the slope of the street.</p> <p>PARKING OBSERVATIONS</p> <p>The Sleddale garage areas were originally designated as parking areas serving the dwellings to Sleddale and Ribblesdale.</p> <p>A factor in the garages falling into disuse may be that they are too small to accommodate many modern cars, and this will have increased the on street parking pressures to the area.</p> <p>Currently the formal and informal parking for Ribblesdale and Sleddale is around 60 spaces for approximately 47 dwellings, and falls below the Zone 3 standard. This and the greatly increased number of commercial vehicles in the locality has added much pressure to on street parking in Wensleydale.</p> <p>In addition, the conversion of many of the houses in Wensleydale to flats will have added to this pressure.</p> <p>On most days the on street parking in Wensleydale is chaotic and often hazardous with footpaths on both sides continuously blocked by vehicles. Pedestrians are forced into the road, and I have witnessed a wheelchair user having to hurriedly struggle uphill in the roadway with the fear of speeding vehicles.</p> <p>I would ask please if consideration is given to any existing formal or informal parking that may be displaced by these proposals, and if there are any nearby alternative areas that could become car parking to help mitigate this increasing and hazardous problem.</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENT</p> <p>I received a letter from DBC dated 20/11/20 outlining these proposals and advising a formal application would follow where comments from local residents would be invited. I assumed a further letter would follow?</p> <p>I heard nothing further and only found out recently by a letter from</p>

Councillor Brenda Link that a formal application had been submitted on 8/12/20.

Thank You

GARAGES

The Design & Access Statement acknowledges the garage court was originally provided to provide parking spaces for residents of Sleddale & Ribblesdale. However, it describes the garages as becoming disused and underused over time. This may give a false impression of the garages being unwanted and not required. The following questions arise:-

1. Does the Council acknowledge the garages are too small for many modern cars, and are therefore not fit for purpose, and given the increase in car ownership this loss of parking provision has led to an increase in on-street parking stress.
2. Has the Council had a policy of not carrying out routine maintenance & repairs that has led to the garage court looking run down or derelict.
3. Has the Council had a policy of withholding re-letting of garages when they have been vacated
4. Other Councils have options that include leveling garages that are not fit for purpose and providing open parking for rent. Has DBC assessed this option.

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

The Design & Access Statement describes the apartment block as continuing the nature of the adjacent 3 storey properties and integrating well with existing surroundings, which appears incorrect.

The height of the apartment block would be equivalent to a comparable 4 storey version of the adjacent property, and even though the ground floor level is lower on the downhill slope the roof will be significantly higher than the adjacent uphill property.

The apartment block is significantly out of character with the Wensleydale street scene where existing 3 storey dwellings generally sit 7 to 8 metres above street level. The height and length of the block will dominate the street scene, and the downhill flank will tower some 12 metres above street level at the junction of Sleddale and Wensleydale, and will also tower some 6 metres above the adjacent new dwelling. The block will significantly obscure direct sunlight from surrounding properties at varying times.

This proposal is not in keeping with Dacorums Area Based Policy for HCA20 Highfield.

PARKING

The displacement of vehicles from garages has led to on street parking in the surrounding streets being highly stressed. There are approximately 45 dwellings served by Sleddale and Ribblesdale. Acceptable formal and on street parking available is approximately 45 spaces and is well below Zone 3 parking standards that would provide 68 spaces in new development. It can be observed that well in excess

	<p>of a further 20 vehicles are often chaotically parking in these streets with many parked on pavements causing obstruction. The eviction of any existing garage users to on street would exacerbate the problem, and the proposal will displace a minimum of 14 vehicles from on street in Sleddale & Wensleydale.</p> <p>Area Based Policy for HCA20 states 'the redevelopment of garage blocks will only be permitted if alternative provision is made for displaced vehicle parking'</p> <p>EXISTING ON STREET PARKING STRESS This proposal will increase the existing high on street parking stress in Ribblesdale and Wensleydale. (comments made in previous consultation on parking stress in Wensleydale)</p> <p>Has the Council carried out an on street parking stress survey in accordance with appendix C of Dacorum's parking standards SPG adopted in Nov 20, and will the results be published prior to committee date. The residents may consider a private independent survey using the Council's methodology in appendix C.</p> <p>Pavement parking is a severe and hazardous problem in Wensleydale, which will increase due to this proposal if no alternative provision is made. How would this fit with any duties the Council may have under network management and The Traffic Management Act, and the House of Commons traffic committee review on the problem of pavement parking.</p> <p>SUMMARY Whilst these proposals may be presented as in keeping with the provisions of the NPPF, and the Council's adopted Core Strategy, can they be justified in overriding previously well thought out Area Based Policies, and particularly where unmitigated increased parking stress will further degrade the quality of living in the area for existing residents.</p>
<p>26 Wensleydale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TF</p>	<p>I live (and own) the property at 26 Wensleydale. I own (and rent out) the property at 28 Wensleydale: both properties are very close to the proposed development. We also rent two garages in Sleddale, one used as storage area (no loft in the house!), and another one to store our second car.</p> <p>I am 65 years old and Antony is 78 years old.</p> <p>We are both strongly against the new development, because of the traffic in Wensleydale and the number of cars already parked here. Removing garages and adding people will make the situation much worse.</p> <p>The increased traffic will make more difficult for an emergency vehicle to reach us. In the last few years, my husband had to be taken to the hospital by ambulance several times. In one occasion, he collapsed outside our home and he had to be resuscitated by the paramedic. I don't even want to think what could have happened if the ambulance was delayed by the traffic between Wensleydale and Cambrian way.</p> <p>Even without the new development, Wensleydale is already</p>

overcrowded with parked cars and because of the nearby school, the traffic in the morning is horrendous.

We avoid leaving/returning home at rush hours, because of the traffic at the junction with Cambrian way.

At night (and day), the pavement at the top of Wensleydale (before the junction with Cambrian way) is full with parked cars : I used to catch the 6:10 am coach to London and most of the time I had to walk in the middle of the road, because it was not possible to use the pavement.

The 'square' at the back on my house is completely full with parked cars, and there is no spared capacity for parking.

Several people in the neighbourhood keep their cars in one of the garage: the development will remove the garages (more cars to be parked in the street), and it will remove the a lot of kerbside, and the garage access, at the moment used for parking cars. In the morning, there are usually 4-5 cars parked just in the access road to the garage. They are often gone during the day when the owners drives to work.

Visitors are unable to park their car, and often leave their car in the middle of the road!

The lower part of Wensleydale is already overcrowded compared to the original design of the street. Almost every town house from number 1 to 20 has been converted to two dwellings, increasing the occupancy, the number of cars, and traffic resulting from delivery vans.

The new development, with the increased populations and traffic, will considerable decrease our quality of life.

Further comments following amendments

I live at 26 Wensleydale. We moved here over 35 years ago, and the area was spacious and pleasant. Since then, we traffic and the number of cars parked have grown exponentially, partly caused most of the town houses at the bottom of Wensleydale have been converted to flat/maisonette, increasing the number of cars, without providing extra space. At the moment, Wensleydale is already overcrowded with traffic and parked cars. If the garages are demolished, all the cars parked in the garages and the access road will move to Wensleydale/Ribblesdale, already full.

For instance, I rent two garages in the area that will be rebuild, we use one as extra storage, and the second for my car. I will have to keep my car in front of the house, and this will cause access problem to my disabled husband, as he will not have enough room to access his car. We need two cars, because we are out at the same time during the day (pre-pandemic!) and my husband is unable to use public transport. If we have visitors they have problems in parking their car because of overcrowding.

	<p>The parking spaces provided to the new dwellings are not enough, for the number of properties, so more cars will be fighting for the non existing parking space.</p> <p>The traffic is currently very heavy, causing congestion at the top of the road. I am really worried that extra dwellings will increase the traffic, and making difficult for emergency vehicle to enter Wensleydale. My husband has an hearth condition, and just in the last year I had to call an emergency ambulance three times. So this is a real concern for me.</p> <p>Already, we try to avoid going out at rush hours, because the traffic make difficult and risky accessing Wensleydale.</p> <p>During school time, the traffic is very heavy, with car parked in the middle of the street, stopping the children from being able to cross the road safely.</p> <p>Cars are parked on the pavements: when commuting to London in the early hours of the morning, I have to walk in the middle of the road to get to the bus stop, because the pavement is occupied by cars.</p> <p>The proposed block of flat is too tall, and its design is not in keep with the rest of the estate architecture. The submitted designs are very pretty, but they don't show how the street will be affected by cars piled everywhere.</p> <p>I am already suffering and taking medication for clinical depression (partly due to the worrying for my husband health). This new proposed development is making my condition much worse, especially because of the future problems with traffic, and the fear and anxiety of not been able to get an ambulance in case of need.</p> <p>We have not been given any alternative arrangement for the garages we rent.</p> <p>I fully understand the need for new dwelling, but the proposed one will make everyone one life more complicated and difficult.</p>
<p>35 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>The height of the proposed block of apartments is really concerning considering the close proximity to multiple 2 storey flat roofed houses. I feel that if the design of the apartment block is not reconsidered, this shows a clear lack of care and understanding for the local residents.</p>
<p>7 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>I object to this plan. There isn't enough parking for what is already here as it is and it will decrease daylight into our homes. It will also increase traffic and congestion on the area.</p> <p>I object to this proposal. Due to there being an impact on privacy, they will be higher than the current homes here. It will have a massive impact on parking. Which is already full as it is. Local facilities will be impacted with more residents in the area.</p>
<p>4 Wensleydale Hemel Hempstead</p>	<p>I am extremely disappointed to receive notification of a development of the Sleddale Garage Sites.</p>

<p>Hertfordshire HP2 5TF</p>	<p>This is the first notification I have seen about the development and note that it has been prepared by local residents!</p> <p>Although I am not affected by loss of sunlight or loss of privacy like the residents nearer the proposed development, just the fact that there is not enough parking for the current residents is enough for me to raise an objection as this will make matters even worse.</p> <p>There is already inadequate parking available for the residents and this is further compounded by parents dropping their children off and collecting from school who block driveways and park on the pavements!</p> <p>An area of green land in Wharfdale was already turned into more parking spaces about 3-4 years ago and mature trees were felled to provide more parking for the current residents and there is still a huge problem.</p> <p>There have been far too many townhouses converted into flats already, which has caused significant problems with parking. We purchased our property in 2015 and unbeknown to us the property next door had been bought by a landlord. We were unaware that planning had been submitted to turn the property into two flats and would have objected strongly if we had known. Since living here, I have seen more townhouses converted into flats, but have never seen any notification of the proposed development and so have never had the opportunity to object!</p> <p>Rather than building more houses, if the Sleddale garages are not being used by any of the current residents which I assume is the case as you are planning to put more houses on the site, then convert the area into more parking for the current residents, please do not add to what is already a huge problem for those who live in the area!</p>
<p>25 Nitterdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TE</p>	<p>I object with the planning permission.</p>
<p>23 Nitterdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TE</p>	<p>GARAGES</p> <p>The Design & Access Statement acknowledges the garage court was originally provided to provide parking spaces for residents of Sleddale & Ribblesdale. However, it describes the garages as becoming disused and underused over time. This may give a false impression of the garages being unwanted and not required. The following questions arise:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the Council acknowledge the garages are too small for many modern cars, and are therefore not fit for purpose, and given the increase in car ownership this loss of parking provision has led to an increase in on-street parking stress. 2. Has the Council had a policy of not carrying out routine maintenance & repairs that has led to the garage court looking run down or derelict. 3. Has the Council had a policy of withholding re-letting of garages

when they have been vacated
4. Other Councils have options that include leveling garages that are not fit for purpose and providing open parking for rent. Has DBC assessed this option.

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

The Design & Access Statement describes the apartment block as continuing the nature of the adjacent 3 storey properties and integrating well with existing surroundings, which appears incorrect.

The height of the apartment block would be equivalent to a comparable 4 storey version of the adjacent property, and even though the ground floor level is lower on the downhill slope the roof will be significantly higher than the adjacent uphill property.

The apartment block is significantly out of character with the Wensleydale street scene where existing 3 storey dwellings generally sit 7 to 8 metres above street level. The height and length of the block will dominate the street scene, and the downhill flank will tower some 12 metres above street level at the junction of Sleddale and Wensleydale, and will also tower some 6 metres above the adjacent new dwelling. The block will significantly obscure direct sunlight from surrounding properties at varying times.

This proposal is not in keeping with Dacorums Area Based Policy for HCA20 Highfield.

PARKING

The displacement of vehicles from garages has led to on street parking in the surrounding streets being highly stressed. There are approximately 45 dwellings served by Sleddale and Ribblesdale. Acceptable formal and on street parking available is approximately 45 spaces and is well below Zone 3 parking standards that would provide 68 spaces in new development. It can be observed that well in excess of a further 20 vehicles are often chaotically parking in these streets with many parked on pavements causing obstruction. The eviction of any existing garage users to on street would exacerbate the problem, and the proposal will displace a minimum of 14 vehicles from on street in Sleddale & Wensleydale.

Area Based Policy for HCA20 states 'the redevelopment of garage blocks will only be permitted if alternative provision is made for displaced vehicle parking'

EXISTING ON STREET PARKING STRESS

This proposal will increase the existing high on street parking stress in Ribblesdale and Wensleydale. (comments made in previous consultation on parking stress in Wensleydale)

Has the Council carried out an on street parking stress survey in accordance with appendix C of Dacorums parking standards SPG adopted in Nov 20, and will the results be published prior to committee date. The residents may consider a private independent survey using the Council's methodology in appendix C.

