

4/01679/17/MFA	ROOF EXTENSION, REFURBISHMENT AND REPAIR, USE OF BUILDING AS 9 FLATS (5 ONE-BED, 4 TWO-BED) COMMUNITY USE ON PART OF GROUND FLOOR AND RAMPED ACCESS, BIN STORAGE AREA AND PARKING (11 SPACES)
Site Address	NASH HOUSE, DICKINSON SQUARE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 9GT
Applicant	Nash House Development Ltd, C/O Agent
Case Officer	Nigel Gibbs
Referral to Committee	Due to the level of public interest and the recommendation is contrary to the response from Nash Mills Parish Council to the Original and Revised Schemes

1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**.

2. Summary

2.1 In its revised form the proposal would enable to the partial rebuilding/ refurbishment of this important heritage asset in accordance with Policy CS27 of Dacorum Core Strategy. In doing so it would provide a permanent inclusive small scale community facility in part of the building's ground floor available for hire /use which accords with Policy CS23 of Dacorum Core Strategy, and the opportunity to fully acknowledge the building's historic significance. These opportunities are facilitated by the accommodation of 9 self-contained flats which accords with national and local policies focussed upon delivering new housing.

2.2 The Agent has confirmed that for viability reasons there are no remaining options to provide fewer residential units or additional community based accommodation at Nash House.

2.3 For clarification and outside the terms of reference of this application, there is no apparent inbuilt retained procedural/ legal mechanism available to LPA to separately require the full rebuilding/ reinstatement of Nash House to its former extremely high quality condition. This is based upon officers' review of the conditions and s106 Agreement for the approved Sappi redevelopment which featured the renovated Nash House as a key focal point for heritage, functional and visual/ urban design reasons.

2.4 The revised proposal has therefore been considered as what appears to officers a last opportunity scheme for Nash House. It represents an alternative to the 2009 originally approved community and B1 uses and the subsequent 2013 planning permission for community and residential uses. This is set against the entire failure of the Sappi Site developers to ensure that in the carrying out the approved 2009 scheme Nash House is the intended pivotal/ landmark feature-'the heart of the development' which was wholly expected by all stakeholders from the outset. It is a fundamental disappointment for all concerned as to what has happened, with the LPA unable to require the original developers to re-establish/ restore Nash House as assured .This is now the intention of the current Applicant in a different way through the current proposal. It is also due regard to the former English Heritage's refusal of the LPA's request to list Nash House and part of the Sappi site which has unfortunately undermined and understated the site's (including Nash House's) unquestionable well documented international heritage importance in terms of paper making.

3. Site Description

3.1 Nash House, Dickinson Square, is a former Georgian style dwelling house (1750) located within the Sappi site residential development, to the north of the Red Lion Lane junction with Rose Lane which is the main entry road to this part of the estate featuring flats/ flat blocks and terraced/ townhouse style housing. The building was the residence of key pioneers of the

paper making with international historical significance, notwithstanding the former English Heritage's aforementioned unpreparedness to list the building/ other parts of the Sappi site. The highly influential John Dickinson was amongst these former residents, purchasing the building in 1811.

3.2 The building has been subject to well documented major dereliction/ demolition with the second floor / roof being removed.

3.3 What should have been the prestigious landmark building at the visual focus of this part of the Sappi development -as a legacy to the site's historical importance- has become the focal point for all the wrong reasons which has understandably drawn major local/ national criticism from the local community, Councillors / Nash Mills Parish Council and local and national historians/ specialist heritage groups and the need for liaison with the MP.

3.4 In its current state it fundamentally detracts from the otherwise high quality surrounding nearby residential development in its high profile very visible location set against the designated play area at Dickinson Square adjoining Butterfly Crescent and the culverted mill stream. It is strident within the local streetscape exaggerated/ accentuated by the necessary enclosing safety hoardings, with its shell roof and portico entrance being particularly prominent.

3.5 The situation was investigated by the LPA's Enforcement Team prior to the submission of the current application. As an overview it has been interpreted by officers that notwithstanding the importance of the building, in the LPA's original support for the residential redevelopment of the Sappi site, the imposed conditions relevant to Nash House and the associated s106 Agreement have not bound the Sappi site developers to renovate the building/ convert Nash House. This is explained below.

3.6 According to the Council's records residential development started at the Sappi Site in 2010 and by early 2013 all family housing had been completed and occupied together with Blocks H1 and H2 flats for affordable housing and an apartment block (G) fronting the canal.

3.7 The Agent has confirmed that when the Applicant purchased in December 2016 Nash House the roof had already been removed. This is demonstrated by a photograph taken in April 2016. Since purchase the Agent has confirmed that the Applicant has not removed any additional elements and has only undertaken works to make the building safe.

4. Proposal

4.1 This is for the partial reconstruction and extension of Nash House to provide 9 flats (5 one-bed, 4 two-bed) and a community use on part of ground floor involving 560 square metres of floorspace. It will be served by ramped access, a bin storage area and 11 parking spaces. This is the Revised Scheme.

4.2 The building will feature a grey slate roof and the reinstated off white rendered walls. There would be the associated installation of replacement doors to reflect original character, re-fenestration of all window openings with sliding timber sashes, restoration of the porch canopy to the front elevation, rebuilding of part of the wall to the western elevation with a render finish applied to match remainder of the building, two new timber panelled doors to the northern elevation and new steps and railings to the door on the western elevation to match main entrance. This would be in conjunction with the provision of a proposed new mansard roof/ roof extension incorporating arched dormers to form the upper floor with a flat roofed single storey section to the eastern flank.

4.3 As compared with the Original Scheme, the Revised Scheme shows the following changes:

- a reduction in the number of units from ten to nine;

- the provision of 5 one-bed units and 4 two bed-units;
- the introduction of a community use on the ground floor with a ramped access;
- Flat 4 shown as a duplex and including a bedroom within the basement;
- the provision of bin storage areas;
- all of the residential units designed to meet the national space standards; and
- the removal of 3 second floor windows on the north-east elevation.

The Agent has also clarified:

Community room.

4.4 The Applicant would accept a condition which requires this element to be brought into use before the whole building is occupied with the room being refurbished and ready for use following the occupation of the 7th residential unit. This would leave two additional units without which the scheme would not be viable. The use for the Meeting Room would be between 10am to 8pm Monday to Friday and 10am to 4pm Saturday. A management company would be established for the building and this would also control bookings for the community room.

Basement. (139 sqm).

4.5 The Applicant does not intend to propose any additional usage of the basement. This was not included in either of the two planning permissions to convert the building (see below). The proposed refurbishment and maintenance of the basement would add considerable costs to what would already be a very expensive undertaking. It is therefore even more important that a residential use is permitted on the remaining floors to ensure that the redevelopment is viable. The Applicant met with the Parish Council in January 2018 to discuss the proposals. The Applicant suggested that a gymnasium could be provided within the basement for the sole use of the residents on the former Sappi site. Whilst an element of community use was welcomed, the general consensus was that a gymnasium would not be the best use of the space as it would have limited benefit to older residents. A meeting room received a more favourable reception.

Applicant's Purchase of the Site.

4.6 The building was purchased by the Applicant in its current state of disrepair. It had been almost completely cleared out internally due to wet rot and dry rot, whilst much of the flooring has had to be removed. In addition the roof had been completely removed.

Viability.

4.7 A report has been prepared by Aitchison Rafferty (AR). This raises serious doubts about the viability of either a Class A3 Café use, or a Class A1 retail use, which would not require planning permission in the event that the Class A3 permission was implemented. Account is also taken of the approved D1 community use. The concerns raised relate to the suitability of the site and its surroundings for such uses, as well as to the commercial viability of these approved uses in this location. The Applicant did not benefit from the wider redevelopment of Nash Mills, and therefore needs to make Nash House viable as a standalone development. There has been the previous submission of a viability report which explained why a full residential conversion was the only viable option for reinstating this important, historic building. The LPA's Strategic Planning and Regeneration Officer accepted that the level of information provided was proportionate and provided a reasonable justification for the proposal.

Dickinson Square.

4.8 The Applicant has a contract which obliges the previous owners to complete the approved landscaping scheme once the refurbishment of Nash House is finished. Dickinson Square is essential to the setting of Nash House and so it is clearly in the Applicant's client's interest to enforce this contract and ensure that the landscaping is completed.

Supporting Viability Report

4.9 This confirms amongst a range of issues:

1. Suitability.

The report raises the following concerns which serve to limit the appeal of the premises for Class A1/A3 and Class D1 uses:

- There are access issues due to stepped entrance to front of premises which would require the installation of a ramp or lift to allow safe and easy access for the elderly, disabled, prams/buggies etc.

- Retail space in large residential schemes such as this are typically most attractive to Convenience Store operators, but the modest size of the unit of just 35m² set against a typical minimum requirement for 280 m², would surely deter any such interest. In a more general sense the lack of a prominent frontage; the limited number of parking spaces; and the difficulties of making external changes to this historic property, such as increasing the width of window openings / installation of extractor fans / signage to increase the commercial appeal of the premises all further serve to suppress demand.

2. Commercial Viability.

The Viability Report notes as follows in this respect:

- The community use space would be unlikely to attract a commercial rent or value that would provide an investor or commercial occupiers with enough income to pay for the cost of fitting out the property. Community users would also be unlikely to be able to afford to buy the property.

- The Report explains the financial/ viability analysis, with reference to the costings to complete the building from 'a bare shell ', in addition consideration of the applicant's costs having already paid for the site, with the report concluding that the approved use of the ground floor is not viable and that in order to pay for the proper refurbishment the scheme needs to include a more valuable use, such as a wholly residential use. In summary it is clarified that adding more flats with reference the submitted costings would make the whole development viable. This report predates the Revised Scheme involving the reduction of the number of units and the introduction of the community use.

The Report details the various and extensive marketing of the premises since April 2011, but which in the light of the above issues have generated no offers and very little interest in the approved commercial floor space.

In considering this issue, it is noted that the existing Red Lion Public House is located within 410m of the site and can be accessed safely on foot, providing a realistic local alternative to the approved café use.

The experience is Community uses generally have little money to pay towards rent. The community use space would be unlikely to attract a commercial rent or value that would provide an investor or a commercial occupier with enough income to pay for the cost of fitting out the property for that use and no investors could therefore afford to let it be used for next to nothing if they had to let it out at low rents suitable for community uses. Community uses could also not in our experience afford to buy the property either to use parts for community uses.

Social Dimension.

4.10 Dacorum Core Strategy Policy CS23: Social Infrastructure states that existing social infrastructure will be protected unless appropriate alternative provision is made, or satisfactory evidence is provided to prove the facility is no longer viable. In the first instance it is noted that there has never been any community use of the premises. With regard to the approved use, in the context of the findings of the Viability Report set out above, it has already been demonstrated that the community of the premises is not viable. With regard to the ongoing need for the facility it is noted that the existing Nash Mills Village Hall is located within 350m of the site, with safe pedestrian access available along Lower Road and a large and dedicated car park. Indeed the Nash Mills Wharf development represents the nearest residential area to the Hall. The Hall appears to be well maintained such that the need for an additional community facility in this location is questioned.

4.11 The use as currently laid out is on slightly different levels internally as well as being up several steps from the outside. For retail uses or community uses any form of steps would be seen as a barrier to potential customers coming in. Many people using shops in a small neighbourhood such as this will probably come with prams, and steps are extremely difficult to negotiate with a pram. In addition disabled people will not be able to use the property without major alterations including a lift of some sort being installed externally. Although the building is not Listed, the external appearance would in our opinion be affected detrimentally if a chair lift or small lift was erected at the front or rear.

4.12 However, a large sector of the target market for this property if it were to remain as a shop or café would be put off coming in due to the barrier of the steps. Visitors with children in prams and the elderly are a large part of the likely target audience and if they cannot gain easy access then they will be put off and any new business is likely to suffer.

4.13. The only way to overcome the problem of the steps would be the installation of a ramp at the front, or a lift of some sort. A lift will be extremely costly and would affect the external appearance.

5. Relevant Planning History

5.1 Nash House was converted to offices in 1906 in association with the paper mill industrial use at the site. This continued until the owners left the site in 2007.

Planning Permission 4/01382/09/MFA: The Sappi Site

5.2 This is for 450 dwellings, comprising 69 houses, 389 apartments and one flat over a garage, including affordable housing, 620m² of community, A3 restaurant and café and B1 business / offices within Nash House, a 145m² D1 children's day nursery within Stephenson's Cottage, the use of the ground floors of blocks K & I to provide 352m² of B1 business / craft workshops, provision of hydro-electric plant, a 64 bed care home, re-opening and enhancement of the culverted watercourse through the site and the construction of vehicular and pedestrian links across the re-opened watercourse, on site car parking and the re-use of the existing car park south of Red Lion Lane, access improvements including the provision of a new roundabout.

The approved floorspaces were:

Level	Use Class – Approved Internal floor space (m ²)		
A3 Cafe	B1 Offices		D1 Community
Ground*	35	32.8	112.6

First	0	113.2	0
Second	0	65.5	0
Total	35	216.98	112.6

* Ground floor figures for each use exclude shared toilet facilities. The office floor space approved at ground floor comprised Management / Concierge accommodation, ancillary to that on the upper floors.