	<p>Pavement parking is a severe and hazardous problem in Wensleydale, which will increase due to this proposal if no alternative provision is made. How would this fit with any duties the Council may have under network management and The Traffic Management Act, and the House of Commons traffic committee review on the problem of pavement parking.</p> <p>SUMMARY Whilst these proposals may be presented as in keeping with the provisions of the NPPF, and the Council's adopted Core Strategy, can they be justified in overriding previously well thought out Area Based Policies, and particularly where unmitigated increased parking stress will further degrade the quality of living in the area for existing residents.</p>
<p>2 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>Due to the height of the development it is not in keeping with the area, as well as the height of the building it will in fringe on the privacy of nearby properties. At the moment the area is used for parking, and any parking taken away will involve them parking in other areas or on the wensleydale, which will be dangerous, many of the local school parents park down there, and I have often seen near misses with parents and children trying to cross here, the garages opposite the development would make ideal additional parking for residents and school parents alike, and would be a safe option.</p>
<p>20 Nitterdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TE</p>	<p>This height of this development is too high, and will block sunlight in my garden. The height of the flats are not in keeping with the rest of the area. I will lose privacy in my garden as a result of this. It would be more ideal to make this development 2 stories high only. This will also reduce parking and cause parking issues in an already difficult area to park, and will result in inadequate parking for all surrounding roads.</p>
<p>28 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>Highfield 14 is already an overdeveloped area, but the Council seems to persist in building on every available small piece of land and digging up trees and concreting over grass areas. The height of the proposed dwellings are too high and will overshadow all nearby houses. Our house at no. 28 will be overlooked and you would have cut off any views we have. You are taking away households privacy from all the houses near by. How can we have pride in our area when it is becoming an overdeveloped site? You want all Dacorum residents to have pride and well being by you are not prepared to let us enjoy our home living. In a national survey HH came 4th in the worst place to live in Hertfordshire, the survey states that HH is a grubby concrete place to live. By overdeveloping each area, I think Dacorum want to knock Stevenage off number 1 on the list and take its place!! Also it is suggested that the glass square in Ribblesdale has the trees cut down and concreted over to make another SIX parking places ~ you have already cut all the corners of the parking areas off to make a square parking area, digging up the grass and cutting down the trees to make more parking, also two large areas of bushes were cut down and concreted over for more parking. I cannot believe that you want to concrete this over for more parking and are prepared to cut down MORE TREES. Children use this grass area to play and ride their bikes and scooters round, when it snowed there were five snowmen built out</p>

	<p>there, but you now want to take this all away from the residents and their children/grandchildren. There is ample parking in Ribblesdale for the residents, but half of Sleddale also walk up and park here, so if you want to concrete any green over, use the big green in Sleddale so they have their own parking. I think you should look for a bigger site for new dwellings and parking and stop trying to jam so many new houses into all ready over developed areas.</p>
<p>27 Wensleydale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TF</p>	<p>Parking is already extremely limited on Wensleydale and Sleddale, building 18 new properties is going to cause even more parking issues.</p> <p>Loss of sunlight as the flats will be blocking the sunlight coming into view of my house.</p> <p>Loss of privacy</p>
<p>5 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>I am currently renting 2 garages to store a car and a motorcycle, If I do not keep my motorcycle in a locked building it will increase my insurance premiums and the possibility of its theft.</p> <p>These garages are in the block above Sleddale, I know of many residents that rent garages in this block.</p> <p>What I would like to know is, will there be alternative garages made available to enable myself and other residents to park the vehicles.</p> <p><i>Further comments</i></p> <p>I currently rent 2 garages in the top block, where am I going to put my project car and my motorcycle and trailer in separate garage as I have no space on my property?</p>
<p>25 Wensleydale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TF</p>	<p>We are writing to complain about the future development opposite our house (25 Wensleydale) as the height of the building will affect our privacy and stop the sunlight. They will be able to look straight in to our bedroom windows.</p> <p>The flats will totally dominate the view that we have at the moment. We have had our house since new and it will affect our way of life. We wont get any sun at the front of our house during the months when the sun is lower. Can you not lower this building to a two storey instead of a three so we're not as overlooked as we will be, and we will get more sunlight.</p> <p>Would it be possible to have very light brick and not the dark ones that my house is made of?</p>
<p>24 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>The proposed height of the flats will ruin the skyline and cause neighbouring buildings to be over-shadowed. People need natural sunlight and to have this taken away because someone wants to make more money is criminal. To stop the building "sticking out like a sore thumb", it needs to be aesthetically pleasing and to be built with the lighter bricks of the 2 options.</p>

	<p>The parking in the surrounding area is already inadequate and so if the large garage area in Wensleydale , opposite the development site, could be made into additional parking this would ease the pressure.</p>
<p>6 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>When taking my children to and from school every day the road is so dangerous, there are so many parked cars on top of all the junctions, there are no safe places to cross, parents from hammond school drive in and park, on top of all the residents that are already parked here makes it a terribly dangerous for the children. Besides that there are not enough spaces for parking the people who live here already without adding another 20 or so families into the mix. The residents here have to park on kerbs and in other streets as it is, adding to this would make it even worse and then if emergency services need to get into the road this may prove very hard. I'm not totally against the space being used for homes as i understand people need somewhere to live but maybe the development could be smaller and with adequate parking.</p>
<p>34 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>I would like to take this opportunity to voice my objections to the proposed planning application submitted by Mr Ian Jackson for the demolition of 34 residential garages and construction of 2 no dwelling houses 6 no apartments at Garage Court Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire, the Planning Reference number is 20/03821/FUL. The proposed development would result in a building site being basically at the bottom of my garden with all the dust and noise that entails for 12/18 months or longer meaning we would not be able to have doors/windows open in the hot weather or let our Granddaughters play out in the back garden. Once the development is completed the properties would be higher than ours and would not only block any sunlight from my garden/house but would mean the residents of the new dwellings would be able to look down into our house, or my Daughters bedroom which would be a massive invasion of privacy. If the development went ahead it would also add to the massive parking problem that already exists in the area and could surely only be addressed by removing the trees and amenity area (green) that the children play on that presently exists in Ribblesdale. If this development goes ahead I think it ill have a massive negative effect on the quality of life for the local residents and a negative effect on the biodiversity of the area, we would also lose valuable green areas which is not for the ecology of the area in general and Ribblesdale in particular. I really do hope that the concerns of the residents are taken into consideration when the decisions are made and are not just brushed aside as Ribblesdale is a nice place to raise a family and it should be allowed to stay that way.</p>
<p>31 Wensleydale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TF</p>	<p>I do not have access to email or internet. I am writing to object to planning of proposed building of 2 bedroom flats + 1 bedroom flats and two houses at the site I Sleddale as it will interfere with privacy and parking of my property.</p>

Agenda Item 5c

ITEM NUMBER: 5c

20/00396/FUL	Extension to block a/b to form additional offices above existing ground floor office.	
Site Address:	Ver House, 55 London Road, Markyate, Hertfordshire	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr Soor	
Case Officer:	Robert Freeman	
Parish/Ward:	Markyate Parish Council	Watling
Referral to Committee:	<p>The application has been referred to the Development Management Committee given the contrary recommendation of Markyate Parish Council.</p> <p>The application has also been called in by Councillor Chapman. Councillor Chapman has expressed concerns about the height of the building and the impact on privacy of neighbouring units. Councillor Chapman is also concerned with the access to the site and the impact of development on highways safety.</p>	

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

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 The proposals would provide additional office space within the village of Markyate of a scale compatible with surrounding residential uses in accordance with Policies CS4, CS12 and CS14 of the Core Strategy.
- 2.2 The buildings are located a significant distance from residential properties in London Road and have been carefully design to avoid harm to residential properties in both London Road and Long Meadow. The increased height to the proposed buildings would not result in any significant loss in either daylight or sunlight to neighbouring land in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.
- 2.3 The controlled use of the site will result in some improvements in terms of noise generation and some alleviation of anti-social behaviour on the site.
- 2.4 The increased office use does not significantly intensify the use of the site and would not give rise to conditions prejudicial to matters of highways safety as set out in the comments of the highway authority. The means of access to the site is therefore considered to be satisfactory in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy, Saved Policies 51 and 54 and Appendix 4 of the Local Plan and Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

- 3.1 Ver House is located to the rear of properties forming 53-89 London Road, Markyate and comprises a light industrial complex of three buildings and associated parking areas. Blocks A and B comprise single storey premises used for more general commercial purposes including manufacture whilst Block C appears to be a more modern two storey office building. There are a total of 47 designated parking spaces across the site.

- 3.2 The buildings are currently occupied by a range of tenants including Acrovision (suppliers of industrial barcode readers and other automated system products) Service Logic Ltd (repair of electrical and optical equipment) A hard standing yard behind units A and B also appears to have been used for the storage and repair of vehicles and as a scrap yard.
- 3.3 The north western flank elevation of building A abuts the boundary with the residential properties in Long Meadow. There are a number of trees on the northern boundary of the site with the busy A5183 beyond this boundary.
- 3.4 The River Ver enters a culvert at the western site boundary and runs beneath the site.

4. PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The application seeks outline planning permission for the construction of additional floors above the existing commercial premises in blocks A and B for use as office accommodation. A single floor would be added to Block A with two floors being added to Block B. Dormers would be utilised in the roof space to provide additional floor area within the building. Permission is required for access, layout and scale.
- 4.2 The proposals would add approximately 413 m² office space to the site. This is capable of being subdivided into a number of separate premises served by communal stairwells and toilets. The yard at the rear of the building would be set out to provide an additional 19 parking spaces.
- 4.3 The application has been revised since its original submission and additional information has been provided by the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment

5. PLANNING HISTORY

- 5.1 An earlier application (4/03141/18/OUT) for the construction of offices was withdrawn to address issues raised by the Environment Agency in relation to the culverting of the River Ver and activities on the site.

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. 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
CS4 – The Towns and Large Villages
CS8 – Sustainable Transport
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS13 – Quality of Public Realm
CS14 – Economic Development
CS15 – Offices, Research, Industry, Storage and Distribution
CS26 – Green Infrastructure
CS29 – Sustainable Design and Construction
CS32 – Air, Soil and Water Quality
CS31 – Water Management
CS32 – Air, Soil and Water Quality
CS35 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.

Local Plan

Policy 13 – Planning Conditions and Planning Obligations
Policy 51 – Development and Transport Impacts
Policy 54 – Highway Design
Policy 99 – Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands
Appendix 4 - :Layout and Design of Employment Areas.

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)
Energy Efficiency and Conservation
Water Conservation

8. CONSIDERATIONS

Policy and Principle

- 8.1 Although the application site does not form a designated General Employment Area under the Core Strategy or Saved Local Plan it does perform an important employment role within the village of Markyate and its growth would be encouraged under Policy CS4, CS14 and CS15 of the Core Strategy providing that this is not to the detriment of residential uses.
- 8.2 Policy CS15 specifically provides support for provision for small businesses that may be served by modest sized and flexible office spaces such as those proposed in this application. This may assume additional importance given the current COVID-19 pandemic and the likelihood of different working trends emerging during economic recovery.
- 8.3 The key issues in this case are therefore whether the growth of the employment use would be detrimental to the residential amenities of those residential properties around the perimeter of the application site and whether the access and parking arrangements remain safe and appropriate for the type and nature of development upon the site.
- 8.4 Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy stresses the importance of making safe and accessible sites with appropriate levels of car parking embedded in a Car Parking Standards SPD.
- 8.5 Policies CS11 and CS12 from the Core Strategy and Saved Appendices 3 and 4 of the Local Plan establish how the impact of development upon residential amenity may be considered.

Layout and Design

- 8.6 The application has been submitted as an outline application and as such it is relevant only to consider the access, layout and scale of the proposed building. All other matters (appearance and landscaping) have been reserved. It has been clarified that the height of the building should be considered as per drawing VER.H.M.P.ELEV.R1 dated 01/20. This indicates that a raised eaves level, roof and dormer windows would be provided to building A and an additional floor and converted roof space would be added to building B. This would add approximately 413 square metres of office space.
- 8.7 Drawing VER.H.M.P.ELEV.R1 also provides illustrative elevations of the proposed building. This is considered to be generally acceptable in terms of its design, bulk, scale, height, layout and use of materials in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS13 of the Core Strategy. These elevations form a sound basis upon which to evolve the overall appearance of building through the reserved matters including the arrangement of fenestration.

Impact on Amenity

Long Meadow

- 8.8 The nearest residential unit to the proposed development is that at 1 Long Meadow immediately to the west of the application site. The impact of the proposed development upon the amenities of this unit is limited.
- 8.9 The alterations to this building result in a lower ridge line than the existing building and the provision of a hipped roof form. Although the eaves line is higher and the internal floor levels have been adjusted to achieve additional office space, the building is not considered to have any significant impact on daylight or sunlight to this property.
- 8.10 A number of dormer windows are shown on the indicative elevation. I would have some concerns in relation to the close proximity of a dormer window serving a stairwell to the western end of Block A and its implications for privacy of 1 Long Meadow. It would be recommended this window is fitted as a non-opening obscure glazed window or removed as details of the appearance of the building are dealt with through reserved matters applications. I am satisfied that the other dormer windows to this building would not provide any direct view into the dwelling or its amenity space and as such would not be considered to be harmful to the residential amenities of this property.

London Road

- 8.11 Ver House is located to the north of London Road and in excess of 40m from the rear elevations to properties thereon. It is also located within the valley of the River Ver and lower than the properties in London Road.
- 8.12 The provision of a two storey building in this location will not result in any impact upon daylight or sunlight to properties in London Road and is significantly in excess of the commensurate residential standards for separation distances. The inclusion of windows at first floor level and at roof level within this building are not considered to be significantly harmful to the privacy of these residential units, in view of the separation distance, topography and nature of intended use.

Access and Parking

- 8.13 The site will continue to be accessed via a road located between residential units at 53 and 57 London Road. This road is approximately 4.5m in width and approximately 35m in length. London Road is generally straight in this location with good visibility of on-coming traffic to the west of the access. There are however parking bays located to the south east of the access providing on-street parking for residential properties.
- 8.14 The scale of the proposed office development has been dramatically reduced since the original comments from the highway authority from the 853m² identified in their response to approximately 756 m² (Gross External Floor Area) This scale of office development is considered unlikely to generate significant vehicle movements in addition to those currently being undertaken from the site and in the opinion of the highway authority would not significantly prejudice matters of highway safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies 51 and 54 of the Local Plan 1991-2011
- 8.15 An additional 19 parking spaces would be allocated as a result of this development and this would represent a shortfall of 2-3 spaces against the standards in the Car Parking Standards SPD (based on 1 space per 35m²). This is not considered to be significant in this case noting the location of bus stops outside 69 London Road and the Plume and Feathers Public House a short walking distance (less than 200m) from the site
- 8.16 It is noted that the current office accommodation has an over provision of spaces against the adopted standards and that overall the site would still provide an over provision in parking spaces of some 7 spaces for the scale of office development within this commercial area.
- 8.17 The applicant should submit further details of EV charging points through a planning condition.

Representations

Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour

- 8.18 The current use of the site does not appear to be regulated leading to its use by business premises till late at night and occasional instances of crime and anti-social behaviour. Lights have been installed to buildings A and B in the interests of security, although their siting appears to have been a nuisance to residential properties in London Road. A number of residents have expressed concerns that the proposals will intensify the use of the site and exacerbate these problems.
- 8.19 The proposals seek to introduce offices, formerly a Class B1 land use and now included in Schedule 2 Part A (Commercial, Business and Services) Class E of the Use Classes Order. These uses extend to commercial uses which can be carried out in a residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, soot, ash, dust or grit and as such should, by definition, not result in any significant harm to residential amenities of neighbouring properties.
- 8.20 The proposals are seen as beneficial, in that they would remove the current yard area from the rear of buildings A and B in favour of additional parking for the office use. A number of complaints refer directly to noise from this activity as being detrimental to residential amenity, particularly where this occurs at weekends.
- 8.21 The use of planning conditions can further control the hours of use of the offices in the interests of residential amenities, whilst conditions on the external lighting and means for security of the site are also considered to be reasonable given the nature of the proposals

and the requirements to prevent or discourage crime under the NPPF and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

Flooding and Drainage

- 8.22 There has been a significant delay in the processing of this application to allow the applicants to address concerns raised by the Environment Agency to the continued development of the site, including the culverting of the River Ver and unpermitted activities within the protected area of the watercourse and the impact of the proposals on flood risk. The uses of the site include the use of land to the rear of buildings A and B associated with scrap and car repairs including works associated with motor sport (as referred to in the objection from 65 London Road)
- 8.23 The site is identified as falling within Zone 3 (high risk) however the proposals are for a less vulnerable form of development and would not increase either the footprint of the building nor hard standing. The Environment Agency has removed their objection on the basis of additional information provided in relation to flooding and the stability and integrity of the culverted section of the Ver underneath the site. There is no objection to the use of the area of hard standing above the culvert as a parking area, nor is it considered that the construction of additional office space above building A and B give rise to conditions that would increase the risk of flooding either on the site or in neighbouring land.

Need

- 8.24 A number of representations have raised concerns with the demand for office space in the locality given the loss of other areas of employment in the village and given a high vacancy rate in existing office premises within the village. They are concerned that further applications will be submitted for residential use of the site. It is not prudent for the local planning authority to question the need for office space given that it is appropriate in the locality nor is this material to the consideration of this case.
- 8.25 Any application for residential use of the site will need to be judged on its own merits.

Noise and Pollution

- 8.26 Paragraph 8.19 clarifies that office uses should not normally give rise to conditions prejudicial to residential amenities of neighbouring properties, whilst paragraph 8.21 above also proposes mitigation measures against nuisance associated with use of the premises. The use of the building as offices should not significantly increase the noise nuisance associated with the site and is unlikely in my opinion to exceed the background noise levels associated with the use of the A5138. The proposed building is also likely to include sound insulation to prevent noise being a concern to future occupants and to mitigate noise arising from the use of the building. For these reasons, it would be concluded that there are no grounds to refuse the application based on the noise and pollution concerns of neighbouring units.

Trees

- 8.27 The proposals do not affect the trees located along the rear boundary of the site in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 99 of the Local Plan 1991-2011

Other Material Considerations

- 8.28 The proposals are not accompanied by any Sustainability Statement in accordance with Policy CS29 of the Core Strategy. The absence of this statement does not prevent the determination of the proposals although it would be useful to understand how the works to the buildings would contribute to the aims and objectives of this policy and meet the requirements of the Energy Efficiency SPD and Water Conservation SPD. The fabric of the building is likely to be improved as a result of development thereby improving the energy efficiency of the properties. As mentioned above, there is also an opportunity to provide EV charging facilities on the site in accordance with the Car Parking Standards SPD

Conditions

- 8.29 The application is submitted as an outline proposal and as such a number of conditions are required in relation to the timing and content of reserved matters applications.
- 8.30 In addition further details in relation to exterior lighting, crime prevention measures, arrangements for EV charging points and sustainable construction measures are required to address the needs emerging from policies in the Core Strategy and to address the representations made in this case.
- 8.21 I am also minded to restrict the use of the proposed premises in the interests of the residential amenities of neighbouring units and to address any concerns with activities from the site late in the evening and at weekends.

9 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 It would be difficult to substantiate a reason for refusal of this planning application on access, layout or scale grounds. The proposals would add additional office floorspace within an employment area and the resulting building would not exceed two storeys in height. They are not considered to result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Planning conditions would be utilised to mitigate any adverse impact on neighbours, particularly through the removal of noise generating activities, control over future occupants and hours of operation. The proposals would be in broad accordance with Policies CS8, CS12 and CS13 of the Core Strategy.

10 RECOMMENDATION

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

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

- 1. Details of the appearance and landscaping (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.**

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 92 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.**

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 92 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. **The development hereby approved shall not exceed the overall ridge and eaves height parameters identified on drawing VER.H.M.P.ELEV.R1 dated 01/20 and revised 20.06.20**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and an appropriate relationship to neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

4. **The details of appearance to be submitted for the approval of the local planning authority in accordance with Condition (1) above shall include:**

- **Full elevation details for the proposed building**
- **Details of the materials to be used on the external appearance of the building hereby approved,**
- **Details of the slab, ridge and eaves height of the proposed building in relation to existing ground levels.**
- **Details of any lighting to be provided to the exterior of the building together with isolux diagrams demonstrating the extent and intensity of illumination,**
- **Details of bin storage provision including recycling facilities;**
- **Details of secure cycle storage;**
- **Details of any security and crime prevention measures incorporated in the building fabric or upon the site;**
- **Any gates, rails or other means of enclosure upon the site**

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance and functioning of the development in accordance with Policies CS11, CS12, CS26 and CS29 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 4 of the Local Plan 1991-2011

5. **Details of landscaping to be submitted for the approval of the local planning authority in accordance with Condition 1 above shall include:**

means of enclosure;
soft landscape works which shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate;
tree protection measures,
proposed finished levels or contours;
external lighting;
minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, storage units, signs etc.); and
proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines), indicating lines, manholes, supports etc;

The approved landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed programme of implementation. The trees, shrubs and grass shall subsequently be maintained for a period of five years from the date of planting and any which die or are destroyed during this period shall be replaced during the next planting season and maintained until satisfactorily established.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area in accordance with Policies CS12 and 26 of the Core Strategy

6. **The development, hereby approved, shall not be occupied until the access and parking arrangements shown on drawing VER.H.M.ST.R1 (Site Layout) have been provided. These parking arrangements shall be thereafter retained in accordance with the approved drawings.**

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy, Saved Policies 51 and 54 in the Local Plan 1991-2011 and the Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)

7. **Notwithstanding the details approved under Condition 6, the offices hereby approved shall not be occupied until electric vehicle charging points have been provided in accordance with plans to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.**

Reason: To ensure the provision of appropriate on-site parking in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Car Parking Standards SPD

8. **No development shall take place until details of proposed sustainability measures within the development shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To ensure the sustainable development of the site in accordance with the aims of Policies CS28 and CS29 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013), the Sustainable Development Advice Note (2016) and Paragraphs 150 and 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

9. **The building hereby approved, shall only be used for purposes falling within Classes E (c) and E (g) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (As Amended)**

Reason: To ensure the adequate provision of parking in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Car Parking Standards SPD (2020)

- 10 **The building hereby approved shall only be used between the hours of 08:00 to 19:00 on Mondays to Fridays.**

Reason In the interests of the residential amenities of neighbouring properties and in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Markyate Parish Council	<p>The Council has objected to this proposal in the past and it would appear that none of those objections have been taken into consideration.</p> <p>There is very strong objection from local residents. This proposal is completely out of keeping. Access road is very dangerous, very narrow, therefore forcing Council lorries to reverse up the road. Cars cannot pass each other, often have to reverse out of the road.</p> <p>Access is of paramount concern. Very dangerous vehicular activity.</p> <p>Privacy is massively compromised, surrounding properties will be overlooked. The Council strongly opposes this application and fully supports the residents who oppose the scheme.</p>
Hertfordshire County Council – Highways	<p>ORIGINAL RESPONSE</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 does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.</p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <p><u>Description of the Proposal</u></p> <p>This outline proposal is for the Extension to block A/B to form additional offices on first and second floor above existing ground floor offices.</p> <p>London Road is an unnumbered "C" classified road, so vehicles are required to enter and leave the highway in forward gear.</p> <p><u>Analysis</u></p> <p>The Roads is Hertfordshire: Design Guide 3rd Edition (RiH) only requires a Design and Access Statement for this level of development, this has been provided by the applicant.</p> <p><i>Impact on Highway Network</i></p> <p>The application proposals include the addition of 853m² of office space. These are not likely to generate a significant number of trips. Therefore, HCC considers the proposals are acceptable.</p> <p><i>Road Safety</i></p> <p>No accident data has been provided to support the application.</p> <p>However, from a review of the accident data available on crashmap</p>

there is no accident history involving personal injury within the vicinity of the site.

Highway Layout

Access Arrangements

There is an existing vehicular access on London Road, which appears to operate without problem. This will continue to be used for the development.

Parking

The proposals will provide an additional 19 parking spaces of standard dimensions, giving a total of 66 parking spaces for 2064m² of office space, which is acceptable to HCC.

However, it will be for the Dacorum Borough Council to determine the appropriateness of the level of parking provided.

Cycle Parking

There are 10 cycle spaces currently and these will be retained.

Accessibility

Public Transport

The nearest bus stops are located on London Road. There is easy access from Markyate to the M1 and surrounding road network.

Pedestrian and Cycle Access

There are no dedicated cycling facilities on the surrounding roads, but the road is suitable for cyclists. The accessibility of the site is considered to be adequate for level small level of trips generated by the office development.

Planning Obligations/ Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

It is not considered that any planning obligations are considered applicable to the proposed development.

AMENDED PLANS

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:

COMMENTS

Description of the Proposal

This amended outline proposal is for the Extension to block a/b to form additional offices above existing ground floor office.

It submits documentation regarding EA comments on the culvert on site.

Analysis

The Roads is Hertfordshire: Design Guide 3rd Edition (RiH) only requires a Design and Access Statement for this level of development, this has been provided by the applicant.

Impact on Highway Network

The application proposals include the addition of 845m² of office space. These are not likely to generate a significant number of trips.

Therefore, HCC considers the proposals are acceptable.

Road Safety

No accident data has been provided to support the application. However, from a review of the accident data available on crashmap there is no accident history involving personal injury within the vicinity of the site.

Highway Layout

Access Arrangements

There is an existing vehicular access on London Road, which appears to operate without problem. This will continue to be used for the development.

Parking

The proposals will provide an additional 19 parking spaces of standard dimensions, giving a total of 66 parking spaces for 2064m² of office space, which is acceptable to HCC.

However, it will be for the Dacorum Borough Council to determine the appropriateness of the level of parking provided.

Cycle Parking

There are 10 cycle spaces currently and these will be retained.

Accessibility

Public Transport

The nearest bus stops are located on London Road. There is easy access from Markyate to the M1 and surrounding road network.

Pedestrian and Cycle Access

There are no dedicated cycling facilities on the surrounding roads, but the road is suitable for cyclists.

The accessibility of the site is considered to be adequate for level small level of trips generated by the office development.