5.3 The comprehensive report noted the following with reference to Nash House and Dickinson Square:-

1. Recognition that:

- The key entrance to the site from Red Lion Lane would provide the necessary focus, for the long vista to Nash House, and
- The opening up of the culvert stream that runs through the development known as Mill Race, and Dickinson's Square adjacent to the Nash House and the proposed play area.

2. Dickinson's Square would be adjacent to the soft landscaped settings of the Mill Race and proposed play area. This area would therefore be hard landscaped dominated with a formal, contemporary and minimalist character. The key feature within the space would be the patterned paving and sculptured boulders with engraved text making references to the local history.

3. The design intent adopted for the new public spaces / squares serving Nash House and the bridge, and the alterations to the War Memorial were regarded as very positive. In general terms the spaces would create safe thoroughfares with well-defined transition areas promoting a soft landscaped setting that met best practice.

4. Heritage. The applicants had acknowledged that Nash House and Stephenson's Cottage are important assets to the development and they had sought to retain and upgrade both buildings, which was welcomed by the Conservation Department. The applicants envisaged Nash House to be used for concierge / security / community managers' office, reception, flexible meeting room and small cafe at ground floor, and upper floors to be used as office accommodation suitable for a variety of users. Stephenson's Cottage was being put forward as a day nursery. The Conservation Department noted that the details were limited as to how the two buildings would be converted and upgraded. For Nash House the Conservation Officer notes that an archaeological watching brief was required to ensure that fabric of the buildings was not compromised. It was noted that the aim should be to reinstate original character through the use of sympathetic materials such as timber sashes and joinery and stucco facings. Therefore, a condition was to be imposed, stating that no works are to take place until a schedule of works had been agreed.

5. Community Facilities. The Applicants had carried out a Community Facilities Audit for the wider area from which they concluded the site benefitted from excellent access to a wide range of facilities and services. They had also considered Dacorum's own assessment of needs and audits of existing facilities, but considered that it lacked detail and was not considered significantly robust to demonstrate or justify the need for a village hall to be provided within the site itself. In terms of Dacorum's Indoor Facilities Assessment Report 2006, it was recognised that Dacorum has a good spread of community hall provision. The applicants concluded in their assessment of current facilities that their scheme would add to the vibrancy and vitality of the area and will help support existing facilities, services and community activities. The applicants had also been in direct contact with the Parish Council and Village Hall Association regarding the building quality and usability of the existing village hall. From this and the above analysis they concluded that they would better serve the whole community by providing commuted sums to the Council/Association of £100,000 for the village hall refurbishment or to

be put towards its rebuilding costs. There would also be some community use provided with the refurbished Nash House, acting as a focal point within the heart of the new development.

6. Crime Prevention. Dacorum has the highest recorded crime figures for offences against motor vehicles across Hertfordshire. Many of these offences occur overnight when vehicles are left by their owners, locked and unattended. Therefore, security was regarded of the utmost importance for any new development. In terms of safety measures CCTV cameras were intended for Dickinson Square and the car park, with their precise locations to be agreed with the Crime Prevention Officer, with the intention of this system being connected to the existing DBC CCTV network.

5.4 Set against this background the permission was subject to a s106 Agreement which makes no specific reference to the renovation of Nash House. The conditions directly relating to Nash House were relating to its expected A3 restaurant and cafe and B1 business/ offices:

18.No works shall be carried out to Nash House and Stephenson Cottage until details of an archaeological watching brief and schedule of works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the work shall then be carried out in accordance with the details so approved.

Reason: To safeguard the historic character and appearance of Nash House and Stephenson Cottage.

26.Prior to first occupation full details of a proposed property maintenance strategy for Nash House and Stephenson Cottage shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory management of the development after completion of works.

36. No development shall be carried out to Nash House until a schedule of works relating to the reinstatement of its original character, through the use of sympathetic materials such as timber sashes and joinery and stucco facings, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of Nash House.

Discharge of conditions:

5.5 Condition 26 remains outstanding as it relates to prior to first occupation.

5.6 Condition 18 (Archaeology: December 2011) the Officer Report noted: 'The archaeological investigation has been satisfactorily completed, including publication of results. No further archaeological work is required in relation to the above planning application. The archaeological condition on consent may now be discharged'. This reflected the response from HCC Historic Environment: Condition 18. The archaeological investigation has been satisfactorily completed, including publication of results. No further archaeological work is required in relation to the above planning application. The archaeological condition on consent may now be discharged'. Note: There was however no submitted schedule of works.

5.7 Condition 36. These specify a schedule of works based upon November 2014 drawings with the roof intact. This was approved in June 2015. At that stage therefore the plans show the building in its original form- the Enforcement Notes for November 2015 refer the removal of

the roof within the last year i.e. November 2014 to November 2015.

5.8 Phasing condition. There was no reference to Nash House.

5.9 Use of Nash House: There were no specific conditions or s106 specifying the use of Nash House.

Planning Permission 4/00195/13/FUL :

5.10 Nash House Only: Change of use of the two upper floors to residential accommodation with the ground floor for commercial Ad and D1 uses. The residential accommodation comprised of 3 x 2 bed flats, with 'minimal alteration to allow the legible form of the original building where possible to be retained' .

5.11 The Archaeological Report noted:

'The survey and watching brief revealed that the first floor rooms had all been significantly modified during conversion and use as offices, and that although the basic floor plan remained largely unaltered, few original architectural details remained. In contrast, the former servants' quarters on the second floor remained largely unaltered, having been used mostly for storage. Proposals for the first floor comprise conversion into two two-bed apartments, accessed by the existing stairwell on the south side of the building. The plan of the larger eastern apartment largely follows the existing floor plan, with some relatively minor subdivision providing en-suite and bathroom facilities. The smaller western apartment requires some subdivision of Room F6, and remodelling of the layout of F7/8/9, though it is likely that the existing layout is not original. For the second floor the proposal is for conversion into a single two-bed apartment, also accessed by the existing stairwell. The existing floor plan, comprising six rooms, will remain unchanged except for the removal of the wall separating Rooms S6 and S7, though there will be some subdivision in S2 and S3 to provide storage space and an en-suite. Based on the absence of significant architectural details on the first and second floors, and the fact that the proposed conversion respects, as far as possible, the existing floor plans, the impact of the proposed development is assessed to be low'.

5.12 The supporting letter / statement noted:

'Given the increasingly pressing need to secure investment for the refurbishment and the reuse of Nash House during this economic recession, and the lack of investor interest from a commercial point of view, Linden Homes and Crest Nicholson consider that the proposed change of use of the upper floors to residential accommodation will attract the investment needed to restore this building, bring back into beneficial use the upper floors of the building, leaving the ground floor commercial A3 and D1 uses potentially to become more attractive to separate commercial and independent investors'.

5.13 As a background by this time Nash House had been intensively marketed by Aitchison Rafferty (AR) in order to secure a commercial occupier or investor to implement the mixed use. The AR report confirmed the reasons why commercial interest had not been forthcoming for the building. Set against this background the officer report noted at the time '...given the increasingly pressing need to secure investment for its refurbishment during the current economic recession and lack of investor interest Application 4/00195/13/FUL was submitted to the LPA'. The officer report also notes '...in terms of parking, Nash House was allocated 7 parking spaces - of which 3 will now be dedicated to each of the 3 flats. The remaining 4 spaces together with an additional 4 spaces which are provided to the front of the existing building will continue to be allocated to the potential ground floor commercial and cafe/community uses'.

Enforcement Investigation/ Questions: November 2015

5.14 The Enforcement Team was requested to investigate the alleged demolition of Nash House.

5.15 Enquires at the site office confirmed that the Developer had encountered significant structural problems with the building, necessitating the removal of the roof, included within which was a small second floor that was to contain the third of the three residential flats granted under 4/00195/13/FUL. The Developer confirmed that Nash House would be returned to its former appearance once the remedial works had been completed. It was noted that re-roofing is usually considered to be a repair and would not require planning permission; however, in this case it had gone slightly further.

5.16 In conjunction with this it was noted:

- In terms of the 'schedule of works, Conditions 18 and 36 appear to duplicate each other, or if not exactly duplicate, then they certainly overlap to an extent in that both require a schedule of works.
- It was understood that the roof of Nash House was removed 'relatively recently - i.e. within the last year' – so the more specific "no works shall be carried out to Nash House..." had been complied with.
- Questions regarding whether there had been a breach of condition 36, which is arguably less prohibitive in its wording – "No development shall be carried out to Nash House...", this was considered to depend on whether the LPA deemed the removal of the roof and, by extension, the entire 2nd floor as development.

5.17 Set against this the LPA did not further pursue the matter which has now been 'overtaken' by the submission of the current application and the preceding pre application request to the LPA.

5.18 It is also interpreted that the removal of the first floor nullified the 2013 permission (4/00195/13) for the conversion of Nash House's upper floors from commercial to flats because part of the original building no longer exists, requiring substantial partial reconstruction and due to the wording of Condition 36 there is no timeframe regarding the completion of the reinstatement of Nash House.

6. Policies

6.1 National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

6.2 Adopted Core Strategy –

NP1 - Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages

CS8 - Sustainable Transport

CS9 - Management of Roads

CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS13 - Quality of Public Realm

CS17 - New Housing

CS19 - Affordable Housing

CS27 - Quality of the Historic Environment

CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction
CS31 - Water Management
CS32 - Air, Water and Soil Quality
CS33 - Hemel Hempstead Urban Design Principles
CS35 - Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

10, 18, 19, 31, 33, 51, 57, 58, 61, 62 and 113

Appendices 3, 5 and 8

6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

- Environmental Guidelines (May 2004)
- Area Based Policies (May 2004) - Residential Character Areas HCA 18 and HCA 19
- Water Conservation & Sustainable Drainage (June 2005)
- Energy Efficiency & Conservation (June 2006)
- Accessibility Zones for the Application of car Parking Standards (July 2002)
- Affordable Housing (Jan 2013)

6.5 Advice Notes and Appraisals

- Sustainable Development Advice Note (March 2011)

7. Constraints

- 45.7m Air direction limit
- Flood zone 1
- CIL Zone 3
- General Employment Area
- Former Land Use
- LHR Wind Turbine
- Groundwater source zone

8. Representations

Consultation responses

8.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A

9. Considerations

Main issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Policy and principle.
- Layout, Design and Historic Environment.
- Impact upon Residential Amenity.
- Access, Highway Safety and Parking.

Policy and Principle

9.2 The background is that two planning permissions enabled the reuse/ renovation of Nash House for a variety of uses in a designated General Employment Area. Significantly in 2013 the LPA was prepared to support the partial introduction of a residential use. This was with due regard to viability issues of delivering the original approved uses, not long after the grant of the 2009 planning permission. The Developers carried out other redevelopment but apparently left Nash House.

9.3 To resist the proposal based upon the GEA implications would be very dogmatic and negative. At the same time to wholly move away from the original concept regarding Nash House's Heritage, Functional and Visual role as envisaged in the Developer's Vision for Sappi and supported by the LPA and Inspire East only a few years ago is wholly unacceptable. Such an approach would fail to create a heart to this part of the Sappi development conflicting with Policy CS23 of Dacorum Core Strategy. The current effect of Nash House's dereliction has had the reverse negative major effect creating a very sterile less inviting environment, contrary to the expected vibrancy generated by the expected a mix of uses through the 2009 permission.

9.4 Notwithstanding the content of the submitted Viability Report there has to be a continuing full recognition that the interaction between uses is central to achieving sustainable development. A decision now to support no mix of uses in urban design terms would be very retrograde. However, the Applicant has not created the situation now faced by the local community and LPA and most importantly is now prepared to provide a community use in part of the ground floor in the Revised Scheme, following the initial submission for 10 flats.

9.5 The Nash House situation currently represents a fundamental flaw in the delivery of the approved redevelopment which can however be successfully retrieved through this application. Given the current lack of opportunity to reinstate Nash House at this stage with the lost Visual, Heritage and Community benefits this can be changed if there is support to the principle of the development. It would accord with Dacorum Core Strategy Policies 23 (Community Uses) and 27 (Heritage) and deliver much needed additional housing in a sustainable location.

9.6 In this context saved DBLP Policy 19 addresses conversions. This states that such conversions will be permitted if:-

- In residential areas of towns and large villages, subject to the retention of necessary local services,
- The Council will also take steps to encourage the reuse of vacant commercial premises..... for housing, and
- All conversions must be designed to a high standard, taking full account of the character of the area. – ensuring they do not adversely affect the architectural or historic character of a listed building.

9.7 Albeit due the current state of the building would militate against a strict conversion the principles of Policy 19 are directly relevant. The mix of flats is a positive aspect of the scheme, albeit there is no affordable housing. The ground floor unit adjoining the main entrance with the basement also provides the opportunity for carer to live at the unit so long as the main entrance is subject to the provision of a disabled access (see below).

9.8 Therefore set against these extenuating circumstances there is a case to support the principle of the Revised Approach, notwithstanding that it falls well short of the 2009 Project high expectations (involving a hub / vibrant mix of uses) which was however diluted by the now expired 2013 permission.