	<p>Planning Obligations/ Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)</p> <p>It is not considered that any planning obligations are considered applicable to the proposed development.</p>
Environmental Agency	<p>AMENDED PLANS</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting us on the above application following the submission of further information.</p> <p>We are now in a position to remove our previous objection.</p> <p>INFORMATIVE</p> <p>The Environment Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for any activities which will take place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On or within 8m of a main river (16m if tidal) - On or within 8m of a flood defence structure or culvert (16m if tidal) - On or within 16m of a sea defence - Involving quarrying or excavation within 16m of any main river, flood defence or culvert - In a floodplain more than 8m from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure and you don't already have planning permission. <p>RESPONSE FROM JULY 2020</p> <p>Thank you for re-consulting us on the above application. We are now in a position to remove our first objection (Absence of a Flood Risk Assessment) but not the second (Proximity fo Culvert)</p> <p>Objection: Proximity to Culvert</p> <p>The proposed development is unacceptable because it involves construction of an extension over the existing development which is adjacent to the culverted River Ver. As submitted, it is unlikely that we would grant a flood risk activity permit for this application.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <p>The submitted Engineering Report Ref BA 4148 does not fully demonstrate that the culvert can withstand the load from the proposed development. The proposed development is likely to adversely affect the construction and stability of the culvert which would compromise its function, The proposal will therefore increase the risk of flooding to the local community.</p> <p>The developer does not explore de-culverting the main river. It is outlined in the South West Hertfordshire SFRA 2018, section 10.3 Existing Watercourses and Assets: 'All new developments with culverts running through their site should de-culvert rivers for flood risk</p>

	<p>management and conservation benefits.</p> <p>Overcoming our objection</p> <p>The applicant can overcome our objection by submitting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detailed design drawings of the concrete slab intended to reduce point loading on the culvert, as referenced in Section 4 of the Engineering Report ref BA 4148 - Calculations and ground strength details from site investigations along the line of the culvert to confirm the conclusions in the submitted Engineering Report - Culvert survey to identify the pre-construction internal condition of the culvert to demonstrate that the culvert can withstand any additional loading from the proposed development, - Opportunities to de-culvert the River Ver must be explored under the Environment Agency and DBC policy. If it is not possible to deculvert the River Ver it will need to be demonstrated that leaving the River in culvert is the only option.
--	--

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Address	Comments
17 Long Meadow	<p>This is gross over development of land surrounded by residential property. As a local resident the area is already suffering from flooding issues caused by development along the River Ver which has seen local residents home insurance rise dramatically in the last few years.</p> <p>You have indicated property prices are not a factor but for local residents it will affect the sale-ability of their homes.</p> <p>The property is two stories higher than any other property within the area. Noise from the site is already an issue in an area with numerous reports already made locally in an area which already suffers from noise from the London Luton Airport. That is not even taking into consideration for the actual building work.</p> <p>Traffic is a big issue already in the village with parking along the London Road causing congestion with London Road into the High Street single file for most of its length. The entrances and exits out of the village onto the A5 are already dangerous and busy at key travelling times with commuter traffic but also vehicles cutting through London Road to the local private school. It is not unusual to have to queue all the way down the road to exit the village and the nearest entrance/exit to the development offers poor visibility and is already an accident hot spot!</p> <p>This will only become more of an issue with such a large development where the likely hood is those working there will commute into the village and then park....already the buildings there have employees parking on the London Road competing residents! That would be after the development and access for construction traffic would pose an even higher risk. This also does not consider delivery traffic for offices!</p>

	<p>It would also provide very difficult access to emergency vehicles which should be a key consideration. The A5 was originally diverted from the London road due to traffic and residents safety and the increase in the traffic puts residents at risk.</p> <p>Pollution increase....more traffic coming into the village on a daily basis.</p> <p>Privacy of local properties....the development is located at the rear of and surrounded by residential properties and a building of this height will dominate two storey dwellings and overshadow gardens.</p> <p>Security. A large site will attract more visitors during and outside office hours and with security already an issue for local residents with and burglaries where people have accessed/exited neighbouring properties and areas through the existing development.</p> <p>We already have a substantial development built in the last 10 years with shop and office facilities with a large proportion of it sitting empty since its creation. An office of this size in this location would not attract enough interest for the rent costs/build costs and would likely sit 50% empty until the owner says its becoming a local eyesore and will apply for change of use from commercial to residential just exasperating the above issues!</p> <p>This has been the norm in surrounding towns such as Harpenden and clearly is on the agenda here...The building is already designed to look like a lot of apartment developments</p>
57 London Road	<p>Nothing has changed from the previous application in the context of our objections to the proposals</p> <p>Our primary objections to this proposed development are on the grounds of increased traffic activity both on the site itself but most particularly as influence on the traffic in London Road together with doubts that the parking and accessibility provisions will be sufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of vehicles requiring access to the site has increased dramatically over the last few years and this often results in difficulties and queues at peak times in the mornings and evenings. - A surprisingly large number of vehicles also visit the site during the late evenings, early mornings (4-7am) and at weekends. This is in direct conflict with arguments made in the Design and Access Statement. - A large number of delivery vehicles access the site during any working day and more often than not are unable to turn round on the site - thus being required to reverse up the access road and out onto London Road. Particularly large vehicles regularly park up, partly on the pavement, along London Road, and the people making deliveries walk down the access road wheeling trolleys - Our own vehicular access from our garage, via our gate at the bottom of our garden, is rendered potentially dangerous by vehicles travelling at speed either up or down the access road. - We also have to be very circumspect about driving out onto London

	<p>Road. The fact that the access road is effectively a 'concealed entrance' means that vehicles travelling up and down are not expecting cars and lorries to be either turning into it or out of it. This is exacerbated by the number of parked cars along London Road making visibility even more limited. A number of accidents have occurred over the years including the recent writing off of a car parked on the SW side of London Road.</p> <p>Additional Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Design and Access Statement makes no reference to the location of the development right in the centre of the River Ver flood plain - the new parking spaces are located precisely on the line of the river - now culverted as it was an open V shaped channel behind Buildings A/B until 3 or 4 years ago. - The Design and Access Statement is disingenuous in suggesting that many employees are local people thus concluding that 'many walk to work or use bicycles etc.' We are specifically aware of only one person who lives in the village and walks to work; we have yet to see anybody with a bicycle; there are one or two people who either use buses or are dropped off or picked up by cars or taxis. - Although we have a partial barrier created by our garage we will be overlooked by the majority of the planned development and this raises questions of privacy - we also are affected during the night by the security lighting - triggered almost continuously by traffic from the site
82 High Street	The traffic in the village is already at an unacceptable level with multiple jams and near misses at peak times
67 London Road	<p>We object to this proposal for the following reasons:</p> <p>Loss of privacy - The proposed revised planning application will now include a fourth floor covering nearly 50% of the total development which is a massive over-development as it will quadruple the height of this part of the existing building. The original plans submitted last year, incorporating 3 storeys, drew many objections from residents who are extremely concerned that occupants of the offices will be able to see into our gardens, where children play, and also into the living and sleeping areas of our homes. This is completely unacceptable to us.</p> <p>This new application has all the negatives of the original, but introduces an even greater privacy issue due to the increased elevation.</p> <p>Trees - Section 15 of the Original Planning Application states that there are no trees on the proposed development site. There are currently at least 7 mature trees at the boundary with the rear gardens of the London Road properties. Is there an intention to remove these trees, thereby causing further loss of privacy?</p> <p>Security lighting - The existing security lighting is very intrusive and is currently on day and night, shining directly into our bedroom and bathroom windows even though there have been numerous requests to rectify this. If additional lighting is placed higher up on the proposed development this would exacerbate the nuisance greatly.</p>

Parking - The parking in London Road is already a problem for residents and is also used by people working and visiting Ver House. The parking issues will be further exacerbated by the increase in occupation of the office space caused by the proposed development.

Over-development - As was stated in previous submissions, the proposal will increase the size of the existing property immensely, creating a large, overbearing building that will be totally out of character with the local area.

Site access - Access to/from the site is restricted due to London Road narrowing at this point for residential parking bays. There is a lack of clear line of sight when exiting, which has already caused several accidents. The access to the site is hardly more than a single track road between two houses and the extra traffic that will be generated by this proposal will increase noise and pollution and have a negative effect on London Road.

Noise - There will undoubtedly be an increase in noise pollution due to the huge increase in tenants and associated ancillary services traffic such as couriers, delivery vehicles, etc.

Infrastructure - The roads in the area are already very busy during commuter and school times, and the additional commuter traffic created by this development will only impact this situation.

Please note there is a school bus stop close to the site access road, which causes additional traffic at morning commuter times.

REVISED PLANS

We object to the revised proposal for the following reasons:

Site access - Access to/from the site is restricted due to London Road narrowing at this point for residential parking bays. There is a lack of clear line of sight when exiting, which has already caused several accidents. The access to the site is hardly more than a single track road between two houses and the extra traffic that will be generated by this proposal will increase the risk of accidents and also noise and pollution and have a negative effect on London Road.

Vehicles should only enter/exit the site in a forward gear. This is not possible here, as if a vehicle enters as another is leaving, the vehicle entering would have to reverse onto London Road to make way. This is a highly dangerous manoeuvre given the lack of sight line.

Parking - The parking in London Road is already a problem for residents and is also used by people working in and visiting Ver House. The parking issues will be further exacerbated by the increase in occupation of the office space caused by the proposed development.

Infrastructure - The roads in the area are already very busy during commuter and school times, and the additional commuter traffic created by this development will only impact this situation.

Please note there is a school bus stop close to the site access road, which causes additional traffic at morning commuter times.

The traffic in the village is already at an unacceptable level with multiple jams and near misses at peak times. This only adds to the issue and the construction work will bring large lorries to tight roads and cause danger to those in the area. It would be totally unacceptable to grant this application.

The village is already struggling to cope with current levels of traffic and noise.

Over-development & Loss of privacy - Although the revised planning application has reduced the height from 4 to 3 storeys this is still a massive over-development of this part of the existing building. The original plans submitted last year, incorporating 3 storeys, drew many objections from residents who are extremely concerned that occupants of the offices will be able to see into our gardens, where children play, and also into the living and sleeping areas of our homes. This is completely unacceptable to us.

There are other office spaces in Markyate, Hicks Road being one, which are still unoccupied after several years, so an application to increase office space at Ver House, where there doesn't seem to be a need, rather begs the question - is this an excuse to get the permission granted and then apply for a change of use from commercial to residential.? Given the foregoing objections, this should not be an option that the Council should consider.

REVISED PLANS

We strongly object to the proposal and are extremely unhappy with the timing of the consultation period. We received the letter updating us of the amendments/update on the application on 30th December, with a deadline of 6th January to respond by. The letter is dated 23rd December however due to the Christmas period the consultation time has been cut short, with others like ourselves no doubt receiving the letter one week into it having been written due to the Christmas bank holidays.

We strongly object to the application, again, for the following reasons:

- Flood risk - we are in a high flood risk area and understand that the gardens on London Road already experience flooding. We believe that this will worsen with increased pressure on the culvert and the surrounding land. We do not believe that this risk has been properly considered in the plans for this development, with it taking objections from the Environment Agency for the developer to admit that the development site is in a high flood risk area and thus provide a flood risk assessment and other documents.

- Loss of privacy - the proposed development will result in our whole garden, and the back of our property, being overlooked, with this including a bedroom and bathroom in our property. The proposed height of the building will mean that many individuals will be able to

see into our home and we therefore strongly object to the proposal.

- Noise and light pollution - we already struggle to mask the security lights that shine into our bedroom from Ver House, with these being on throughout the night, and this is something which will only get worse with an increase in the height of the building. Furthermore, we experience noise from the site, with bin lorries and other vehicles regularly driving between our property boundary and Ver House. This noise is only going to increase with more visitors to the site.

- Parking / road issues - the parking on London Road is already an issue, with residents struggling to find spaces outside of their own homes. This is only going to get worse with increased traffic to the site. In addition, the turning for Ver House is extremely difficult to see and the chances of accidents occurring on London Road is high and congestion will only worsen, with the turning only a few metres down from the bus stop outside of our property.

- Overdevelopment - in the Urban Design Assessment document written in 2011 for Dacorum it states that buildings in the "Inner Zone" of Markyate "should be two storeys". The proposed development therefore goes against this assessment and is a massive overdevelopment of the site which harms the residential amenity of the village. The building will be the largest in the area by far. We do not understand the need for such a large building, especially if it is to be used as offices as stated. We understand there to be empty offices sitting in the middle of the village unoccupied and given the current climate we don't believe that there will be a need for more. We therefore question what the intention behind this application is and believe that this building, if built, will be converted to flats which we strongly object to.

- On page 4 of the "draft" Geotechnical Investigation report dated October 2020 it states that "the adjacent building to the southwest may also be extended from single storey to two storeys" and then goes on to say that "the report is based on the above development proposals and the existing ground levels. Should either of these alter significantly following issue of this report, then the contents will require re-evaluation". Although it states that the building is not part of the scope of the report, we are struggling to understand why this is incorrect, with the proposals in fact for a three storey building! It appears that this document has been produced without full appreciation of the actual plans.

- The original application states that there are no trees on the proposed development site. As highlighted by other residents this is incorrect, with trees lining the boundary between the proposed development site and gardens of residential properties on London Road. This issue has not been addressed and no clarity has been provided over what the developer's intention is regarding these trees which at the moment provide a little bit of privacy between our property and Ver House. If these trees are to be removed we will lose even more privacy and will be even more overlooked by the proposed development. The inaccurate information included in the application and report is of great concern to us.

	<p>For all of the reasons stated above, we strongly object to this application and hope that our objection and the many others received are carefully considered.</p>
<p>53 London Road</p>	<p>The access road is already inadequate. It is a single track road for traffic and pedestrians and consequentially the traffic queues to access the site leading to congestion in London Road. There is already not even enough parking for residents on the road and current tenants are competing for road parking since there are currently not enough spaces at the offices. The proposed 19 new parking spaces will be totally inadequate for the increased traffic. There are currently 19 parking spaces and the proposal is to increase this by 19 when the block will be tripled in size. Clearly this is not enough. The previous application stated that many people will walk to work or come by bus.</p> <p>Observation alone demonstrates that very few people do that. It is very difficult to exit the site because of the traffic parked in the residents' bays and for traffic travelling north along the London Road it is a blind entrance so vehicles not familiar with the area travel too fast. Over the years there have been many accidents and cars being written off. Many large delivery vehicles have no turning point after they have entered the site and they have to reverse in. This has a detrimental effect on London Road as the traffic is held up while they are doing this. Recently it has been observed the some delivery drivers go in forwards and reverse out onto the road.</p> <p>Many delivery vehicles including large lorries do not go down the access road but park in front of my house and that of my neighbour at number 51, blocking our drives and disappear to make their deliveries therefore the situation would be exacerbated.</p> <p>Environmental assessment</p> <p>This states that there is no river but the proposed new parking area appears to be where the culverted river is. There is a history of flooding in the village. It also states that there are no trees that would be affected but there are a few mature trees and it unclear whether they would remain.</p> <p>Noise and air pollution</p> <p>The traffic on the access road would be greatly increased due to more tenants, more delivery vehicles and more visitors. This would lead to more noise and air pollution. This is predominantly a residential area and the size of the development would have a detrimental impact on all the residents.</p> <p>We have lived alongside the offices for many years reasonably amicably but the size of this proposal will change the situation completely. Many of the residents are not at work all day or retired or spend significant amounts of time at home with children so they would be unable to enjoy their own homes and gardens.</p> <p>Overlooking/lack of privacy</p>

Despite the owner having been asked on several occasions to sort out the security lights he has not done so. They are on 24/7 and they security lights are intrusive.

Appearance/overdevelopment

Bearing in mind that this is primarily a residential area the proposal represents a massive overdevelopment which would not be in keeping with the surrounding properties. It will be completely overbearing to those being overlooked and the tenants will be able to look into everyone's garden and living areas leaving no privacy at all.

REVISED PLANS

The new plans do nothing to address the issues raised twice before.

There is still no design and access statement on the portal.

Access and exit

After having read the comments from Highways Agency I do not believe that they are aware that the entrance to the site is a single track, not a road, and is very poor condition. Highways state that London Road is classified as a "C" Road and as such traffic must enter and leave the site in a forward gear. This is not possible for long vehicles because there is no room for them to turn around to exit. Instead they reverse in, causing traffic on London Road to be congested especially in the morning and evening busy periods. This includes council bin lorries. In fact, many of the delivery drivers find the exit so difficult that they prefer to park in front of numbers 51 and 53 and block their drives while walking down the track with their parcels.

The entrance to the site is a blind entrance when travelling northwards after exiting the A5 so they go too fast and cars exiting the site cannot see because of the parked cars. Highways Agency believes that the traffic runs smoothly yet there have been many incidents of cars being badly damaged or written off over the years.

What is particularly worrying is that cars start to enter the site and when they meet a vehicle leaving there is no room to pass so they reverse out onto the London Road. There is already not even enough parking for residents on the road and current tenants are competing for road parking since there are not enough spaces at the offices and some of the tenants park in London Road because of the difficulty in exiting.

Overdevelopment/privacy

This is predominantly a residential area and as such this plan shows no respect for the quality of life of the householders in terms of privacy and enjoyment of their own properties. For those in numbers 57 upwards it would have a major detrimental effect on them in that many offices workers would be able to see directly into their homes and

	<p>gardens.</p> <p>Since there is no design and access statement, we have no idea what they plan to do about the several mature trees.</p> <p>Noise and air pollution</p> <p>The traffic on the access road would be greatly increased due to more tenants, more delivery vehicles and more visitors.</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>On the first application in 2019 the applicant stated that the offices were full and that he had received enquiries from businesses wishing to rent office space. It is difficult to see that the same situation exists in today's environment and also there are empty commercial premises in Hicks Road. It is possible that there will be empty premises and the way the staircases are placed the applicant may request change of use to flats.</p>
1 Long Meadow	<p>We object for the following reasons:</p> <p>Increased traffic, noise and disturbance and vehicles;</p> <p>We are already aware that there are issues surrounding the parking of existing employees of Ver House and with this huge increase in office space and vehicles already parking on London Road, our concern is that employees and visitors of these offices will use residential areas outside our property for parking.</p> <p>There is currently only one road used as an entrance and exit for access to Ver House, with the huge increase in vehicles this will cause huge problems for vehicles coming in and out, particularly large delivery vehicles. We have already had an incident whereby our fence was damaged due to manoeuvring issues with vehicles trying to get access and exit Ver House at the same time.</p> <p>There will be increased noise pollution from additional vehicles and employees. We have already experienced antisocial behaviour and had litter thrown into our garden on several occasions, which is a real concern, especially we now have a young daughter that will be in the garden.</p> <p>There will be increased air pollution in the area due to the considerable amounts of additional vehicles.</p> <p>The infrastructure of Markyate is not equipped for the additional vehicles, we already experience moderate traffic in London Road, exiting to the A5 which will have a huge effect on residents exiting the village for work. We are also concerned at the effects this will have in our roads and the maintenance of them.</p> <p>Obstruction of sunlight and Overlooking</p> <p>One of our biggest concerns is the loss of light at the front of our property. Although the design has now changed, the proposed plan is</p>

	<p>still to be situated right next to our boundary will block out significant amounts of light from the front of our property, making it very dull, dark and cold inside.</p> <p>This is now our young daughter's bedroom that will be completely overlooked meaning for privacy and the safe guarding of our child, the blinds will constantly have to be down.</p> <p>This overlooking will also be an issue for our garden, along with the noise and air pollution mentioned above and the increased threat of litter throwing whilst our child and friend/families children (who often attend our property) are in the garden.</p>
59 London Road	<p>I object for the following reasons</p> <p>1) Inadequate provision for current volumes of traffic.</p> <p>Access to VER HOUSE is via a single track road. It is neither marked properly nor situated safely to allow traffic to enter and exit. As an example my car was written off in November 2018 when a car travelling along London Road had to swerve to avoid a car leaving the VER HOUSE turning. The force of collision twisted the chassis and caused irrevocable damage to the children's car seats. This occurred at 2130 on a Friday evening.</p> <p>The traffic during peak commuter hours is significantly worse and I have witnessed over 20 near misses since November 2018. In addition I have had cause to challenge the drivers using the access road whom I consider to have been driving recklessly.</p> <p>In the Summer of 2018 one such driver came out of the access road and nearly killed my husband who was changing a tyre on his car. When challenged, the driver was astonished that driving 30 miles per hour along a single track road with restricted view was considered dangerous. Increasing the number of cars using the turning will only increase the likelihood of a fatal incident.</p> <p>2) Access for service such as waste collection/delivery drivers etc –</p> <p>Currently large trucks reverse down the small, single track access road because there is no room for them to turn at the bottom. This again causes significant traffic disruption and increases the risk to children who walk to the local bus stops and school. It also creates significant noise disruption as the reversing sounds disturbs my children and some of our elderly neighbours.</p> <p>3) Uncontrolled parking - London Road is sensibly not a controlled parking zone, however many of the current workers of VER HOUSE take advantage of this and choose to park outside our properties, rather than the allocated spaces near their place of work. Discussions with some of the workers who park along LONDON ROAD imply that they do this due to the poor access and the fear they feel when using the access road. Increased provision for parking outside the commercial properties will obviously not solve this if the workers continue to feel unsafe using the small, single track, limited view</p>

access road.

4) Over-development - As was stated in previous submission, the proposal will increase the size of the existing property significantly, creating a much larger commercial building in an area where other commercial properties are under utilised. It is unclear which new businesses will be attracted to a building which has dangerous access and limited services.

5) Security lighting - The existing security lighting is incredibly intrusive and is starting to cause significant harm and distress. It is on day and night, shining directly into our bedroom even though my neighbours have made numerous requests to rectify this. I cannot see how additional buildings, which will require significantly better lighting will not compound the issue.

6) Increased threat of crime and knock on impact of privacy - To ensure the building is secure and can prevent/deter crime there will undoubtedly be more CCTV, lighting etc. This will have collateral intrusion. There is nothing in the planning to explain how this will be managed and how it will protect my privacy. In addition Crime Prevention Theory is specific about the increased threat to neighbouring properties following a crime. The new development adds additional risk to my property without making any provision for enforcement agencies. Would the developers consider funding a new dedicated police officer for Markyate?

7) Loss of Privacy - The revised planning application now includes a fourth floor covering a significant portion of the total development. This appears to quadruple the height of the existing building and actually makes the building more intrusive than it was. As a result the development will overlook my garden and have an almost unrestricted view of me and everything I do in it. Would the contractor consider removing all windows above the ground floor to eliminate overlooking? In addition to protecting privacy concerns it would also go some way to reassure the residents that this application is not a precursor to the building converted for residential use.

8) Trees - Section 15 of the Original Planning Application states that there are no trees on the proposed development site. There are several mature trees at the boundary with the rear gardens of the London Road properties. Is there an intention to remove these trees, thereby causing further loss of privacy?

9) Design not in-keeping with local period properties. - Whilst the proposal may look in keeping with numerous new developments in the village, their closest neighbours are period properties and not comparable in design.

REVISED PLANS

The updated plans appear to have reduced the height of the development from 4 to 3 stories, however that is the only change and does very little to address the concerns listed in my original objection dated the 15th March, furthermore the recent crisis faced across the

UK compounds the main issues of traffic and parking. There is still:

1) Inadequate provision for current volumes of traffic. Access to VER HOUSE is via a single track road. It is neither marked properly nor situated safely to allow traffic to enter and exit. Whilst I have already given details about my car being written off and my husband being nearly run over, there is recent data from ONS that suggests a post COVID world will see a rise in traffic. ONS statistics showing that road travel has increased post COVID bolsters the inference that traffic to VER HOUSE will INCREASE SIGNIFICANTLY as people are forced to drive to VER HOUSE as they are unable to use public transport for health reasons or lack of capacity. This will have a knock on impact on the traffic, parking and air quality.

2) Access for service such as waste collection/delivery drivers etc - Currently large trucks reverse down the small, single track access road because there is no room for them to turn at the bottom. This again causes significant traffic disruption and increases the risk to children who walk to the local bus stops and school. It also creates significant noise disruption as the reversing sounds disturbs my children and some of our elderly neighbours.

3) Uncontrolled parking - London Road is sensibly not a controlled parking zone, however many of the current workers of VER HOUSE take advantage of this and choose to park outside our properties, rather than the allocated spaces near their place of work. Discussions with some of the workers who park along LONDON ROAD imply that they do this due to the poor access and the fear they feel when using the access road. Increased provision for parking outside the commercial properties will obviously not solve this if the workers continue to feel unsafe using the small, single track, limited view access road. Again we cannot ignore the impact that COVID will have on the way people choose to travel.

4) Over-development - As was stated in previous submission, the proposal will increase the size of the existing property significantly, creating a much larger commercial building in an area where other commercial properties are under utilised. It is unclear which new businesses will be attracted to a building which has dangerous access and limited services.

5) Security lighting - The existing security lighting is incredibly intrusive and is starting to cause significant harm and distress. It is on day and night, shining directly into our bedroom even though my neighbours have made numerous requests to rectify this. I cannot see how additional buildings, which will require significantly better lighting will not compound the issue.

6) Increased threat of crime and knock on impact of privacy - To ensure the building is secure and can prevent/deter crime there will undoubtedly be more CCTV, lighting etc. This will have collateral intrusion. There is nothing in the planning to explain how this will be managed and how it will protect my privacy. In addition Crime Prevention Theory is specific about the increased threat to neighbouring properties following a crime. The new development adds

	<p>additional risk to my property without making any provision for enforcement agencies. Would the developers consider funding a new dedicated police officer for Markyate?</p> <p>7) Loss of Privacy - The revised planning application now includes a fourth floor covering a significant portion of the total development. This appears to quadruple the height of the existing building and actually makes the building more intrusive than it was. As a result the development will overlook my garden and have an almost unrestricted view of me and everything I do in it. Would the contractor consider removing all windows above the ground floor to eliminate overlooking? In addition to protecting privacy concerns it would also go some way to reassure the residents that this application is not a precursor to the building converted for residential use.</p> <p>8) Trees - Section 15 of the Original Planning Application states that there are no trees on the proposed development site. There are several mature trees at the boundary with the rear gardens of the London Road properties. Is there an intention to remove these trees, thereby causing further loss of privacy?</p> <p>9) Design not in-keeping with local period properties. - Whilst the proposal may look in keeping with the numerous new developments in the village, their closest neighbours are period properties and not comparable</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENT</p> <p>In respect to the letter from the Valerie Spiers (Transport Department) dated 13 July 2020. I challenge the analytical conclusion that there have been no accidents. This I assume is based on police data rather than community safety reports and insurance claims. If the latter you will clearly see that the conclusion from the analysis is incorrect as my car was written off when a driver from Ver House pulled out into London Road and caused an accident.</p> <p>All other objections remain.</p>
51 London Road	<p>Firstly, we would like to raise the issue that the supporting documents for this application were certainly not available at the 'Published Date' of '20 February 2020' as it says online. It was in fact, sometime after this date that they appear to have been uploaded. In light of this, we believe that as the consultation period was considerably shortened for the residents of Markyate to respond to it the deadline should be extended accordingly.</p> <p>This new application all feels a little bit déjà vu - it would appear that none of the concerns raised by the residents and the community of the village of Markyate in March 2019 have been addressed.</p> <p>We again object to this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposed works are an over development of this site. We have particular concerns that the increased size of the height of these works and upstairs windows of this development will severely overlook</p>

the rear of our property and impact on our privacy.