9.9 In terms of the community use this could be positively reinforced with a community gym in the basement for residents to use as recommended by the Conservation & Design Team. For clarification after extensive positive Officer/ Agent dialogue the Agent had initially agreed that the basement would provide a community gym in accordance with the specialist advice of the

Conservation Team. However following the Applicant's/Agent's attendance at the Parish Council meeting the Applicant withdrew this agreed approach to the basement which was very disappointing. Subsequently the Applicant has also been unable to agree that the basement is used for much needed storage for the flats, being now limited to being a part of one of the ground floor flats, with the remainder otherwise left unused. It has been explained to the case officer that the lack of basement use is consistent with the LPA's previous approach (2009/2013) to the basement with associated viability issues. However opportunities remain to use the basement which forms part of part of the remaining heritage asset. It is therefore recommended that a condition requires the positive use of more than the currently proposed part of the basement.

Layout, Design, Scale, etc.

9.10 The template for the proposal is that the LPA has previously granted planning permission for conversions at the site with curtilage parking. The flats would accord with national flat size standards served by external refuse storage facilities. Although no amenity space can be provided due to the site conditions this is not uncommon for conversions of buildings in urban locations. Appropriate noise measures would be necessary in accordance with normal practice and to ensure the harmonious coexistence between the community use and the flats. Air quality was not considered to be an overriding issue in granting the 2009 permission.

9.11 In terms of the expectations of Dacorum Core Strategy Policies CS12 and CS32 and the NPPF regarding residential amenity the relationship with the immediate locality requires careful consideration. The starting point is that the LPA supported the 2009 and 2013 schemes for the respective conversions in the full knowledge of the position of the surrounding residential development. In granting the 2013 permission the LPA was fully aware of its massing and design and window positions, with no officer identified objections.

The Agent's Report notes:

Fig 7.3.0: Assessment of the proposal against adopted amenity standards Issue	Requirement	Provision and Evaluation
Privacy	Local Plan Appendix 3 specifies minimum distances of 23 m between the main rear wall of a dwelling and the main wall (front or rear) of another be met to ensure privacy.	Given the nature of the proposal, this criterion is of limited relevance. Nevertheless the principle front (southern) and rear (northern) elevations are very well separated from the neighbouring properties, surpassing the 23m distance. The western flank elevation would be set some 20m from the adjacent flats beyond the Mill Canal, which must be acceptable in a suburban setting. To the east a 15m flank to flank relationship would be achieved between the upper floors of the properties, which is similarly considered acceptable in this context. A 10m gap would be achieved at ground floor, but in reality the relative positions and sizes of the windows to both Nash House and the

		flank of the adjacent property would preclude any significant opportunity for overlooking.
Sunlight and Daylight	Local plan Appendix 3 requires that residential development should be designed and positioned in such a way that a satisfactory level of sunlight and daylight is maintained for existing and proposed dwellings.	With regard to neighbouring properties, no additional impact would result over that from the implementation of the approved scheme. With regard to the impact for prospective occupiers, the degree of separation and /or the proposed fenestration should ensure satisfactory levels of light.

9.12 In support of the current application the Agent understandably refers to the how the LPA considered the 2013 application as a background .This is with reference to the building's original massing and that now proposed and the position of windows. In response to officers' concerns regarding the relationship with Butterfly Crescent, especially nos. 5 and 6 Butterfly Crescent, the Revised Scheme is an improvement to the Original Scheme through the change to fenestration, with the Agent observing:

9.13.'Second floor windows. Three second floor windows on the north-east elevation have been removed. This would prevent any additional overlooking into properties in Butterfly Crescent. The siting of the two remaining second floor windows would reflect that allowed by the previous permission to convert Nash House (4/00195/13/FUL). These windows were to a living room and kitchen and were the same distance from the neighbouring dwellings and gardens as would be the case for the current scheme'.

9.14 It is acknowledged that the Conservation & Design Team raises no objections to the enlargement of the building / roof profile and this facilitates the provision of additional accommodation to increase the schemes' viability. This has to be weighed against the effects of the resultant increased massing in relation to the adjoining dwellings in Butterfly Crescent. Members will be updated at the meeting following the culmination of additional dialogue with the Agent.

9.15 The Crime Prevention Officer raises no fundamental objections. The parking area has natural surveillance with the area served by existing column based lighting.

Impact on Street Scene/ Character of the Area

9.16 The approved scheme's key objective in recognising Nash House's major heritage importance in international paper making can still be rekindled through this application.

9.17 As confirmed the Applicant is not responsible for Nash House's current state of major dereliction. However, it is fully understandable how residents, the Councillors/Parish Council feel about the site's extremely poor condition. Officers are of the same view. The intended landmark building is to the contrary fundamentally detrimental to the whole area.

9.18 However, the situation is retrievable through this major rejuvenation/ restoration project... the door remains open. Therefore in principle there is a most robust case for the LPA to support this major rebuilding project. It is fundamentally important that every opportunity is given to support the rebuilding.

9.19 With due regard to the proposed design details and the imposition of conditions a high quality rebuilding /replication of the original building can be achieved, taking into account that the Conservation & Design Team's support the proposed enlargement, with due regard to the expectations of Policy CS27.

9.20 With regard to the Conservation & Design Team's support for heritage signage in Dickinson Square, following the C&D's dialogue with Apsley Paper Trail Archivist a condition cannot be imposed as Dickinson Square lies outside the application site. The Agent/ Applicant are aware of the situation and dialogue is ongoing and any updates will be provided at the meeting. In the overall equation the 'procedural inability ' to deliver the signage at Dickinson Square would be most disappointing but less so than if the building is not revitalised soon. A recommended condition does refer to signage within the application site.

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.21 The scope for soft landscaping is limited.

Impact on Highway Safety/ Access/ Parking

9.22 There have been no objections raised by Hertfordshire County Council Highways Hertfordshire Fire & Rescue Service. This takes into account the role of access road to the site and hydrant availability, both serving the existing approved development. An informative is recommended regarding essential fire access requirements.

9.23 As noted by the supporting statement the extant permission for the mixed Class A3, B1 and D1 use of the premises, the proposed wholly residential use should reduce the general number of vehicular movements generated, as well as the number of larger commercial vehicles visiting the site.

9.24 There is disabled/inclusive access to the community facility and one flat. There should be a ramped access to the main front entrance, providing entry/exit to the ground floor. The Agent has been unable to provide a requested drawing for this, but accepts this can be addressed by a condition.

9.25 It is fully acknowledged that there is a major demand upon parking in the area as expressed by local residents and the Parish Council and major parking objections. At one space per unit this is consistent to the approach to the Sappi development (residential: 1: 1) with two spaces available for the community use. The Agent considers that 1 space per unit is acceptable with the Revised Scheme also providing cycle storage. It is expected that those using the community use would be primarily local residents who would be able to walk or cycle to the site two spaces available for community users. With due regard to the acknowledged role of car free developments and that the site is in a relatively sustainable location, the Agent has been unable to agree that any of the units could be occupied by non- car owners. The parking implications are not ideal which has to be balanced against the importance of focusing upon revitalizing the building.

9.26 The Agent has been requested to increase the on- site refuse storage in order to comply with the Refuse Guidance Note.

Other Material Planning Considerations

9.27 There are no apparent fundamental drainage, contamination or water supply issues, with the site not within a vulnerable Flood Risk Zone, setting aside the lack of a response from the Environment Agency (with specific reference to the partial use of the basement). This is with due regard to the advice of the other responding relevant respective specialist technical consultees and the need for appropriate conditions, taking into account this is a source

protection zone and a former land use, with paper making subject to chemical processes and the need to address drainage given the advice of the Lead Flood Authority. A recommended informative addresses land stability issues.

9.28 Hertfordshire Ecology has not identified any ecological implications. Within this very sterile built environment with such limited soft landscaping but with water nearby bat / bird boxes are recommended. In order to safeguard the residential amenity of the locality and for ecological, highway safety and crime prevention reasons an exterior lighting condition is recommended.

9.29 The proposal is not an EIA development. There are no air safeguarding objections.

9.30 It is fully acknowledged that there is likely to be significant local environmental disruption during the partial reconstruction of Nash House, given the access arrangements, parking issues and the closeness of adjoining housing which could have been fully avoided if Nash House had been converted in conjunction with the carrying out of the whole development. The application could not be refused due to the effect of the construction works, however it would be essential that a construction management plan is subject to a condition. It could restrict the construction hours/ delivery times, associated phasing and an emphasis upon limiting trade/ works vehicles parking with shared transport and setting up a liaison group with neighbours and the Parish Council.

Response to Neighbour comments

9.31 These points have been addressed above.

CIL

9.32 The development is CIL liable.

S106 and Planning Obligations

9.33 The provision of 9 units/ 1,000 sqm is below the affordable housing threshold.

10. Conclusions

10.1 There is unquestionably a fundamental conundrum for all stakeholders in considering this case. However difficult it is for all the stakeholders the background is in the apparent 'enforcement vacuum', Nash House could stay in its derelict state indefinitely.

10.2 To the best of officers knowledge there is no enforcement opportunity to require the full reinstatement of Nash House to facilitate the approved vibrant mix of uses. This is what everybody is faced with- a wholly difficult cold reality situation. This is notwithstanding what was expected to happen through the 2009 Sappi decision with Nash being the development's landmark focal point.

10.3 It is unequivocally fully understood why the Parish Council / Councillors , local residents/ other heritage groups/ specialists seriously remain so alarmed as to 'why we are here', with the landmark building so key to overall development concept now in such a derelict condition.

So what is the way forward?

10.4 In focusing upon the merits of the current application officers are now at an absolute crossroads. Based upon the information available officers have noted that the condition of the building is not due to the actions of the current Applicant whose proposal offers an opportunity to rejuvenate the site within a comprehensive development.

10.5 Therefore, however difficult for all concerned, the focus should **not** be why the building is in its current condition, **but whether the scheme delivers a positive environmental outcome**. Based upon the officers' interpretation of the lack of enforcement action powers to fully reinstate the building ready for the approved uses, a refusal based upon the failure of the landmark building to be delivered as an integral part of the original development would not be tenable. This is notwithstanding the unquestionable negative perception of the building's current condition and the issue of 'we should not be where we are'.

10.6 Setting aside the issue of the building's massing in relation to the residential amenity of Butterfly Crescent, it must be clarified that the opportunity for officers to request further changes has been now entirely exhausted. Albeit it still remains desirable for a community use gym in the basement as originally agreed but subsequently withdrawn by the Applicant.

10.7 In addition based upon discussions the Agent has been unable to agree any of the following:

- the basement to be used for storage for the flats which is a missed opportunity, given that it is well recognised that flats are often short of storage,
- the provision of any of the units with occupants not having a car (this has been approved elsewhere in highly sustainable locations),
- any affordable housing, and
- the provision of a front disabled ramp which would open up the ground floor unit as a potential a live in ; care based unit.

10.8 Setting aside why the building is in its current state, this is a now a case of deciding whether to support a scheme - **which is a another vital opportunity to reinvigorate/rejuvenate Nash House to become the landmark feature of the Estate which was originally intended** but fully acknowledging that it is not an ideal scheme- or refuse the application.

10.9 Therefore in this fundamentally difficult vacuum, the question what is the best outcome - a lower quality version of the originally expected landmark building to reinvigorate such a key part of the site providing a community facility and 9 much needed units - or further decay and dereliction, with the limiting effect of a s215 notice seemingly to be the only redress at this stage with no use.

10.10 If the application was refused, with further delay through the Developer 'doing nothing' or awaiting the outcome of an Appeal- potentially a public inquiry- there would remain no immediately foreseeable progress.

10.11 So how is all this resolved in the most pragmatic way? It has to be a most carefully balanced decision, set against the very real concerns of the Parish Council/ Councillors and local residents, with heritage groups reinforcing the building's importance. It is quite simply what is best for the site/ community.

10.12 In accordance with the NPPF 's emphasis upon sustainable development it is concluded that to give the opportunity to 'unlock the situation' would be for the LPA to support the scheme subject to the carrying out of the development within a clearly prescribed time period, the permanent provision of a community use on the ground floor , an option to use the basement for alternative purposes and the provision of a disabled/ inclusive ramp linked to the portico.

10.13 Of course there can be no guarantees that if granted the current applicant would develop the site. It needs to be also recognised that a future application could be submitted for an alternative scheme to demolish the building with a proposal to replace it entirely and weight would have to be given to the 'fallback position' of an extant permission.

10.14 However, there would be a vital platform to enable the opportunity to facilitate the site's now much needed overdue rejuvenation, representing an alternative, albeit less vibrant version of what was originally envisaged.

10.15 Accordingly, the application is recommended for the grant of planning permission which will act as a catalyst for the revival of Nash House.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the application be DELEGATED to the Group Manager, Development Management with a view to approval subject to the expiry of the neighbour notification and subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission and completed fully in accordance with the specified conditions within 5 years of the date of this decision.**

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 and once started there is a need to complete the development given the extenuating background circumstances.

- 2 No flat hereby permitted shall be occupied until the community use unit is provided fully in accordance with the approved drawings and thereafter the community use unit shall be permanently available for community use between 10.00 and 20.00 hours Mondays to Fridays and 10.00 and 16.00 hours on Saturdays and before the first use of the community unit hereby permitted a Management User Plan shall be submitted to the local planning authority confirming how it will be operated at all times. The community use shall be operated fully in accordance with the approved Management Plan at all times.**

The community use unit shall be provided before its first use with an internal heritage display and external heritage signage for Nash House and thereafter at all times fully in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the community use is permanently provided at all times to accord with the expectations to the former Sappi site which is subject to Planning Permission 4/01382/09/MFA and Policies CS 23 and CS27 of Dacorum Core Strategy.

- 3 Notwithstanding any of the submitted details no development shall be carried out until a detailed schedule of all the external works and materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All windows and doors shall be of timber and gutters and down pipes/ soil pipes shall be black painted and the roof light shall be of a conservation roof type fitted flush with the roof slope. The development shall be carried out fully in accordance with all the approved details and thereafter shall be retained and maintained at all times fully in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To reinforce the original character and appearance of Nash House in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS27 of Dacorum Core Strategy

- 4 **Within one month of the commencement of the development hereby permitted a scheme for noise insulation/ mitigation shall be submitted to the local planning authority. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until all the measures have been installed fully in accordance with all the approved details and thereafter all the approved measures shall be retained and maintained at all times.**

Reason: To ensure that at all times the development is subject to noise insulation / mitigation in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS32 of Dacorum Core Strategy and the approved community use can harmoniously coexist with the residential environment at all times.

- 5 **The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until all the ramped access to the community unit and the parking spaces shown by the approved site layout plan shall have been provided. In addition the main portico entrance access shall at all times be provided with a disabled access fully in accordance with details which shall be submitted to and approved in writing within one month of the commencement of development at the site. Both accesses and all of the parking spaces shall be retained thereafter at all times and they shall not be used thereafter otherwise than for the respective approved purposes. In addition cycle storage shall be provided at the site at all times fully in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the first use of the building hereby permitted.**

Reason: To provide the ramped/ disabled/ inclusive accesses, parking and cycle storage at all times in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of Dacorum Core Strategy.

- 6 **The access road within the curtilage of Nash House and parking spaces hereby permitted shall be subject to a drainage design which shall be submitted within one month of the date of the commencement of the development hereby permitted. The drainage shall be installed and thereafter retained and maintained fully in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and wider drainage requirements in accordance with Policies CS8, CS12 and CS29 of Dacorum Core Strategy.

- 7 **The refuse storage facilities shall be provided fully in accordance with the approved details before any use of the building hereby permitted and thereafter shall be retained at all times and only used for the approved purposes.**

Reason: To ensure a refuse facility is provided at all times at the site in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Borough Local Plan.

- 8 **A scheme for all boundary treatment shall submitted within one month of the commencement of the development hereby permitted and shall be installed prior to the first use of any part of the development and thereafter the approved boundary treatment shall be retained at all times.**

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the locality and in the interests of the residential amenity to accord with the requirements of Policies CS10, CS12 and CS32 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

- 9 **Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Phase I Report to assess the actual or potential contamination at the site shall be**

submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. If actual or potential contamination and/or ground gas risks are identified further investigation shall be carried out and a Phase II report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development. If the Phase II report establishes that remediation or protection measures are necessary a Remediation Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

For the purposes of this condition:

A Phase I Report consists of a desk study, site walkover, conceptual model and a preliminary risk assessment. The desk study comprises a search of available information and historical maps which can be used to identify the likelihood of contamination. A simple walkover survey of the site is conducted to identify pollution linkages not obvious from desk studies. Using the information gathered, a 'conceptual model' of the site is constructed and a preliminary risk assessment is carried out.

A Phase II Report consists of an intrusive site investigation and risk assessment. The report should make recommendations for further investigation and assessment where required.

A Remediation Statement details actions to be carried out and timescales so that contamination no longer presents a risk to site users, property, the environment or ecological systems.

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 offsite receptors in accordance with Policies CS31 and CS32 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

- 10 **All remediation or protection measures identified in the Remediation Statement referred to in Condition 9 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 offsite receptors in accordance with Policies CS31 and CS32 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

Informative:

Paragraph 121 of the NPPF states that all site investigation information must be

prepared by a competent person. This is defined in the framework as 'A person with a recognised relevant qualification, sufficient experience in dealing with the type(s) of pollution or land instability, and membership of a relevant professional organisation.'

Contaminated Land Planning Guidance can be obtained from Regulatory Services or via the Council's website www.dacorum.gov.uk

- 11 **All the bathroom windows of the development hereby permitted shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass, no additional windows shall be installed within the building and the roof of the flat roofed side extension shall not be used as an amenity area, balcony or roof garden.**

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity to accord with Policies 12 and 32 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy.

- 12 **Details of all exterior lighting to be installed at the application site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The exterior lighting shall be installed fully in accordance with the approved details before any use of the building hereby permitted. Thereafter the approved lighting shall be retained and maintained fully in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the local environment,, the residential amenity of the locality, highway safety, biodiversity, access for persons with disabilities and crime prevention/security in accordance with Policies CS12, CS27, CS29 and CS32 of the Dacorum Core Strategy and Policy 113 and Appendix 8 of the saved Dacorum Borough Local Plan.

- 13 **Bat and bird boxes shall be installed at the site before the first occupation of any of the flats or the first use of the community unit hereby permitted. Thereafter all these boxes shall be retained at all times.**

Reason: In accordance with Policy CS29 of the Dacorum Core Strategy and the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework to biodiversity.

- 14 **The development hereby permitted shall be subject to a permanent Management Plan for both the building and its curtilage's regular and permanent maintenance which shall include the refurbishment and use of the basement, communal areas and all parts of the community unit. The Plan shall be submitted to the local planning authority before the first occupation / use of any part of the building and the Plan's requirements shall be carried out at all times fully in accordance with the approved scheme.**

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the building to accord with the requirements of Policies CS10 ,CS12 and CS27 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

- 15 **No development hereby permitted shall commence until a Construction Management Plan is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and residential amenity in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of Dacorum Core Strategy.

- 16 **Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of a**

surface and foul water drainage system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out and thereafter retained fully in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the site is subject to an acceptable drainage system serving the development in accordance with the aims of Policies CS8 ,CS12 and CS31 of the Dacorum Core Strategy , including highway safety, and to protect groundwater to accord with the requirements of Policies CS31 and CS32 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

- 17 **Subject to the requirements of other conditions of this planning permission the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:**

**PL01E Site location and block plan
PL02D Ground floor plan
PL03B First floor plan
PL04D Second floor plan
PL05B Elevation A
PL06C Elevation B
PL07C Elevation C
PL08C Elevation D
PL09 Existing ground floor plan
PL10 Existing first floor plan
PL11 Existing second floor plan
PL12 Existing elevations A and C
PL13 Existing elevations B and D
PL14D Proposed basement
PL15 Existing basement
PL16 Bin store details
Site Section A
Site Section B
Site Section C**

Reason: To safeguard and maintain the strategic policies of the local planning authority and for the avoidance of doubt.

ARTICLE 35 STATEMENT

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 (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

Informatives

Fire Access/ Safety

It is fundamentally important that the parking / turning area within the curtilage of the site is constructed fully in accordance with the access and loading requirements for fire tenders and it is expected that the Developer fully liaises with Hertfordshire Fire & Rescue Service to ensure all its requirements are fully complied in servicing the

development.

Dickinson Square

It is requested that the Developer contacts and liaises with the owners of Dickinson Square regarding the permanent provision of historical information boards within Dickinson Square regarding Nash House. The Council's Conservation Team can provide specific advice upon this in the interests of permanently recognising highly significant the role of Nash House/ the site in the history of paper making.

Land Stability/ Contamination

The government advice is that where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.

Paragraph 121 of the NPPF states that all site investigation information must be prepared by a competent person. This is defined in the framework as 'A person with a recognised relevant qualification, sufficient experience in dealing with the type(s) of pollution or land instability, and membership of a relevant professional organisation.'

Contaminated Land Planning Guidance can be obtained from Regulatory Services or via the Councils website www.dacorum.gov.uk

Drainage

Hertfordshire County Council Lead Flood Authority has confirmed:

There is a need to seek information of how the Applicant intends to manage the surface water generated on site and how the proposed development site can be adequately drained. It has been noted that there are no public surface water sewers within the vicinity of the site.

The LFA therefore recommended the imposition of a pre commencement condition to obtain information regarding surface water management of the site. As a minimum the LPA there is the need for a drainage strategy that includes the details of how the on-site surface water will be managed, where possible providing appropriate sustainable drainage techniques and the location of discharge off the site, along with any supporting calculations. In case the Applicant proposes to infiltrate, it is recommended that infiltration tests are carried out to ensure that feasibility of the soakaway.

Highway Issues

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 <http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

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

and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Appendix A: Consultation responses

ORIGINAL SCHEME

Nash Mills Parish Council

Initial Response

The Planning Committee met on the 9th October to consider the above application.

After a wide-ranging discussion Councillors agreed that this application would not be approved or formally objected to, until the planning history of the application since 2010 is clarified by planning officers.

Comments received 26 October 2017

Main Response

NMPC Councillors were appalled that the Nash House building has been allowed to decay so badly. There appear to be, planning conditions attached to the decision notice for application 4/01382/09/MFA which requires the Developer to agree a time schedule for the rebuilding/refurbishment of Nash House and other construction works. This condition has not been complied with and NMPC would like to know why this situation has been allowed to develop, that did not ensure developers would be held to their original plan to refurbish this important and historic landmark in our community.

Councillors **strongly object** to the proposed new development on the following grounds:

CONTRARY TO PLANNING POLICY

The proposed change of use application, as currently proposed will be contrary to local planning policies of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD), the principle document of the Local Planning Framework, adopted by Dacorum Borough Council on 25 September 2013; in particular the adopted policies of Core Strategy CS23, which emphasises the importance of:

Quality of Design for both the public realm and built environment

Strengthening economic prosperity by providing spaces for offices and supporting retail and commerce

Meeting community needs by delivering community services and facilities and delivering leisure facilities

Conserving the historic environment and the effect of changing the historic building, which forms a significant part of the local character

OVER DEVELOPMENT

The change of use of Nash House, to allow additional residential units, will lead to an adverse social impact on the residents of the Nash Mills development and the wider local community, as there will be no social facilities or amenities formed within the boundaries of the development. If approved, this would be contrary to the Council's adopted policy CS23 and the original developers' public declaration and principle aims for the development, which state:

'Nash House is a key part of the overall development and is the heart of the scheme. The proposal would retain this building and make a focal point for the future community of the site and the surrounding area.

The conversion of Nash House to additional residential units which seeks to include an unwelcome substantial addition to the existing footprint on what is already a high density development. This will lead to an adverse visual impact on the character and setting of the local area, requiring additional parking spaces formed upon the site, further eroding the important 'green spaces' of the Nash Mills development.

The proposal to provide additional residential units within the Nash Mills development site will cause overdevelopment and overcrowding of the Nash Mills site, due to a proposal to further increase the population density and an according increase in parking provision within the development and cause a further increase in vehicular traffic within the wider area, which is already a clear problem for local residents.

The proposed lay-out of the ten residential units illustrate very small, cramped living areas indicative of overdevelopment.

CONVERSION OF THE HISTORIC HOUSE

Nash House was, at the time of the original planning application and occupation by the developer, a building that was in use and one which retained a unique and important architectural structure, finishes and fittings. Though the property required extensive maintenance and refurbishment it appears that the developers took it upon themselves to strip the building completely of all structural materials, coverings, protective surfaces, finishes and fittings, leaving the remaining structure in poor condition. By doing so, the developers' have a moral obligation to the local community and a legal obligation under the conditions of the planning approval and subsequent approvals, to return Nash House back to a habitable condition for community use. Nash Mills Parish Council would like Dacorum Borough Council to request that the developer commission a comprehensive structural survey to ensure the building as it remains is structurally safe.

This historic house is important to Nash Mills' history and any sensitive design would incorporate some mention of its history within the development.

MARKETING & COMMERCIAL VIABILITY

The property has been marketed by local agents over recent years, but only in the unsafe and un-inhabitable condition that it was left in by the developers', following the granting of approval of the Nash Mills development.

Due to the high costs in returning Nash House back to a habitable building, regardless of use, these costs alone would be prohibitive to any community or small commercial use. Therefore we feel that the building has not been properly marketed in a genuine and viable manner, for which the planning guidelines on marketability of a property would relate. We feel sure that an appeal inspector would concur that the marketing of this important local property must be carried out in a genuine and meaningful manner, which has not been demonstrated with this application. The relatively low levels of financial contributions of rent etc. cited by the developer as a reason to exclude community use and occupation of the building are not grounds to exclude community uses from the site. It is specifically written into local and national and planning policies that community uses should be both encouraged and supported in developments where possible. This has not been demonstrated as noted above.

It is acknowledged that few, small -scale, commercial and community groups could raise finances such as to enable the reinstatement of Nash House, we therefore feel that the property must be reinstated as a viable, habitable property, ready for occupation and use for it

to attract any genuine and meaningful offer.

The value of Nash House is clear to the community and also acknowledged by the developer in their public statement as part of their initial public consultations as noted above; that the value of Nash House is not limited to the financial cost of reinstatement of the property, but in its wider, long-term community use as an important heart and hub, both for the Nash Mills development and wider parish of Nash Mills.