The site has single track access -over the years that we have lived here this access road has proven to be a major problem and it is only a matter of time before there is a critical accident where this access road meets London Road. It is a concealed entrance and is the only means of access in and out of the site of Ver House. Refuse collectors, delivery vans and lorries, struggle as it is to visit the site, it is quite apparent that this increase of tenants on the site will only exacerbate this situation.

We also experience frequent parking outside our property by delivery drivers who will not attempt the access road to make their deliveries, and quite often block the driveways to Nos. 51 and 53 London Road.

We would like to reiterate that the proposed plans still do not address the problems of access and we have concerns about what effect this may have for London Road at anytime of the day but more especially at peak times. Whether this site is commercial or whether (as it would appear to be) it is converted into residential premises the problems of access and parking still stands.

REVISED PLANS

The amendments to this application have still not addressed many of the concerns raised by the local residents to this site and the community of the village of Markyate in March 2019 and March 2020.

We again object to this application for the following reasons:

The proposed works are an over development of this site. We have particular concerns that the increased size of the height of these works and upstairs windows of this development will severely overlook the rear of our property and impact on our privacy.

The site has a long, single track access with a concealed entrance/exit point from/onto London Road. At peak times London Road can be very busy and at quiet times it can be very fast. Our concerns are that even as the site currently stands, and with fewer commercial units, this access point is dangerous.

We note from the Highways Agency's documents that vehicles are required to "enter and leave the site in forward gear". With the narrowness and length of the access road this is not always possible. In practice, and on a frequent basis, vehicles reverse without adequate visibility back onto London Road. Even if the driver is able to vacate the site in forward gear, when turning left they are quite often forced onto the other side of the carriageway in order to gain better visibility.

We thankfully note from the Highways Agency that there are no recorded serious personal injuries at this junction, however, the residents in the vicinity of this access road have witnessed many accidents at this junction involving numerous vehicles, in the worst cases a number have even been written off. Our concern would be:

	<p>how long would it be before a serious personal injury does take place at this spot especially if an increase in capacity at this site is allowed together with its associated traffic.</p>
<p>71 London Road</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter consulting my property in respect of the planning application for proposals at Ver House, 55 London Road, Markyate.</p> <p>Block A/B of Ver House is located within close proximity of my residential property boundary and will cause a detrimental impact on my property. I therefore have significant concerns with the proposals - I Object to this planning proposal. I have outlined these in turn below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overlooking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The building line of Block A/B is approximately 9 metres from my boundary. Within my property I have a child's play area including swings and a climbing frame for my children and their friends. <p>My family use this garden on a daily basis, and the presence of a multi-storey building overlooking this area would significantly and negatively impact on the ability to use our garden as currently enjoyed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The mass and bulk associated with the development would appear visually intrusive and overbearing to nearby residential gardens, and the large number of windows on the southern elevation will create overlooking concerns negatively impacting on the quiet enjoyment of these amenity spaces. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Saved Appendix 4 of the Local Plan (2004), Policy CS12 (c, f and g) of the Core Strategy (2013), and Section 12 of the NPPF (Feb 2019). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of privacy and outlook: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The development by reason of its excessive mass, bulk and proximity to adjacent properties, would have a significant adverse impact on neighbouring and nearby residential amenity. Given the topography of the area, the new floorspace and extensive built form would lead to a loss of privacy and outlook to surrounding properties, specifically numbers 57-71 London Road and number 1 Long Meadow,. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Saved Appendix 4 of the Local Plan (2004), Policies CS10 (Figure 13), CS11 and CS12 (c, f and g) of the Core Strategy (2013), and Section 12 of the NPPF (Feb 2019). - Design, scale, bulk, massing, appearance, overdevelopment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o By reason of the proposed excessive size, scale, bulk, appearance and visual dominance of the proposed extension and additional floorspace, the proposals would amount to an overdevelopment of the application site creating an overbearing form of development. In view of this, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Saved Appendix 4 of the Local Plan (2004), Policies CS10 (Figure 13), CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), and Section 12 of the NPPF (Feb 2019). - Siting, design, out of character with the area:

o The predominant character of Markyate, and the immediate area surrounding of the subject site is that of 2 storey traditionally-formed dwellinghouses. The proposal, by virtue of its long, continuous, unbroken façade, overly dominant height, scale and bulk, would be wholly out of character with the local area, and would be detrimental to the character of the area. In view of this, the proposal is considered to be contrary to saved Appendix 4 of the Local Plan (2004), Policies CS10 (Figure 13), CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), and Section 12 of the NPPF (Feb 2019).

- Impact on highways, noise and disturbance, intense use of the site, impact on amenity:

o There is a local issue of existing businesses and their employees at Ver House already parking vehicles (cars, vans and HGVs) in the residential parking bays on London Road, creating severe highway safety and pedestrian safety concerns along London Road. Planning policy at all levels seeks, inter alia, to ensure that new development does not cause highways or parking issues to the detriment of highway safety. There are already issues arising from both the tenants of the existing buildings, along with their related traffic e.g. courier/delivery vehicles

o By significantly increasing the built floorspace at this site and the number of visitors/deliveries, neighbouring residents will experience further highway safety issues exacerbating and magnifying the existing concerns, resulting in an unsafe and uncontrolled arrangement, negatively impacting on the local highway network and creating further car parking pressure along London Road. Furthermore, this will create an unacceptable living environment for existing residents in terms of additional noise and disturbance from vehicular comings and goings. The proposal would therefore conflict with Saved Appendix 4 and Saved Policies 51, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60 and 62 of the Local Plan (2004), Policies CS8 and CS9 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Section 9 of the NPPF (Feb 2019).

I have spoken with my neighbours that are also directly affected by the proposals, and as you can see from various submissions on the online portal, they share the same concerns as I have raised above. I therefore request that you visit my property in order to fully understand my concerns and those of my neighbours, and to better understand the impact this proposal would have on the surrounding residential environment.

Further, I formally request the opportunity to speak at any planning committee that this application may be heard at. Given the significant scale of these proposals for Markyate, I have copied this email to our local Ward Councillors and will be speaking with them separately regarding this matter.

I would additionally ask you to confirm the existing permissions on this property - from the submission, I understand that this is an office premises. I am confused therefore as to how this includes the maintenance and repair of vehicles used for racing, which includes frequent noise on Saturday mornings.

	<p>Should you decide to grant this permission, I would request that you withhold any Permitted Development allowing the later conversion of these plans to become residential.</p> <p>I look forward to your confirmation of receipt of the above formal representations, and reserve the right to review these comments in the future.</p>
65 London Road	<p>The intended height of the plans would limit light, overlook our property completely – and give us complete loss of privacy. They would be overlooking gardens where children play and into backs of the house and back bedrooms.</p> <p>The parking on London Road is incredibly limited and overloaded - with people having to park on grass verges. The current parking in Ver House is very full - there is no way the extra cars that this development would bring would be able to park - and park safely.</p> <p>The extra traffic this would create would be very dangerous, and disruptive to the already incredibly busy main road - especially at rush hour. Thus creating more pollution, noise and possibility of accidents.</p> <p>The turning to Ver House is hidden and has narrowing to slow traffic on the road right at the entrance - with cars parked both sides this is already a dangerous turning to get in and out of. The access road is not wide enough for 2 way traffic.</p> <p>There was a previously unauthorised culvert that was put in by the owners around the back of Ver House and this may make flooding more likely. The end of the gardens do flood.</p> <p>The back of Ver House is currently used for vehicle maintenance and illegal burning of waste - which I believe isn't known to the council and may require some contaminated land investigation.</p> <p>A drag racing car can be heard and seen revving up and down the road too.</p> <p>The actual work will be incredibly intrusive with vehicles and noise and increased traffic and pollution. The road and access road are not suitable for heavy traffic, loads and equipment. The impact on residents would be horrendous.</p> <p>The size of the development is completely out of keeping with the area. There are no facilities down this end of the village.</p> <p>It is stated there are no trees - there are mature trees at the bottom of the gardens. The height of the intended extension is from 1 and 2 floors to 4 floors - this would mean a long build. The foundations on an area prone to flooding would need to be very deep. The plans also look as though they may try to get change of usage to flats in the future?</p> <p>The view from the upstairs of houses would no longer be fields - they</p>

	would be people in offices.
69 London Road	<p>We strongly object this development for the following reasons:</p> <p>Over development - We consider the proposed plans to be an overdevelopment of this site. The proposal to extend the existing building into a large 4 story block is excessive and totally out of place / character within the area.</p> <p>Overlooking / loss of privacy - Block A/B of Ver House is located within close proximity to my property boundary. This proposed development will see the existing building significantly increase in size, becoming 4 stories high. The occupants of the offices would have clear view into my garden and all of our living space at the back of our house which is highly intrusive and causes me huge concern.</p> <p>We enjoy the use our garden regularly and the proposed development would significantly impact on this. A development of this size overlooking our properties in this way is completely unacceptable, especially considering that children play in these gardens.</p> <p>Loss of light - we have concerns about the loss of light to our garden and property. The proposed construction of this 4 story building so close to the boundary of our property is likely to block out a huge amount of light.</p> <p>Trees - I understand that the planning application refers to there being no trees on the proposed development site? This is incorrect as there are a number of very mature trees at the boundary with the gardens of the London Road properties.</p> <p>Adequacy of parking - There is already a big problem with parking on London Road which is made worse by the current employees, customers and visitors to the Ver House businesses using the residential parking bays. This will only become worse with the proposed development and potential cause a danger.</p> <p>Site access - The access road to Ver House s a single track road between two houses at a point at which the road narrows. In my opinion this is not suitable for the increased volume of traffic that the proposed development would generate and would be potentially dangerous. There is already a big problem with traffic and congestion on London Road at peak times.</p> <p>Environmental impact - The additional traffic that is likely to occur will cause an increase in pollution which will negatively impact on the London Road area.</p> <p>Noise - There will undoubtedly be an increase in noise caused by the number of additional employees and visitors to the site and the number of delivery vehicles to the businesses. This will significantly impact on all local residence</p>
63 London Road	The new property will overlook my back garden and there will be a major loss of privacy, not only in the garden but office workers will now be able to see into my bedroom.

	<p>The security lights at the moment are very intrusive and I believe this will get worse. As the lights seem to be on all night, if they are placed any higher, they will be shining directly into my bedroom.</p> <p>Parking is also a major problem; from the plans it appears they have an extra 19 spaces allocated to the new proposal, which seems inadequate as we already have office users parking outside our houses during the day and evening so when we return home there is no place for us to park nearby.</p> <p>Accessing the site from the single road on to London Road is a problem already, numerous times I have either been walking or cycling past the entrance and have had near misses with cars driving out as they were not paying attention. This will only get worse.</p>
15 Long Meadow	<p>Markyate is already becoming an over developed village which has plenty of new empty offices which can't be rented due to high rental prices.</p> <p>I feel the building will be too high, too large and not within keeping of the immediate area. It will overshadow neighbouring properties and our quiet residential road.</p> <p>Traffic will increase on an already busy part of London Road where visibility is poor when turning in and out.</p> <p>We are already affected by the noise pollution coming from the existing building and often until 9/10pm on a weekday.</p> <p>The River Ver is essential to avoid flooding in the immediate area and I feel that adding such a big development will endanger this safety net. The current user of the existing building already causes problems where the river enters that plot. I have had to clear debris to allow it to flow effectively during the most recent storms.</p>
5 Long Meadow	<p>We believe that the proposal represents gross overdevelopment of what is currently a small commercial site. The proposed plan is for a building which is two storey's higher than any neighbouring properties. This development would seriously restrict the light coming onto our property and the privacy of our home and gardens</p>
52 Long Meadow	<p>Ver House is accessed via a very small driveway type entrance onto the main road that runs through our village. My concerns are that they will look to get access via our beautiful cul de sac and completely ruin our road.</p> <p>The building is going to be too high, and I for one don't want to look out onto that! Besides which this is going to really impact on the surrounding homes overlooking them, denying their light and privacy.</p> <p>Our village had already had multiple developments and this has had a major impact on our already narrow streets. We are often grid locked if the A5 is busy when cars use our village as a cut through. Adding</p>