Where community support services are not provided within large-scale residential developments, there is a clear and demonstrable lack of balance between public and private spaces, which result in the ghettoization of an area over the medium to long term. It is for this fundamental reason that community projects and public spaces are provided, to ensure that a community retains a properly balanced and well-proportioned sense of public and private space, the requirements of which are detailed within both local and national planning policies.

COMMERCIAL AND COMMUNITY USE

We appreciate that the relatively small scale of the property footprint, will typically exclude a 'convenience store' type use, for the reasons defined within the developers planning Statement of Support, however, it is important to recognise that the developer has sought to and obtained permission to change the use of the principal retail units of the Nash Mills development. Nash House was not proposed to perform the service of a dense, retail use of the Nash Mills Development, but to provide a space for community and business use, by way of smaller non-intensive (coffee shop) retail use and small business development opportunities, forming, as defined by the developer, a mix of uses at 'the Heart of the scheme'.

The developers consulted the public prior to the issue of the development planning approval and confirmed:

'After careful review of existing community facilities and listening to the aspirations of local stakeholders, it is proposed that Nash House will incorporate 'a' mix of uses'.

Local stakeholders have not been consulted on these new revised proposals to remove all community and retail opportunities from the Nash Mills development and the community facilities that the developer had carefully reviewed at the outset remain as they were prior to the granting of the development planning approval. The public consultation formed a key aspect of the original development plan and subsequent granting of approval. The developers have suggested in their planning Statement of Support, that any commercial use for Nash House would be difficult to let and unsustainable in the longer term. The nearby developments of both Dickinson Quay and The Ovaltine development, both have vibrant, well supported and flourishing retail units combined within the fabric of their developments.

Dickinson Quay provides two restaurants, a public house, coffee shop and local convenience stores, all of which have been in operation for many years and continue to be fully supported by the residents of the development. The lack of street-frontage and parking provision to these units means that they are principally supported and well patronised, by residents of the development, rather than being reliant upon passing or trade from the wider surrounding community. We do not feel this an appropriate ground for supporting a change of use application.

The developers have suggested in their planning Statement of Support, that finding a low density commercial use, such as a coffee shop, would be difficult due to the architecture of the building. Many successful low-density retail units, such as coffee shops exist within the fabric of historic buildings, the form and style of the building does not deter people from using these facilities, where they are presented. The units of Dickinson Quay have large floor to ceiling

windows and their facades are set back behind canopy roofs with large quay-style arches. We do not feel this an appropriate ground for supporting a change of use application.

PLANT AND AIR EXTRACTION

Air extraction within historic buildings must be given due consideration and a considered design should form an integral part of the recommissioning of Nash House. Whilst the use of external extraction units would not generally meet with the support of the conservation department, internally formed and attenuated extraction can easily be accommodated within the development, as with many other historic buildings that have been converted throughout the country. We do not feel this an appropriate ground for supporting a change of use application.

SIGNAGE

Signage for the new retail and commercial uses of the development would need to be proportionate, well designed and considered. Many examples of good and proportionate signage are in existence on historic buildings. The developers have suggested in their planning Statement of Support, that a lack of road-frontage signage would be detrimental to the use, operation and overall future viability of any commercial use of the building; however as defined above, the vibrant and long established commercial units of the neighbouring Dickinson Quay development have succeeded without the need for road front signage. We do not feel this an appropriate ground for supporting a change of use application.

ACCESS

The developers have suggested in their planning Statement of Support, that level differences between the external ground level and finished floor would be an issue for the conversion of the property to a commercial use. Though Nash House has steps as the principal entrance access, considered design will allow the addition of ramped access by way of considered external gradient landscaping, a feature that if designed correctly, would we feel be supported by the local conservation officer.

If the application for change of use to residential units were to be approved, the new residential units would also require level access between the site and ground floor of the property, in order to achieve current minimum Building Regulation Standards. We feel this suggestion is a like-for-like argument and one that is not appropriate grounds for supporting a change of use application. We do not feel this appropriate ground for supporting a change of use application.

LOCATION

The developers have suggested in their planning Statement of Support, that the location of Nash House within the heart of the development would not attract a commercial business, however, as noted above, the vibrant commercial units of the neighbouring Dickinson Quay prove this to be quite the opposite. The continued occupation of the retail units of this development over many years and the support from the surrounding residents proves that where these units are formed and included within a development, they are well-supported and much needed facilities for local residents and give a genuine sense of community and heart to a development. The importance of these public spaces is an important aspect of large residential developments as defined and supported by both local and national planning policies.

We do not feel this an appropriate ground for supporting a change of use application.

PARKING

The developers identify in their planning Statement of Support, that a lack of parking for

commercial use is a reason for allowing the change of use. The parking and traffic flow about the site is exceptionally difficult and causes problems for the wider community beyond the boundaries of the development. Providing additional residential units upon the site will compound the long established problem further.

It can be seen that where community uses and low-density retail opportunities are provided within a development, these do not increase parking within the site as these units are not reliant upon passing or external trade to support their operation. Their support comes from the residents of the development and immediate surrounding areas, whose vehicles are by and large, already parked on or about the site. This can be seen in both the neighbouring Dickinson Quay and Ovaltine developments, neither development providing dedicated parking for the commercial units.

We do not feel this appropriate ground for supporting a change of use application.

CONCLUSION

The application for change of use of this important building can be seen to be contrary to local and national planning policies.

The application fails to take account of the developers own '*careful review of existing community facilities and the aspirations of local stakeholders*'.

The application ignores the historic importance of the building and makes no reference to any plan to mark this in any way.

The application has generated an unprecedented level of local objections through the public consultation of the application, demonstrating the proposal is not reflective of local needs and opinions.

If the Borough planning department are minded to recommend approval of this application, we would ask that the application be referred to the Dacorum Parish Planning Committee for determination.

Furthermore, DBC should seek changes to:

1. Eliminate the over-bearing building extension proposed;
2. Seek to reduce the number of small cramped residential units to allow more acceptable living standards for new residents;
3. Seek an enhanced landscaping scheme for Dickinson's Square. Consider eliminating the four parking spaces indicated to the west boundary of Dickinson Square which would enhance the setting of Nash House and the square. (Note: These four spaces are indicated as available to the users of Nash House but are shown as located outside of the application site. This parking provision needs clarification). Nash Mills Parish Council feel strongly that the aim set out by the original developer recognising this building historic importance should be honoured notably:

"The aim has been to create a sensitively designed development that offers the Nash Mills Community a high-quality and attractive environment in which to live, work and relax. The site's waterfront will be opened up to the general public for the first time whilst existing key features such as the War Memorial, Nash House and Stephenson's Cottage will be retained and refurbished".

To date, the majority of these aspirations have not been achieved. Waterside access is limited, Stephenson's Cottage is being used partially for residential use, and Nash House is a ruin.

Strategic Planning: Current Application

None to the current application. Please see all the pre application advice below which remains relevant.

Strategic Planning : Pre Application

- Initial

This site has had a complicated planning history being formerly part of a GEA (Nash Mills), then part of a wider residential redevelopment and finally permission was granted for conversion of the upper floors of Nash House to A3/C3/ D1. SP note the building is of historic interest but not listed, has been vacant for a number of years, and is in a state of disrepair.

Ideally, larger housing sites should contribute towards social infrastructure (Policy CS23). However, the scheme has come forward outside of the normal policy framework and I note that there is no Plan-related allocation against which to refer to. At the time of the original application a planning statement was prepared (see attached) which did seek a mix of uses on the site as part of delivering a sustainable development. The statement is a material consideration, but SP do not believe it was ever formally adopted by the Council, so only a limited weight can be attached to it.

SP think the LPA need to take a pragmatic view over the application. SP's preference in policy terms would be for a mixed use scheme as this would help complement the existing new housing and create a slightly more sustainable form of development. However, the wider proposal is nearly complete and is dominated by housing as the key use. Additional housing at Nash House would reinforce this. It is clear that there has been no active interest in bringing forward a mixed use of the building over the last few years, and given the present state of the building there are likely to be viability issues. Residential re-use does seem a logical approach in the circumstances and would potentially reinstate the historic character of the building (Policy CS27) which would be welcomed. The latter would be subject to the views of the Design and Conservation team. Therefore, we would support the principle of residential development in this general location.

However, it would be helpful in support of their scheme if the applicant could provide any marketing information they may have for the lack of interest in a non-commercial use of the building.

Normally, a development of 10 homes would not be liable for affordable housing under the new Government approach to small sites. Does the floor space of the building exceed 1,000 sqm? If this were the case, then the Affordable Housing Advice Note makes clear that a commuted sum towards affordable housing would be a requirement:

<http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/affordable-housing-spd---clarification-note-july-2016.pdf?sfvrsn=4>

Saved Policy 19 provides general advice on flat conversions.

- Additional Response 1 : 5 May 2017

While SP acknowledge the approach to date to securing commercial/community use of Nash House, I would take a pragmatic view regarding an alternative residential re-use given the current condition of the building and the overall benefits of restoring and bringing it back into active use, subject to achieving a satisfactory scheme that is fully justified.

SP have read the statement produced by Aitchison Rafferty which is helpful in providing an

explanation for a number of issues the scheme gives rise to. However, I would make the following comments:

- consider that the statement make a number of general but valid points regarding the suitability of the building (given its historic character/ access/level issues), the lack of parking and its generally poor location for a range of uses.
- acknowledge that new businesses will struggle to survive in weaker trading locations e.g. Dickinson Quay.
- it would be helpful if the statement could be more specific regarding the cost of refurbishing the building given its current poor state of repair.
- can the statement be clearer about commercial rent/value for community uses so that we can better understand how this impacts on viability.
- can the report explain how they reached a conclusion over the cost of refitting the shell of the building being in the order of £50-100,000.
- It is clear that the property has been marketed but no detail has been provided regarding the actual marketing process.

Providing responses to the above points will better help the applicant justify their scheme should they eventually submit a detailed application.

- Additional Response 2 : 26 July 2017

SP have now had an opportunity to read the attachment. SP note that Aitchison has provided an updated version of their supporting statement where they have sought to respond to the queries SP raised in previous comments:

“While I acknowledge the approach to date to securing commercial/community use of Nash House, I would take a pragmatic view regarding an alternative residential re-use given the current condition of the building and the overall benefits of restoring and bringing it back into active use, subject to achieving a satisfactory scheme that is fully justified.

I have read the statement produced by Aitchison Raffety which is helpful in providing an explanation for a number of issues the scheme gives rise to. However, I would make the following comments:

- I consider that the statement make a number of general but valid points regarding the suitability of the building (given its historic character/ access/level issues), the lack of parking and its generally poor location for a range of uses.
- I acknowledge that new businesses will struggle to survive in weaker trading locations e.g. Dickinson Quay.
- It would be helpful if the statement could be more specific regarding the cost of refurbishing the building given its current poor state of repair.
- Can the statement be clearer about commercial rent/value for community uses so that we can better understand how this impacts on viability.
- Can the report explain how they reached a conclusion over the cost of refitting the shell of the building being in the order of £50-100,000.
- It is clear that the property has been marketed but no detail has been provided regarding the actual marketing process.

Providing responses to the above points will better help the applicant justify their scheme should they eventually submit a detailed application.”

SP welcome the additional information provided in explaining the context for their future application. SP consider the level of information is proportionate and makes a reasonable case for the application.

One small point, SP didn't get to see the appendices. Can these be sent for completeness?

Building Control

No response.

Trees & Woodlands

No response.

Conservation & Design

- Original Scheme

I have considered the plans for the site and would offer the following comments

1. The original permission needs to be scrutinised as this does appear to have placed a responsibility on the developers to produce a scheme of works prior to the main site being developed
2. English Heritage took the decision not to list the building; it is considered however to be an important local heritage asset both in terms of the building and the historical significance of its past occupiers
3. The development was planned around Nash House remaining as an anchor in the new layout
4. The building has been extensively recorded in 2008 and in 2010-11
5. The house is now in very poor condition and I am concerned that the surviving historic fabric is extremely vulnerable
6. The proposed scheme works with the remaining footprint of the building (post demolition of the wing)
7. The front section of the building consisted of a pedimented mansard roof. The proposal is to extend the mansard roof over the rear sections – this in my view is acceptable from a design perspective and helps to balance and improve the massing of the building. Some negotiation on the dormers and fenestration may be required to ensure there is no overlooking.
8. The front and rear elevations are to be restored with their original openings, including the front porch and timber paned sashes
9. The external render should be specified to be an appropriate lime render – both for visual reasons and so as to ensure the remaining brickwork is not damaged. The 'break-back' in the render to the front elevation to each side of the pediment, as evidence in the brickwork, needs to be preserved
10. Window and door details required – the front doors appear to be shown as glazed double doors but it would be more appropriate to have a single solid panelled door here
11. Methodology for repairing porch required including cornices, pillars, steps and reinstatement of the railings
12. Design details for restoration of bracketed cornices and pediment required, and details of oculus window
13. Cellars – no proposals have been put forward to provide access to, or to preserve and restore the cellars – considerable historic fabric survives here
14. While the overall design approach is acceptable, CD unable to comment on the viability – the squeezing in of 10 flats does put pressure on the existing shell and would mean that any appreciation of the original interior spaces would be lost
15. Suitable disabled access arrangements required – CD understand a scheme is being devised to ensure the front porch is not compromised
16. CD understand discussions are underway to allow ground floor community use, which is to be welcomed. This would go some way in providing a space to articulate the

important history of the building – the original ‘safe’ door (still on site) should then be reinstated.