	<p>more cars at peak times for more offices will only make it so much worse. The infrastructure just isn't here to support more people/cars</p> <p>Which brings me to my next point - we have numerous office spaces/shop fronts on Hicks Road that have been empty for several years, if we can't fill those why does this developer think they can fill this one, it doesn't make sense. Unless of course, the plan would be to change useage and then go for flats which again would have a massive impact and one this village can't cope with.</p> <p>Long Meadow and Ver House is on a flood plain, over development is going to compound this problem - our household insurance doubled this year and has affected all residents. This could make matters far worse for us.</p> <p>We have a great environment in our village and over development whether that be housing or industrial or office is slowly encroaching and ruining it.</p> <p>I am sure if there were any call for this kind of service in our area, Hicks Road would be thriving instead of looking desolate as it does</p>
31 Long Meadow	<p>A ridiculously large development on a very small area. I strongly suspect the idea is to gain PP develop then convert to flats, but even if not, I strongly object for the reasons stated below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Affect local ecology - Close to adjoining properties - Development too high - General dislike of proposal - Inadequate access - Inadequate parking provision - Inadequate public transport provisions - Increase danger of flooding - Increase in traffic - Increase of pollution - Loss of light - Loss of parking - Loss of privacy - More open space needed on development - Noise nuisance
63 London Road	<p>We strongly object to this application on a number of reasons.</p> <p>The new property will overlook my back garden and there will be a major loss of privacy, not only in the garden but office workers will now be able to see into my bedroom.</p> <p>The security lights at the moment are very intrusive and I believe this will get worse. As the lights seem to be on all night, if they are placed any higher, they will be shining directly into my bedroom.</p> <p>Parking is also a major problem; from the plans it appears they have an extra 19 spaces allocated to the new proposal, which seems inadequate as we already have office users parking outside our</p>

	<p>houses during the day and evening so when we return home there is no place for us to park nearby.</p> <p>Accessing the site from the single road on to London Road is a problem already, numerous times I have either been walking or cycling past the entrance and have had near misses with cars driving out as they were not paying attention. This will only get worse</p> <p>REVISED PLANS</p> <p>I've just looked at the amended plans submitted on the 30th June 2020, and again I strongly object to this application.</p> <p>I don't feel the amended plans make any difference to my original objections from the 16th March. Having read the Flood Risk Assessment report with interest, it appears the site is located within Flood Zone 3 (high risk of flooding). I am now concerned any major changes without any adequate safeguards may result in an increased risk to flooding in the area and the adjoining properties.</p>
61 London Road	<p>I object to this planning application due to my significant concerns about the impact of this development on myself, my family and the community.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overdevelopment - Markyate is a largely residential village with some small areas of industrial/commercial development, these areas are currently underutilised with many standing empty including the new units in the Hicks Road development which have been empty since being completed some years ago. I do not believe that the village has the need for further commercial premises, if there was a need the existing premises would be used. Additionally most commercial building is zoned in the centre of the village, closer to shops, post office and cafe, the Ver House units are surrounded by housing with no facilities for workers. 2. Noise - the nearly doubled floor area in Ver House will lead to a corresponding increase in workers, visitors and deliveries which will greatly increase noise levels for all of the houses surrounding this development. Noise is already an ongoing issue from traffic and planes, the addition of this increased noise will make use of our gardens incredibly uncomfortable. 3. Traffic and access - The access road to Ver House is a single track fairly unmade up road which turns onto London Road at a narrowed section between houses. At peak times the current workers at Ver House cause significant blockage of the road and genuine fear of accident. I generally have to park on the opposite side of the road and at these times it is quite scary to try and get into or out of my car, with speeding cars heading for the A5 and into/out of the access road. As I said, the access road is single track and deliveries to Ver House are a particular issue as they often have to park in London Road and manually handle the delivery down the access road because it seems that it is not possible to turn around a medium sized/larger van/lorry. This causes blockages in the street, affects visibility for traffic travelling along London Road and people pulling out

of parking spaces or driveways. They often have to park either opposite our house and across the pavement or outside my neighbour's houses (again on the pavement) forcing pedestrians to walk out into the road). This problem is likely to be magnified during any building phase of this proposed development with the delivery of building materials and plant and then ongoing following completion. This increase in traffic and deliveries is not suitable for this residential area and not helped by the narrow access road.

4. Privacy - Although the latest plans appear to be lower than the previous version they are still out of proportion with surrounding residential development and with a large number of windows overlooking our and neighbouring gardens and houses. The plans virtually double the existing area and we must assume that will lead to a doubling of activity, noise and workers all overlooking our house and garden. These units directly overlook our house and garden which will be incredibly invasive with a serious impact on our privacy and quality of life. The size of the block is not in keeping with the village surroundings, it is relatively close to our boundaries and will overshadow/block our light and view. Security lights on the existing buildings already shine directly into our house all night and with additional floors this type of invasive development will have major detrimental effect on all of our lives.

REVISED PLANS

In addition to our previous comments and along with many of our neighbours we strongly object to this development for the following reasons.

Inadequate/Dangerous Access - The narrow single track access way is really a concealed entrance partly due to the road layout where the access road joins London Road - adjacent to traffic calming measures which partially restrict the view of cars both pulling out of the access road and travelling along London Road. And also because it is a very narrow roadway between houses and garden fences which also restrict the view. Deliveries to the units at Ver House regularly have to be unloaded on London Road causing traffic issues. Larger vans and lorries, including the DBC refuse lorries, have to reverse along the accessway because there is insufficient room to turn around on the Ver House forecourt. This again causes traffic disruption and danger to pedestrians and drivers.

Traffic & traffic increase- Markyate suffers with severe traffic problems (as evidenced by the introduction of a 20mph zone slightly further along the road. If these commercial units were all full the increase in traffic would be unconscionable as, based on the existing workers at Ver House who all travel by car, there would be a doubling of traffic to the building, along with increase in pollution. It is already dangerous to walk along the pavement across the accessway during rush hour as cars leaving and entering Ver House (often at speed) and the increase would seriously impact neighbours. This situation is evidenced by the accident on London Road when a car exiting the Ver House accessway and a car travelling along London Road collided and hit my neighbour's parked car, writing it off. I often park on London Road and

have been unable to safely get out of or into my car due to the volume of traffic during rush hour which will be made significantly worse by this development.

The development is too high and out of keeping with the character of the area - the current Ver House development is low level and although not ideal in a residential area it is relatively unobtrusive. The new development will be much higher and much more visible from the surrounding residences. This is a residential area of mainly 19th century houses so any modern construction is out of character, the size (both length and height) make this development wholly inappropriate and detrimental to the area. The current building overlooks my house and garden with direct sight from Ver House into our windows which is extremely disquieting. The huge increase in height and numbers of windows and people on site will greatly increase that very real sense of invasion of privacy from Ver House. This lack of privacy in and around our home is worsened by the security lights which are on all night and shine into our windows. With a larger building these lights could become even more invasive.

Noise Nuisance - The site is already noisy from cars, vans and business activity to the point where it is often uncomfortable to use our garden. With the large increase in activity this will become unbearable and have a very significant negative impact on our quality of life.

Conflict with local plan - I believe that increasing commercial activity in this area of the village is against the local plan and is completely unnecessary. There are empty commercial premises in the centre of the village where new units are standing empty and have been since they were built some years ago. There does not seem to be any need for further business premises in the village.

As I assume the owner wishes to profit from this development I cannot help but assume there is a secondary intention, for instance for future change of use to residential premises.

Affect on local ecology - I am not an expert but the intention to build car parking over the culverted river Ver seems to be less than ideal.

The report seems to say that it is questionable whether the ground can support the planned construction over the river. In my opinion any building over the river is likely to further pollute the river which is already subject to pollution from the roads and fields surrounding the village. We have newts, frogs and hedgehogs as well as other birds and animal life in our garden and I strongly object to any impact on them.

Additionally the papers state that there are no trees on the site, however there are a large number of mature trees along the boundary between our gardens and Ver House, these should be preserved and not ignored or worse, removed because they have been overlooked.

Increased danger of flooding - the village has been subject to flooding due to being in the bottom of a steep sided valley and every time further hard standing is laid this is likely to impact the water flow. The

	<p>larger parking area could well have unintended consequences for the surrounding area.</p>
--	--

	<p>Additionally there could be consequences from improvements to the whole surround of the new building and presumably the currently virtually unmade accessway will be fully paved.</p>
--	--

ITEM NUMBER: 5d

20/03878/FUL	Pergola to front entrance (temporary planning permission (2 years)).	
Site Address:	Boxmoor Coffee & Wine Ltd 67A St Johns Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1QG	
Applicant/Agent:	Claire Hobson	Mark Biddiss
Case Officer:	Aneeka Shah	
Parish/Ward:	N/A	Boxmoor
Referral to Committee:	Elected Member is Applicant	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That temporary planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The application relates to a commercial property on the south side of St Johns Road. The application was submitted due to the impact of COVID-19 restrictions. The retractable structure would enable outdoor seating during operating hours of the cafe and therefore support the establishment. As it is uncertain how long some form of social distancing measures will be in place for, the proposal is considered reasonable due to current circumstances.

2.2 The proposed temporary development through size, position and design would not detriment the appearance of the existing building or street scene. Furthermore, the proposal would not adversely impact the residential amenity of neighbouring residents or the heritage of these assets. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policies CS4, CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2006-2031) and the NPPF (2019).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The subject property is located on the south side of St John's Road, diagonally opposite the lower junction of Puller Road. The immediate stretch of St John's Road is characterised by a mix of terraced units featuring a range of uses with residential accommodation above; there is no overall character to the area.

The site is located within a high street in Boxmoor. Adjoining this site is a dog grooming shop which forms the lower floor of a two storey Victorian villa. The remaining properties within this part of St John's Road are predominantly residential.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 This application seeks planning permission for a temporary pergola to the front entrance of the Coffee & Wine Café.

4.2 The pergola would be 3310mm in height, it would project out by 2270mm and the overall width would be 4400mm approximately. The structure would project approximately 40mm in front of the adjacent dog grooming shop. The roof would be made from poly carbonate and the side and front will be a transparent retractable curtain walls supported by a dark grey metal frame.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications (If Any): None

Appeals (If Any): None

6. CONSTRAINTS

CIL Zone: CIL3
Former Land Use (Risk Zone):
Residential Character Area: HCA7
Parking Standards: New Zone 3
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:

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
CS27 – Quality of the Historic Environment
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

DBLP Policy 43 – Shopping Areas in Local Centres

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)

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;

Principle of Development

9.2 The site is located within the Town of Hemel Hempstead, wherein CS Policy 4 states that, 'Development will be guided to the appropriate areas within settlements'. Furthermore, the site is located in Boxmoor Local Centre wherein, in accordance with DBLP Policy 43, a minimum level of shopping choice should be protected. This application would support the current business on site and is therefore acceptable in principle, subject to the design, heritage and neighbour amenity points discussed below.

9.3 Under the latest Business and Planning Act 2020 temporary measures to support businesses while social distancing measures are in place. For example, the expectation is that local authorities will grant pavement licences for 12 months unless there are good reasons for this to be a shorter period. Therefore the proposal is considered acceptable and should be supported.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.4 Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2006-2031) and the NPPF (2012) all seek to ensure that any new development/alteration respects or improves the character of the surrounding area and adjacent properties in terms of scale, massing, materials, layout, bulk and height.

9.5 Given the relatively small scale of the proposal and that the canopy would be transparent, retractable and light in structure it is considered that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the proposal would extend 0.4m beyond the adjacent dog grooming shop and therefore would be mostly hidden when viewed from the West side of St. Johns Road. The proposal therefore complies with these policies.

Impact on Heritage Assets

9.6 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that local authorities should have special regard to preserving the setting of listed buildings. This requirement should be given great weight in the planning process.

9.7 Paragraph 193 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets when considering the impact of a proposed development. Policy CS27 requires development to protect, conserve and where appropriate enhance the integrity, setting and distinctiveness of heritage assets.

9.8 The application site is immediately adjacent to a group of grade II listed flint built residential properties, as such the setting of these designated assets needs to be carefully considered. The setting of these listed buildings already consists of commercial businesses to their west, whilst the proposal is a temporary, light, mainly transparent structure. As such it is concluded that the impact on the significance of the heritage assets would be less than substantial.

9.9 In accordance with Paragraph 196 of the NPPF it is necessary to consider whether there are public benefits that outweigh the less than substantial harm described above.

9.10 Due to current government guidance around COVID-19, the pergola would provide more space for social distancing and therefore improving the health and safety of customers. This would also have economic benefits allowing the business to remain operational with an increased seating

capacity. The business also provides social benefits to the local residents and it is also important to support this establishment during the current COVID-19 pandemic.

9.11 Overall it is considered that these social, economic and health benefits outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the surrounding heritage assets in accordance with the NPPF and Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy. It is nevertheless very important to note that the heritage balance only falls in favour of the development due to the current pandemic circumstances.

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.12 Given the position of the pergola and that the side curtain walls would be transparent and retractable, it is considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact to daylighting on the neighbouring residential property. Furthermore, the orientation of the development means that neighbouring properties would not suffer any loss of sunlight as a result of these proposals.

9.13 As this application creates a covered area for customers, it is likely that customers will stay at the premises for longer and this could increase noise levels. However, it is not considered that the proposals could be refused on noise disturbance grounds for three reasons. Firstly, when retracted the pvc material itself would act as a noise dampener. Secondly, Boxmoor Coffee & Wine Ltd is open during the hours when any nuisance caused by noise is likely to be much lower of (8 a.m. to 4 p.m. Monday to Thursday; 8 a.m. to 9 p.m. on Friday; 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. on Saturday; and 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. on Sunday). A condition would be added to any permission preventing the use of this area by customers other than between those hours. Thirdly, the site is located within a relatively busy street where the ambient noise during the premises' opening hours is already higher than other residential areas, such as cul-de-sacs. Overall, it is considered that these factors should mitigate any noise impacts arising from this development.