17. Car parking for 10 flats clearly raises the issue of the extent of the curtilage and amenity space, which is highly constricted, impacting on views of Nash House
18. There is also scope to introduce an interpretation panel or panels within the curtilage to provide a context for Dickinson Square and the history of the building – the design and wording for this should be agreed as part of the condition.

- Additional Advice Following a Meeting between The Conservation Officer & Archivist for Apsley Paper Trail

CD would like to see a condition being imposed which will allow for the introduction of interpretation to ensure that this important site and building is appropriately acknowledged, as part of the re-development of Nash House. Given that there is a considerable amount of information relating to the historic importance of the building and its occupants, an interpretation panel set in front of the building at an accessible point in Dickinson Square would be appropriate – it could either be a raked panel set on a block, using concrete or brickwork - it would require a more sophisticated and appropriate design or a monolith. It is assumed that the landscaping plans can incorporate this feature – It is understood this may require some further negotiation with the owners of the former Sappi Site, given that the red outline is tightly drawn.

(Please Note: The Agent has confirmed that it is not possible for Dickinson Square to be incorporated with the application site).

- Additional Advice

The use of the basement as a ‘museum’ is entirely impractical – there would be insufficient environmental control (damp/flooding/heating/lighting) and there is no proposal as to how any display material, exhibition panels, objects, store etc would be curated. The ‘demand’ for such a facility, if it is to be constrained to residents of Nash Mills, would appear to be negligible.

The House, forming part of Dickinson Square, was intended to be the anchor building for the development and the whole scheme was designed around its retention and occupation as a focal point. Concerned that proposals for the basement should be included in the current scheme – a much better use of the basement might be, for example, as a gym to serve the residents of Nash House and Nash Mills. The heritage element would need to be moved to the ground floor, where it could be combined with a mixed use community room. This would preserve some public access (via the main entrance) and help to prevent some of the sense of too many units being shoe horned into the remaining historic shell/footprint of the building.

Noise & Pollution

No adverse comments on Environmental Health grounds, but EH can't help agreeing with some of the public comments regarding the lack of parking in that vicinity.

Housing

Due to the number of units being developed, the site will be exempt from any affordable housing contribution.

Scientific Officer

The site is located centrally within the recent Nash Mills Wharf residential development erected on the former SAPPi paper mill site. The site was residentially redeveloped following the grant

of planning permission in May 2010 (4/01382/09/MFA). The application site is set on the western side of Butterfly Crescent, to the north of a children's play area and adjacent to residential development on all other sides.

Nash House was erected in the 1800s. It was converted to offices in 1906 and expanded and remained in this use until the site ceased operating in 2007. As part of the 2010 planning permission relating to the wider site, approval was given for Nash House to be converted to provide a mix of restaurant and community uses at ground floor with offices above. In April 2013 permission (4/00195/13/FUL) was granted for the conversion of the upper floors to form three flats, with restaurant / community use again approved to the ground floor. This department was not consulted in respect of 4/00195/13/FUL. Neither of these options has been implemented.

The building is currently in a state of disrepair. It had been almost completely stripped out internally due to wet rot and dry rot, whilst much of the flooring has had to be removed. In addition the roof has been completely removed. As such only a shell remains.

The 2010 planning permission for the redevelopment of the wider Nash Mills Site (including 450 dwellings, a 64 bed care home and various community and business uses) has essentially now been implemented. The approved scheme included the retention and conversion of Nash House with a mix of restaurant and community uses at ground floor with offices above, which (as stated above) has not been implemented.

Condition 5 of planning permission 4/01382/09/MFA related to contamination. A number of phases of investigation have been undertaken at the site over the years and contamination identified, which required remediation. A remedial strategy was submitted and approved under planning reference 4/01757/11/DRC. Our records indicate that 3no. validation reports have been informally submitted for review (relating to Plots 1-6, 7-9 and 10-12). Our records do not indicate the validation reports to have been formally submitted.

In order to ensure that any contamination issues are dealt with in relation to Nash House, SO recommends that the standard contamination conditions be applied to this development should permission be granted. For advice on how to comply with this condition, the applicant should be directed to the Councils website (www.dacorum.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=2247).

Environmental Health: Health & Safety

No response.

Refuse Controller

No response.

Hertfordshire County Council: Highways

Decision

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

The Highway Authority recommends inclusion of the following Advisory Notes to ensure that any works within the highway are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980.

AN1) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction

works commence. Further information is available via the website <http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

AN2) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Description of the Proposal Roof extension, refurbishment and repair and use of building as 10 flats

Analysis

The applicant has not submitted any transport information i.e. - Transport Assessment, Transport Statement or a Travel Plan. A Planning Design Statement has been submitted though as part of this submission. As part of a Design and Access statement, the application should take account of the following policy documents; • National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012); • Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) Local Transport Plan 3-2011-2031 • Roads in Hertfordshire Design Guide 3rd Edition • Dacorum Borough Councils parking provision as per their parking policy.

Trip generation and distribution

As there are no supporting/mitigating details from the applicant regarding trip generation and distribution that this level of development will generate. However, this level of development is unlikely to generate significantly high levels of movements which would ultimately lead to demonstrable harm to the highway network in terms of free flow and capacity.

Impact on Highway Network. A review of accident data held by HCC (5 year, latest to date) identifies no reported collision / injury accidents at this location associated with the use of the access. The creation of ten flats on this site will only impact on the highway if the development fails to provide sufficient off street parking space. This includes visitor parking if applicable. New or additional trips associated with this development would be low.

Parking

Although parking is a matter for the Local Planning Authority (LPA), the applicant should always provide details of parking provision and whether or not there will be any impact on the highway. In this case the applicant is providing a total of 11 off street parking spaces. The applicant will also need to provide cycle spaces. Roads in Hertfordshire highway design guide 3rd edition states that the dimension and location requirements for parking bays, driveways shall be in accordance with the guidance in DfT Manual for Streets. The LPA may wish to consider, if appropriate, either a condition or an informative covering the temporary increase of construction workers parking associated with this development. Whilst there are no current waiting restrictions, the highway authority (HA) would not wish for construction related vehicles to be parked close to the junctions on footways etc

Accessibility

Forward Planning Officers (Passenger Transport Unit) have not supplied any details of bus services and bus infrastructure to identify gaps in the service. Refer to HCC's Bus strategy (<http://www.hertsdirect.org/docs/pdf/b/busstrategy.pdf>). The site lies in a reasonably sustainable location with access for vehicles direct to the principle road network. Bus stop provision is provided along Belswains Lane and the A4251 with bus services to Hemel Hempstead Town and Watford. HCC recognises that the proposal is not expected to significantly intensify vehicle trips to / from the site.

Servicing Arrangements Refuse and recycling receptacle storage will need to be provided. It is likely that this will be via a kerb side service. No information is provided regarding servicing of the property.

Travel Plans

The applicant has not submitted a travel plan as part of this application. The scale of the development falls below the threshold that requires either a Travel Plan or a Statement Planning Obligations/ Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

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

Conclusion

The assessment does not indicate any significant issues with the proposal. The highway authority would not wish to restrict the grant of planning permission subject to the inclusion of the above conditions and informatives.

Hertfordshire Fire & Rescue Service

HFRS has examined the drawings and note the access for fire appliances and the provision of hydrants appears to be adequate. Further advice will be provided at Building Regulations stage.

Hertfordshire Constabulary: Crime Prevention Officer

It is noted that security has been discussed at the Pre Application stage 4/03438/16/PRE and will be covered by building regulation ADQ as will the roof extension, HC have no further comment .

Hertfordshire County Council: Lead Flood Authority

In the absence of a surface water drainage assessment, LFA object to this application and recommend refusal of planning permission until a satisfactory surface water drainage assessment has been submitted.

In order for the LFA to advise the relevant local planning authority that the site will not increase flood risk to the site and elsewhere and can provide appropriate sustainable drainage techniques, the following information is required as part of the surface water drainage assessment:

- A statement of compliance with the NPPF and NPPG policies, LPA local plan policies and HCC SuDS Guidance and Policies.
- Anecdotal information on existing flood risk with reference to most up to date data and information.
- Location and extent of any existing and potential flood risk from all sources including existing overland flow routes, groundwater, flooding from ordinary watercourses referring to the national EA fluvial (River) and surface water flood maps.
- Detailed calculations of existing surface water storage volumes and flows.
- Detailed post development calculations/ modelling in relation to surface water are to be carried out for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year including +40% allowance for climate change (for brownfield sites we require pre- and post-development run-off rates and volumes).
- Full detailed drainage plan including location of SuDS measures, pipe runs and discharge points, informal flooding (no flooding to occur below and including the 1 in 30 Year rainfall return period). All drawings to be 'final' not 'preliminary' or 'draft'.

- Detailed modelled outputs of flood extents and flow paths for a range of return periods up to the 1 in 100 year + climate change event and exceedance flow paths for surface water for events greater than the 1 in 100 year + climate change.
19. Full details of any required mitigation/ management measures of any identified source of flooding.
- Evidence that if the applicant is proposing to discharge to the local sewer network, they have confirmation from the relevant water company that they have the capacity to take the proposed volumes and run-off rates.

Justification of SuDS selection. Details of required maintenance of any SuDS features and structures and who will be adopting these features to the lifetime of the development.

Reason: A surface water drainage assessment is required under the NPPF for all Major Planning Applications as amended within the NPPG from the 6 April 2015. A surface water drainage assessment is vital if the local planning authority is to make informed planning decisions. In the absence of a surface water drainage assessment, the flood risks resulting from the proposed development are unknown. The absence of a surface water drainage assessment is therefore sufficient reason in itself for a refusal of planning permission.

Overcoming the LFA objection: The applicant can overcome our objection by submitting a surface water drainage assessment that demonstrates that the development will not increase risk elsewhere and where possible reduces flood risk overall. If this cannot be achieved we are likely to maintain our objection to the application. Production of a surface water drainage assessment will not in itself result in the removal of an objection.

The applicant should take into account the opportunities for improvement of the existing situation by giving priority to the use of sustainable drainage methods, the SuDS hierarchy and management train.

Informative to the LPA: For further advice on what we expect to be contained within the surface water drainage assessment, please refer to our Developers Guide and Checklist on our surface water drainage webpage

<http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/envplan/water/floods/surfacewaterdrainage/>

The LFA ask to be re-consulted with the results of the surface water drainage assessment. We will provide you with bespoke comments within 21 days of receiving formal reconsultation. Our objection will be maintained until an adequate surface water drainage assessment has been submitted.

Hertfordshire County Council: Historic Environment

Nash House [Historic Environment Record No 15958] is a 17th century house, and, as the home of the Dickinson family (the paper makers) and Sir John Evans, in the 19th and early 20th century, it is a building of local importance. An historic building record of the house was made in 2008 and further recording took place in 2010-11, when the house was stripped back to the historic fabric as part of a scheme to convert it to community use. It is fortunate that this detailed record exists, given the current condition of the building.

In this instance, given the building's recent history, HE consider the proposal will not have an impact on heritage assets, and I have no comment to make upon the proposal.

Hertfordshire Ecology

The building affected by the proposals is now largely a shell and has no roof. Bats are not likely to be an issue in such a structure.

HE consider the LPA can determine the application without the need to consider bats any further. Unfortunately the wider redevelopment site of the former mills is ecologically impoverished with little or no greenspace or trees, although the canal side corridor has been retained. The mill site was also previously wholly developed.

Consequently HE do not consider there would be any significant ecological gain by providing bat box enhancements within the redevelopment of the building itself. Any landscaping enhancements to reflect the historic nature and setting of the building and which would benefit local ecology would be welcomed.

Hertfordshire County Council: Herts Property Services

HPS do not have any comments to make in relation to financial contributions required by the Toolkit, as this development is situated within Dacorum's CIL Zone 3 and does not fall within any of the CIL Reg123 exclusions. Notwithstanding this, HCC reserve the right to seek Community Infrastructure Levy contributions towards the provision of infrastructure as outlined in your R123 List through the appropriate channels.

Environment Agency

No response.

Thames Water

Waste

Surface Water Drainage - It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Reason: To ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

Water

With regard to water supply, this comes within the area covered by the Affinity Water Company.

Affinity Water

Planning applications are referred AW where its input on issues relating to water quality or quantity may be required.

The proposed development site is located close to or within an Environment Agency defined groundwater Source Protection Zone (GPZ) corresponding to Hunton Bridge Pumping Station. This is a public water supply, comprising a number of Chalk abstraction boreholes, operated by

Affinity Water Ltd.

The construction works and operation of the proposed development site should be done in accordance with the relevant British Standards and Best Management Practices, thereby significantly reducing the groundwater pollution risk. It should be noted that the construction works may exacerbate any existing pollution. If any pollution is found at the sites then the appropriate monitoring and remediation methods will need to be undertaken.

For further information we refer you to CIRIA Publication C532 "Control of water pollution from construction - guidance for consultants and contractors".

NATS

The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.

However, please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NATS (that is responsible for the management of en route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly consulted.

If any changes are proposed to the information supplied to NATS in regard to this application which become the basis of a revised, amended or further application for approval, then as a statutory consultee NERL requires that it be further consulted on any such changes prior to any planning permission or any consent being granted.

Civil Aviation Authority

No response.

Vice President & Honorary Secretary ,Hemel Hempstead Local History & Museum Society

I am writing to you as Vice President and Honorary Secretary of this Society, and as someone who spent over 27 years working in Nash Mills House itself, during the days of John Dickinson's, DRG and Sappi. The Committee have also asked the VP to write to the LPA concerning this matter as they are most concerned.

I have to say that the current plans to make the building a 'residential only' establishment is totally out of keeping with its proud history. It was bad enough that it was opened up like a can of beans and left open to the elements and the vandals, but the decision to do away with the proposed use of the ground floor, which would have at least served the community, is the last straw.

I am aware of course of the almost total disregard of History and Heritage that has existed in Hemel Hempstead over the years, and I implore you to reconsider this application.

This building, as you will be aware, was home to John Dickinson himself, and the universally known and revered Evans Family, and cannot be allowed to just fade away without some form of acknowledgement of its former glory, hence my request. A colleague has suggested that history tablets be put in place on the outside wall of the building to remind people of its historical past – A request that I support totally.

I can assure you that apart from our membership, there are many people who would support

the request. I can vouch for other former employees, who I see from time to time at our Nash Mills reunion evenings, many of whom have been saddened by the demise of the mill itself, but in particular the House.

I sincerely hope that our requests meet with your understanding, and that you may be inclined to look again at the decisions regarding this magnificent building.

Dacorum Heritage Trust

I am writing to you as Chairman of The Dacorum Heritage Trust because we had anticipated from the Public statements and plans displayed in August 2009 that there was to be a communal meeting facility on the ground floor of the redeveloped house. These were expected to allow a permanent storyline of the former mill and particularly John Dickinson and the Evans family. All made important contributions to our understanding of mankind and its development. The large multinational company founded by Dickinson used his many inventions to provide employment for many. Paper and board made by the techniques he pioneered is still being made in much the same way today on modern machines.

The current proposals remove the possibility of interpreting this information and so will deny the community of the knowledge of important aspects of our heritage.

I would urge that consideration is given to reinstating this community facility but in the event that approval is given then an appropriate form of wording acceptable to local historians be permanently added to the outside walls.

St Albans and Hertfordshire Architectural and Archaeological Society

The Society is concerned to ensure the preservation and public appreciation of this important building. The Georgian house is believed to have been built around 1790 and, following Sir John Evans' move to a new home in 1906, the house became an office for the mill from 1906 until 2006 when paper production at the mill ceased. John Dickinson, FRS had lived there from 1811 to 1834 during which time he took out many important patents for the development of paper making processes, a significant part of the economic history of the county. Without doubt the most famous resident was Sir John Evans, FSA, author of many important books, recipient of many honours and a key player in the county's intellectual and political life in the late nineteenth century.

The building is an important feature of the "Apsley Paper Trail" and the Society regrets that an earlier scheme to turn it into a museum did not happen.

The Society understands that previous proposals to include the building in a housing development would have secured some level of public access its history and heritage, but that revised proposals may risk curtailing this. The Society understands that there is a proposal for the developer to provide some form of interpretive plaque or tablet, and the Society commends this to you subject to appropriate wording being agreed.

The Society stresses that the house is an invaluable heritage asset for appreciating the economic, political and intellectual life of the county, and failure to preserve it and present it to the public would be a sad loss.

Archivist for the Apsley Paper Trail

Object.

It should be noted that the plans submitted in August 2009 together with the public exhibition and supporting leaflet created the unequivocal understanding that Nash Mills House was to be

the centrepiece of the development.

This principal was repeated in April 2013 in the application to change the office use to residential. It seems strange that a reversal should have taken place in such a short period.

Historic Buildings Assessment

APT hold a copy of the detailed archaeological assessment conducted in 2008 by Archaeological Assessment & Consultancy Ltd. This report includes detailed plans, descriptions and several hundred photographs of the entire site.

Detailed Comments:

Existing Elevation 2/2. Shows a door partly below ground level which would presumably give access to the cellars. The extensive cellars extended throughout the site but are not referred to in the application. The details were however recorded in the Historic Buildings Assessment.

Do the cellars still exist?

If so then what is their proposed use?

Existing Ground Floor Plan. This shows the floor plan as it was at the time of the Historic Buildings Assessment in 2008, not as it is today. Since 2008 the wing to the rear and left of the plan has been removed. This plan is therefore not representative of what exists and so is inaccurate and therefore misleading.

The Safe. The Ground Floor plan also shows the location of a 'Locked Safe', this would have originally contained Sir John Evans' valuable gold coin collection. Is the safe still in situ? See the proposed ground floor plan in which the safe appears to have been replaced by two wash basins. Why has this historic and unusual feature not been retained? See pictures below.

The Planning Application Forms

Assessment of Flood Risk. This has not been answered correctly as the building is approximately eight metres from a watercourse, not more than twenty.

Residential Units. The high density of housing coupled with the lack of parking would not be attractive to potential buyers, nor does it do anything to solve existing pressures on parking in the vicinity.

The Planning, Design and Access Statement.

1.2.1 The Historical context of the site is acknowledged.

1.3.1 The reference to the 'dilapidated but locally significant building' fails to acknowledge that the bulk of the major dilapidations have occurred since May 2007 when the house was acquired for development, and so is of the developers own making.

2.2.1 Incorrect information. This house was built in the 1790's not the 1800's (Ref. Joan Evans *Prelude and Fugue*). Nor was it built as the home of John Dickinson who bought it in 1810 and moved in 1811.

7.1.2.18 The environmental dimension fails to address the opportunity to register the

history of the site, the house and its inhabitants. See the final paragraph of my conclusions below.

8.2.2 The writer spoke to the developer's representatives at the public exhibition held in September 2009 about restoring the house in the early stage of the project. When told that there were other priorities the writer became concerned that the developers were not likely to honour their original plans for the house in the way they had been detailed in the exhibition and in the associated leaflet. Time has proved this to be true.

The Atchison Rafferty Report.

3.1 Our best information is that the house was not built in the 1750's but the 1790's (See 2.2.1 above).

3.4 The condition of the house referred to in this paragraph has been, in my opinion, considerably aggravated by the developers themselves. In the early days during demolition of the factory blocks it is said that vandals entered the house and did significant damage despite 24-hour security on site. Later, the roof was completely removed so that the internal shell was left unprotected for about two years, during which there was an exceptionally wet winter. This must have contributed materially to the rot as well as damaging plasterwork and ceilings. These are problems which the developers clearly took no steps to alleviate.

Conclusion

Previously there has been the intent to provide a community use facility in which an opportunity to provide a detailed history of the mill, the house and its famous inhabitants and visitors as published in Sept 2009 (Ref. Linden Homes, Crest Nicholson, 'A Flagship Scheme Comes to Nash Mills', leaflet A4 two-sided). Clearly the new proposals would prevent this so that an alternative means of disseminating this information is now required, possibly by permanent tablets or plaques on the building's exterior.

The writer has been following the progress of this Georgian building since the time when it was still part of the former Sappi premises. Previously it had been a major component of the John Dickinson paper manufacturing empire. For some years now the writer has been also been a contributor to the Nash Mills Parish Newsletter with many articles illustrating the history of the house and of the notable people who lived there.

The writer is keen to see this once attractive house restored to some of its former dignity and believe that this planning application should be modified to become a vehicle for its reinstatement. It should be allowed to tell its story too, if not in a communal area within the house, then by the use of suitable agreed panels or plaques on the exterior. For this it is suggested that a small panel of local history enthusiasts should be auctioned to agree a suitable wording. I would be most happy to arrange this.

Some of the comments about dates etc may seem to being pedantic once erroneous information gets into public records then it is almost impossible to get things straight again.

A/so:

1. In summary concerns regarding recording of the representations received from some other third parties on the website (none of these relate to representations from local residents). The objections should be in full.

2.The writer has have been deeply involved with the future of this historic building and am the person who originally, and unsuccessfully, applied for listed status. There has been a tragic history of neglect since it has been held by the developers. Whilst' I could say more we are where we are and need to make the best of things'.

3.Others will be commenting on the issues of density and loss of a potential community benefit. The writer's concern is to maximise the historic potential in a permanent way and to ensure that links remain to the world's of industry and academia which were represented by the occupants of the house. It had been expected that this would have been done through displays within the public areas but as these will no longer exist there is the need to look at other solutions.

4.At the present time, concerned that the drawings showing the existing elevations and plans with the application are incorrect. They actually seem to show a hybrid combination of what was once there. Not what IS there. The drawings are misleading and they also create a mistrust of the detail in the remainder of the application.

5.I have been deeply involved with the future of this historic building and am the person who originally, and unsuccessfully, applied for listed status. There has been a tragic history of neglect since it has been held by the developers. Whilst I could say more we are where we are and need to make the best of things.

6.Others will be commenting on the issues of density and loss of a potential community benefit. My concern is to maximise the historic potential in a permanent way and to ensure that links remain to the world's of industry and academia which were represented by the occupants of the house. It had been expected that this would have been done through displays within the public areas but as these will no longer exist we need to look at other solutions.

7.At the present time, I am concerned that the drawings showing the existing elevations and plans with the application are incorrect. They actually seem to show a hybrid combination of what was once there. Not what IS there. I find them misleading and they also create a mistrust of the detail in the remainder of the application.

Trustee of Apsley Paper Trail

I am writing to you as a Trustee of The Apsley Paper Trail because we have a deep interest in the story of paper development within the Borough of Dacorum. The two principal processes for paper making used today were both invented on the river Gade's mills. These pioneers of paper making drove a revolution in the dissemination of knowledge through the availability of cheap machine-made product instead of labour intensive hand-made paper

We have learnt with dismay that the previously proposed development plans for this house have been abandoned by removal of the communal facility, thereby removing the opportunity to retell the important stories of the people and story of the mill and John Dickinson, in particular. Dickinson's son-in-law, John Evans, also lived in the house and was a polymath in many fields.

The Nash Mill site was a major part of the large multinational company founded by Dickinson using his many inventions to provide employment for many. Paper and board made by the techniques he pioneered is still being made in much the same way today on modern machines.

The current proposals remove the possibility of interpreting this information and so will deny the community of the knowledge of important aspects of our heritage.

I would urge that consideration is given to reinstating this community facility but in the event that approval is given then an appropriate form of wording acceptable to local historians be permanently added to the outside walls. house

Vice President, Hemel Hempstead Local History and Museum Society Chairman, Berkhamsted & District Archaeological Society

The changes proposed in the present development application for Nash Mills House from the previous agreed planning application by new developers are iniquitous. It completely overrides and ignores the previously agreed Heritage preservation aspect of that plan. New developers should not be allowed to totally ignore agreed Heritage aspects for their own rapacious ends. The new developers have allowed vandalism to occur and promoted the destruction of the house by removing the roof to allow the elements to complete their requirement of destruction. They have wantonly destroyed the historic Heritage associations of the house associated with the previously granted development application.

Since the house is lost it must be a requirement in the present planning application, if granted, that the developers fund an appropriate plaque on the development recording the house's historic association with paper making in the area and being the home of three successive prominent, internationally known, local archaeologists: Sir John, Sir Arthur and Dame Joan Evans - all also quondam Presidents of the Society of Antiquaries of London (Dame Joan being the first woman President in its 300 year history). The wording on any such plaque must be composed and agreed with local knowledge input.

DBC makes much of its concern with Heritage, but in this instance its Planning Department has shown to be lacking in awareness and now has the opportunity to rectify that omission. It is said that they who have no past have no future - it is up to DBC and Planning to stand by its Heritage commitment in making the provision of an appropriate plaque a requirement of granting the development application.

Association of British Paper Historians

The local area holds an important position with regards to the paper industry, because it was in mills such Frogmoor and Two Waters that development of two mechanised paper machines was carried out over two centuries ago. These developments can be traced directly to the major global industry we have today, that worldwide products 4370 million tonnes per annum of paper and board.

One of the pioneers of this development was John Dickinson, who was resident at Nash Mill House. As such would wish to preserve the property, and would endorse placing a plaque or some other information plate / informative plate to document his residence, as well as his son in law, Sir John Evans, the noted industrialist and academic.

However it has been brought to our attention of ABPH that the roof was removed some months ago. And the building has since suffered the ravages of the weather. ABPH fully support the redevelopment of the site in order to preserve the structure, and would loath to see it damaged to the extent that demolition were deemed expedient. It is questioned what is being done to expedite the redevelopment of this beautiful Georgian building, the abode of two major figures in the local economy, and one of international importance to the paper industry as a whole.

Response to Neighbour Notification/ Publicity

10 Butterfly Crescent

Too many units for the development of houses that surround it.

Nowhere near enough parking spaces- you only have to look at the estate overflow car park and Red Lion Lane.

Where will the contractors park in the construction stage. No. 10 does not want vehicles in front of its driveway as it's a controlled parking area and again when residents move in how will parking restrictions be enforced?.