9.14 Should there be an unexpected and unreasonable noise impact arising from the use of this development, the Council's ECP Department has powers, such as a Noise Abatement Notice, to take further formal action as deemed necessary and appropriate.

9.15 Overall the proposal is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity in accordance with Policy CS12.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.16 The proposal would not have an impact to car parking arrangements of the property as there currently are no off street car parking spaces.

9.17 It is worth noting that the safety aspect of parking a car in the driveway of the adjacent residential property has been taken into consideration. However as the existing driveway slopes downwards, and combined with the existing wall on the shared side boundary, any views of pedestrians are already obstructed.

Other Material Planning Considerations

9.18 The original proposal was for a permanent retractable structure. The Conservation & Design Officer did not have any issue with the retractable canopy, however the appearance of the side wall was of concern. Following these comments the application was then amended for a temporary structure (2 years) which the Conservation & Design Officer supports due to the current social distancing measures.

9.19 There are no land contamination issues associated with this application.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.20 No Neighbour comments received.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.21 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 To conclude, 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, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2006-2031) and the NPPF (2019).

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That temporary planning permission be **GRANTED** with conditions.

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

1. **This permission is for a limited period expiring 24 months from the date on the decision notice by which time the use of the temporary pergola structure shall cease and it shall be permanently removed in its entirety from the site.**

Reason: This proposal is only considered to be acceptable due to the current circumstances around COVID-19. To make sure that any less than substantial harm to the heritage assets is temporary in accordance with Policy CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2006-2031) and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

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

**Location Plan
Planning Drawings – 01 Rev B**

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 approved Drawing 01 Rev. B. For the avoidance of doubt the proposed PVC curtain walls shall be of a transparent material.**

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 (2006-2031).

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
Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)	Having reviewed the application submission and the ECP Team records I am able to confirm that there is no objection on the grounds of land contamination. Also, there is no requirement for further contaminated land information to be provided, or for contaminated land planning conditions to be recommended in relation to this application.
Conservation & Design (DBC)	<p>04.01.2021 If it were a temporary structure and permission granted on a time-limited basis (and for Covid reasons) then that should be OK.</p> <p>15.01.2021 The application site is immediately adjacent to a group of grade II listed flint built properties, as such the setting of these designated assets needs to be carefully considered.</p> <p>It is not clear from the plans what the external appearance of the canopy and side walls would be and also how permanent it would be? A retractable canopy would not be an issue but the appearance of the side walls could be. If the applicant does wish to pursue this option more information is needed including photos of similar canopies / polycarbonate walls etc. I cannot visualise it / have never come across a proposal of this type!</p> <p>If they are wishing to create a more permanent form of enclosure / seating area to the front courtyard of the property then a glazed structure with aluminium frame may be preferable. Again, we would need details of appearance and any signage etc</p>

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
6	0	0	0	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments

Agenda Item 6

6. APPEALS UPDATE

6.1 APPEALS LODGED

Appeals received by Dacorum Borough Council between 01 February 2021 and 23 March 2021.

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
1	20/01754/MFA	W/21/3268082	Land Off Tring Road Wilstone Hertfordshire	Written Representations
2	20/03345/FUL	W/21/3268444	Flaunden Stables, Flaunden	Written Representations
3	20/01126/FUL	W/21/3268495	Land at Laurel Bank, Hemel Hempstead	Written Representations
4	20/03246/FUL	W/21/3268586	2 Cemetary Hill, Hemel Hempstead	Written Representations
5	20/02279/FUL	W/21/3269008	Land at The Street, Chipperfield	Written Representations
6	20/03800/FUL	W/21/3270460	121 High Street, Markyate	Written Representations
7	20/03801/LBC	Y/21/3270459	121 High Street, Markyate	Written Representations
8	20/03046/FHA	D/21/3271067	24 Lockers Park Lane, Hemel Hempstead	Householder

6.2 PLANNING APPEALS DISMISSED

Planning appeals dismissed between 01 February 2021 and 23 March 2021.

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
1	20/01546/FHA	D/20/3260928	1 Brownlow Farm Barns Pouchen End Lane Hemel Hempstead	Householder
	Date of Decision:		09/02/2021	
	Link to full decision:			
	https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3260928			
	Inspector's Key conclusions:			
	<p>The roof lights would constitute small-scale alterations and would be sensitively designed in so far as being of flush-fitting conservation style. Even so, by virtue of their visible domesticating influence, the roof lights would cause harm to the heritage significance of the complex as a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>Whilst the level of harm in this instance would be fairly modest, any benefit brought about by improving the usefulness of the property's loft area would attract minimal weight insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. This is particularly so when noting the primarily private nature of the benefit and the limited extent of loft space under consideration.</p> <p>The roof lights would cause harm to the character and appearance of the rural area, having particular regard to the effect upon the significance of a non-designated heritage asset.</p>			
No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
2	20/01868/FHA	D/20/3262367	42 Box Lane Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0DJ	Householder
	Date of Decision:		09/02/2021	
	Link to full decision:			
	https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3262367			
	Inspector's Key conclusions:			
	<p>The newly proposed car port would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and conflicts with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy and with the Framework in so far as these policies affirm that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.</p> <p>Whilst the car port would be single storey and of limited scale, its prominent forward positioning upon the site would lead to a loss of openness. This is even when noting that the car port would be sited on land already capable of accommodating parked vehicles.</p> <p>The existing planting cannot be relied upon to provide solid or permanent</p>			

<p>buffers to views. This is because planting is ever evolving, is reliant on regular maintenance to retain a consistent form and may be reduced in scale or extent in the future.</p> <p>A structure of single-storey height and limited scale is intended. Whilst its rear and side facing elevations would be of continuous timber composition, the car port would not have an unduly prominent or stark presence in the streetscene. Indeed, it would not appear as a discordant addition and the area's green and spacious character and appearance would remain readily identifiable.</p> <p>The potential fallback position afforded by permitted development rights attracts limited weight. The car port would offer enhanced on-site parking facilities. However, this benefit attracts limited weight and would not outweigh the substantial harm identified to the Green Belt (including harm derived from loss of openness) so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal.</p>				
No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
3	20/01414/LBC	Y/20/3260285	29 High Street Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 3AA	Written Representations
Date of Decision:			08/03/2021	
Link to full decision:				
https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3260285				
Inspector's Key conclusions:				
<p>Although the staircase would be a lightweight structure, it would not appear as a visually discreet addition to the rear three-storey gable of the building. Rather, it would be substantial in size and have a functional appearance that would be prominent and disrupt the simple form and appearance of the gable. Its impact would therefore be significantly adverse and unacceptable in this respect. However, the staircase would not, of itself, have a harmful impact on the historic fabric of the building.</p> <p>The proposal would remove these windows and replace them with traditional joinery, but they would be significantly inferior, as they would not incorporate the detail and embellishment found in the framing of the existing windows. Historic masonry would also be lost below the windows due to enlargement to accommodate doorways. The loss of historic fabric would therefore be significant, which would be harmful to the understanding and legibility of the listed building, and thereby its significance.</p> <p>The proposal would be harmful to the special historic interest of No 29, the setting of No 27 and the character and appearance of the CA, which would have a negative effect on the significance of these designated heritage assets. In my view the harm that I have identified would equate to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets. In</p>				

	<p>such circumstances, paragraph 196 of the Framework identifies that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of proposals, which includes the securing of optimal viable use of listed buildings.</p> <p>The public benefits I have outlined ... would not justify allowing works and development that would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building, the setting of the adjacent listed building or the character and appearance of the CA.</p>			
No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
4	20/01413/FUL	W/20/3260286	29 High Street Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 3AA	Written Representations
	Date of Decision:		08/03/2021	
	Link to full decision:			
	https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?Caseid=3260286&CID=0			
	Inspector's Key conclusions:			
	<p>The proposal would be visually prominent from publicly accessible areas, including between Able House and the flats to the north.</p> <p>While there are some metal and other external staircases within the CA, they are not a prevalent feature. Where they are present, they are not to the scale of that proposed, so would not be comparable with it. In any event, I am mindful that I must consider the individual merits of the proposal in light of the policies and evidence before me. Accordingly, the staircase and enlarged openings would be harmful to the character and appearance of the CA and thus fail to preserve its significance.</p>			

6.3 PLANNING APPEALS ALLOWED

Planning appeals allowed between 01 February 2021 and 23 March 2021.

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
1	20/01523/FHA	D/20/3264329	Cloverleaf Chapel Croft Chipperfield WD4 9DR	Householder
	Date of Decision:		04/02/2021	
	Link to full decision:			
	https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3264329			
	Inspector's Key conclusions:			
	<p>The Council explain that the proposal would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. On that basis, they have concluded that the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. I do not disagree with the views of the Council in respect of this matter.</p> <p>Given the site's planning history, the dispute between the main parties primarily relates to the acceptability or otherwise of the proposed two storey side extension.</p> <p>The proposal would have a subservient relationship with the host building...the external surfaces of the proposed extension would be constructed from materials to match the host building, whilst the double hipped roof form would respond positively to the roof form of the existing building...the overall appearance of the extended dwelling would be in-keeping with the local vernacular...the host building would retain a substantial plot, which would preserve the area's spacious character. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>I conclude that the proposal would have a neutral impact upon and thus preserve the setting of the CA and hence no harm would be caused to the significance of the CA by the proposed extension of the appeal property outside of it.</p>			

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
2	20/01491/FUL	W/20/3261246	Honours Building 72-80 Akeman Street Tring HP23 6AF	Written Representations
	Date of Decision:		09/02/2021	
	Link to full decision:			
	https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?caseid=3261246			
	Inspector's Key conclusions:			
	<p>I am satisfied that what remains of the former cinema has been correctly identified as a non-designated heritage asset. When factoring in the intended low-scale and discreet positioning of the proposed extensions at roof level, as well as the significant alterations that have previously occurred at the site, the proposal would have a neutral effect upon the significance of the former cinema as a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>I accept that the rooftop extensions would be visible, at least in-part, from Akeman Street vantage points to the north of the site and thus from within the TCA. It is also the case that buildings in the site's vicinity are typically of comparatively lower scale. Nevertheless, when factoring in the existing roof features to be removed and the presence of a large building of modern composition to the site's southern side, the proposed rooftop extensions would not appear domineering nor out of place and would preserve the TCA's character and appearance accordingly.</p> <p>Whilst the extensions would form part of No 81's backdrop when viewed from certain vantage points, they would not appear overbearing and would not harmfully impinge upon the way in which No 81 is experienced and enjoyed. The proposal would thus not cause harm to the heritage significance of No 81 through bringing forward development within its setting.</p>			

6.4 PLANNING APPEALS WITHDRAWN

Planning appeals withdrawn between 01 February 2021 and 23 March 2021.

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
1	20/00787/FUL	W/20/3256677	Fairydell Farm Rucklers Lane Kings Langley WD4 9LF	Written Representations
	Date of Decision:		02/03/2021	

6.5 ENFORCEMENT NOTICE APPEALS LODGED

Enforcement Notice appeals lodged between 01 February 2021 and 23 March 2021.

None.

6.6 ENFORCEMENT NOTICE APPEALS DISMISSED

Enforcement Notice appeals dismissed between 01 February 2021 and 23 March 2021.

None.

6.7 ENFORCEMENT NOTICE APPEALS ALLOWED

Enforcement Notice appeals allowed between 01 February 2021 and 23 March 2021.

None.

6.8 ENFORCEMENT NOTICE APPEALS WITHDRAWN

Enforcement Notice appeals withdrawn between 01 February 2021 and 23 March 2021.

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
1	E/19/00290	C/20/3263148	Land at Featherbed Lane Felden	Written Representations
	Date of Decision:		29/01/2021 (not reported in previous update)	

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Procedure
2	E/19/00378	C/20/3265529	199 High Street Berkhamsted HP4 1AW	Written Representations
	Date of Decision:		05/03/2021	

6.9 SUMMARY OF TOTAL APPEAL DECISIONS IN 2021 (up to 23rd March 2021)

APPEALS LODGED	11
-----------------------	----

APPEALS DECIDED	TOTAL	%
TOTAL	12	100
APPEALS DISMISSED	4	33.3
APPEALS ALLOWED	4	33.3
APPEALS WITHDRAWN	4	33.3

	TOTAL	%
APPEALS DISMISSED		
Total	4	100
Non-determination		
Delegated	4	100
DMC decision with Officer recommendation		
DMC decision contrary to Officer recommendation		

APPEALS ALLOWED	TOTAL	%
Total	4	100
Non-determination		
Delegated	3	75
DMC decision with Officer recommendation		
DMC decision contrary to Officer recommendation	1	25

6.10 UPCOMING HEARINGS

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Date
1	E/20/00023/MULTI	C/20/3249358	Haresfoot Farm Chesham Road Berkhamsted HP4 2SU	25 May 2021

6.11 UPCOMING INQUIRIES

No.	DBC Ref.	PINS Ref.	Address	Date
1	E/19/00321	C/19/3237920 W/19/3237919	Land at Featherbed Lane Hemel Hempstead	11-14 May 2021
2	20/02060/LDP	X/20/3261710	Parker House Maylands Avenue Hemel Hempstead HP2 4SJ	29 June 2021