Object due to cramming as many units as possible in what should have been a historic focal point and building, the lack of parking and the extra noise and pollution due to extra traffic etc.

6 Francis Mews

Object to the amount of residential flat: it should be 6.

Agree that the ground floor should be converted to flats.

It isn't clear whether there is any change in external design : if there were to be no. 6 would object.

The site is important on the estate and the restoring this old and original building to the shape and design originally proposed is to the betterment of the whole Nash Mills Wharf Estate. But if its design were to change then this would detrimentally affect the environment of the immediate neighbours .

Agree that the real effect of 10 flats would be an unmanageable amount of cars and traffic on an estate whose road system wasn't designed very well.

5 Butterfly Crescent

This is the house neighbouring Nash House and look forward to seeing it restored to its former glory - the current wreck we look at is sad and unsightly.

However, these plans do not suggest a sympathetic restoration project but merely a cramming exercise to maximise profit. The previous plans to convert the 1st floor to 2 flats & 2nd floor to 1 flat were approved and we did not raise objections. However, now 3 flats are proposed for the first floor with an extension to the 2nd floor to allow for 3 more flats (2 more than originally planned). From our point of view the increased number of windows facing our house and garden will feel intrusive - the road between our house and Nash House is very narrow. We therefore object to the 2nd floor extension. 10 units is an over development of the site and allowing only 11 car spaces puts a strain on an area already congested. In summary, we object to the 2nd floor extension and huge number of units proposed.

33 Butterfly Crescent

Given the intention to create 10 units, the provision of 11 parking spaces is not sufficient. Dacorum and Hertfordshire County Council have already noted existing parking issues with this development which has resulted in the addition of double yellow lines in the roads adjacent to the development and near which (in reference to Red Lion Lane), is still an issue. A mere three weeks ago there was a traffic collision where Rose Lane meets Red Lion Lane which cited parking facing the entrance to the development as a mitigating factor.

The development at present is in urgent need of parking measures to improve the current

situation. Developers would need to prove that they would be improving the parking situation and not exacerbating it if they would like to gain support.

Further, the application does not state how it would intend to carry out the work with minimal disruption to residents. The roads on the development are not designed for goods vehicles.

12 Croxley Road

Object

- the amount of units within this building of historical interest appears excessive and with more units comes more traffic in the general area, which is already an issue.

- Nash House provides a perfect opportunity to provide a community space in the area. A portion or the whole ground floor could be a great space for the community to use as a meeting hall and amenity space for the large amount of residents that now live on the estate. There is very little community space in Nash mills. In fact, the local primary School at Nash mills is forced to close for safety reasons as it is used as a polling station. This could be avoided if a community hall was provided in Nash house which could also act as a polling station when the need arises. The developers have failed to provide any community buildings/space on this large residential site and this is the last opportunity to do so.

22 Richardson House (the registered proprietor)

Richardson House is located directly opposite the proposed development.

The conditions which writer proposes to be attached any grant of planning permission are:

1. Restrictions on the hours in which the works are undertaken. These should be kept to daytime hours only to prevent any disturbance to local residents.
2. An Acoustic Management Plan to minimise noise pollution to Richardson House.
3. A Traffic Management Plan to minimise disruption in accessing the development. Restrictions should be placed on the type of vehicle used and the times in which they access the development should be kept to a minimum. The residents require access to and from the undercroft car park and along Rose Lane at all times.
4. Provision of not less than 10 allocated car parking spaces for the residents of the proposed development and extension to the existing visitor's car park on the intersection between Red Lion Lane and Lower Road.

13 Crossways (Co-chair Apsley Paper Trail)

Most disappointed by this proposed development. It is most important that this Georgian house maintain its original character and connection to the community.

Hemel Hempstead and the surrounding area are often accused of suffering from a certain soullessness. This is not uncommon for new towns, but there are ways to help with this. One means is to identify and remember the history of the community. The Gade valley used to be the paper making centre of the world. This was in large part due to the activities of the innovative industrialist John Dickinson and his family. Nash House represents an opportunity to connect the community to this history and celebrate it.

The original promise to provide a community meeting place in the refurbished building was an excellent way to achieve this, and should be delivered.

66 Douglas Crescent, Stevenage

As a former resident of the area and a former employee of Nash Mill disappointed that the historical significance of this Georgian building seems to have been conveniently forgotten in the haste to cram as many dwellings into the space as possible and reap the profits.

That aside, 10 flats seems greedy and given the parking issues already raised by others, this application should be reconsidered eg: the reduction of the number of dwellings within Nash House and creation of some community areas.

5 Cannon House

This is already a large housing development with existing issues of traffic and parking resulting in multiple car accidents on the edge of the estate. There is not enough parking currently for residents. By adding additional flats into the development will only add to this existing issue.

Eleven parking spaces is not sufficient. Most households especially those which have more than one bedroom are highly likely to have more than one vehicle.

The roads are not suitable for large goods vehicles especially by a childrens play area.

The works will cause noise disruption and should be limited to weekdays.

The area would be more suited to local businesses eg a shop, hairdresses, dentist etc to support the large number of existing residents.

1 Francis Mews

Nash House was intended to be an historical focal point on the estate, giving a mix of contemporary & traditional buildings.

The increase in size is not appropriate for the estate, 11 parking spaces for 10 units of this size (based on number of bedrooms being 2 in 8 of the units, potentially at least 2 vehicles for each of these units) is not enough.

There are already huge parking issues on the estate & surrounding area, where estate occupants are parking on local residential streets (Bunkers Lane is particularly badly affected).

An increase in the size of the development of Nash House means more construction traffic for a longer period of time & more parking issues & mess whilst in construction.

Grover House , The Embankment 1st Response

The 450 homes that are already built are enough. There is not enough parking and cramming more and more homes in an area that is already reaching breaking point with regards to parking is unnecessary.

The use of the surrounding roads confirm that there is a real problem with regards to the amount of homes built vs adequate parking. What is an idyllic area is soon becoming a mini town, defeating the reason the majority of residents have chosen to live here.

Strongly object as it will overwhelm/ ruin the current development. When making the assessment it is requested that the LPA spend an evening from 6pm to review the roads and to observe the real problem. There has been a car crash into the wall of the care home due to the narrowness of road to drive with the amount of cars. .

Grover House ,The Embankment 2nd Response

There is nowhere near enough parking for the current flats. The current development is overrun with cars and no consideration regarding parking.

Object to this as cramming more flats into an already built up development will ruin the area. You only have to look at the surrounding roads to the development to see the number of cars. There is currently 450 homes, no more are needed.

11 Francis Mews

Object.

10 units is an over development of the site not to mention the space around the building is not big enough for the parking that would be required, 11 spaces is just enough either for the amount of flats. There are already issues with parking in this particular area of the estate as well as across the whole estate.

No. 11 is opposite the site with some full length floor to ceiling windows facing the site would mean a loss of privacy and being overlooked. As well as a visual intrusion with the building not being restored in the manner in which it should be.

19 Croxley Road

Object to these plans mainly based on the parking situation.

The original plans were for a much smaller amount of properties to be within the current building. The plans submitted appear to be incorrect at ground floor level, have these been based on old plans?

Parking will be a huge problem. Having 10 properties and only 11 spaces for majority of the flats being 2 bed, where will the additional parking be? . The proposal will add more issues with people trying to double park etc. No. 19's spaces are behind this and there are already cases of being blocked in or have issues and this will just increase the issue with so many more people needing to park.

How is the developer planning on providing construction vehicular access as road leading into this area is a single track road. So how will the current access to parking for residents be affected. There is also no space for large vehicles to be based throughout the day.

We therefore object to these plans mainly based on the parking situation.

18 Croxley Road

Object due to the increased parking needs and road traffic that would be generated by a further 10 households needing to access this relatively small area.

No. 18's own parking spaces are in the parking area adjacent to Nash House and it is inevitable that access to these spaces will be affected by any increased traffic in this area.

However, clearly something has to be done with Nash House as it has remained derelict for far too long. The well-considered report by Atchison Rafferty recommends that 6 residential units would be appropriate for the site and, given the need for the site to be put to good use.

No. 18 would not object 6 units being approved. 10 units is just too many!

25 Butterfly Crescent

These plans are not appropriate for the site because the building is of historic interest (we understand the original consent for the Nash Mills Wharf development was given on the basis of Nash House remaining as a historic focal point).

We do therefore have objections to its greatly increased size and the number of units proposed which we feel amounts to "cramming" and not appropriate to the estate.

Whilst the Nash House site has a number of allocated parking spaces (11), these will almost certainly not be sufficient for the number of potential occupants in the proposed 8 x 2 bedroom and 2 x 1 bedroom units.

This will also considerably increase the amount of traffic flowing through this area of the estate.

Further with such a large project as this, the amount of builders' traffic during the construction process through the estate will be massive.

The application was received on the 26th June and then validated on the 27th July and comments/objections have to be received by 24th August. We only received notification on the 5th August. This appears to have taken a huge time to process. Bearing in mind the holiday period with so many of us away during the month of August together with what we see as the serious implications of this proposal, such a close deadline for consultation is most unreasonable and should be extended.

6 Nettlecroft

The writer is a lifelong member of Hemel Hempstead Local History and Museum Society. Distressed to see the condition of Nash House. This building should be preserved for the future generations of Hemel Hempstead residents and for the history of England. Request that the Council helps the work of the Archivist for the Apsley Paper Trail- please see below.

Reference to the then latest information sheet regarding Nash House.

9 Francis Mews

In purchasing the property there were assurances that there would be no development of the estate beyond what could be seen. Up to now the area developed sensitively, and within expectations.

Nash House is at the heart of the development and is an attractive and historic building. Several ideas have been suggested for its use over the years but all of them have been acceptable and within the spirit and mood of the estate. The present plan for 10 flats is both unacceptable and horrifying echoing the worst aspects of the Victorian back to back ribbon development .

There are already several blocks of flats and this proposal will not only ruin an established historic building but subject the writer to seriously increased traffic, parking issues and air pollution which will endanger the children playing in the immediate locality.

It is appreciated that some kind of use must be found for Nash House , but surely the Developers must be satisfied

20 Formosa Street, Maida Vale

It has been distressing to read of the treatment meted out to this historic property by the

current developers, evidently with the approval (or at least the acquiescence) of the Borough Council.

The writer visited the house in 2007 with a party of curators and staff from the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford: the visit was in the nature of a pilgrimage to the home of one of the museum's principal benefactors, Sir John Evans, and the sincere pleasure brought by the visit was shared by all concerned. In the following year, at the centenary of his death, the writer had the privilege, as the then Director of the Society of Antiquaries, of laying a wreath on behalf of the Society at Sir John's grave in Abbots Langley, before going on to chair a day-long symposium at the Ashmolean which celebrated Sir John's many contributions to society and to launch a multi-author book that acknowledged the achievements of this outstanding figure of his day – *Sir John Evans 1823–1908: Antiquity, Commerce and Natural Science in the Age of Darwin*.

At that time the property was unoccupied but in a sound condition: there was every expectation in Hemel Hempstead that when the Nash Mills site was to be developed Nash Mills House would form the centrepiece of the new development. It was, of course, the principal Georgian building in the town and hence (it was anticipated) would function as a potent centre for community activities. Its architectural merits are undisputed, but just as important is the central role it played as home to the Evans family, in the heart of the Dickinson paperworks.

If the Council has decided that the community is to have no such amenity at its centre – indeed no centre at all – then that is a matter for the Councillors and their electorate. For the building to have been wrecked – and for yet further indignities yet to be visited on it – is, however, a matter of national interest and a source of shame on those whose task it is to protect and nurture the community interest. Although the integrity of the house has already been ruined, it is not too late for the Council to recognize its past failures and to reinstate Nash Mills House to the permanent prominence it deserves within its historic setting.

280 Belswains Lane

The Crest Nicholson development of the former Sappi Paper Mill has been thoughtfully and carefully constructed with 2 exceptions - Nash Mills House and overspill parking provision.

As the estate has become understandably a more desirable place to live, the parking issues have become increasingly serious . Belswains Lane and Red Lion Lane have become 'car parks' themselves at peak times twice a day, and overspill has rendered Red Lion Lane almost un navigable.

Originally intended to be a hub for the state community , Nash Mills House has almost been destroyed by subsequent developers with little thought to the preservation of the historic building that it is it has been converted as several dwellings , then 9 flats is a considerable overdevelopment of an already crowded space , and the original proposal of 6 is more than enough .

What provision will be made for safety surrounding the kindergarten / nursery if the estate becomes hazardous ?

10 Croxley Road

The consent for a change of use following the original application has expired and will therefore need to be re-applied for. Any new application will need to be re-submitted along with justification as to why commercial units are not viable. I would have thought that there is more demand for commercial units now the site is built out.

The proposed parking is totally insufficient for the dwellings proposed. Some of the apartments clearly show one bedroom and a study. The latter is big enough to accommodate a bed and of course will be used as such. The parking required for a two bedroom apartment in Dacorum's planning guidance is greater than that required for a one bedroom apartment and yet the developer is seeking to avoid having to provide the required standards by annotating the second bedroom as a study. This practice should not be tolerated particularly on a site which already suffers from lack of parking space.

REVISED SCHEME

Nash Mills Parish Council

Planning Committee want to clarify ownership of car spaces

As far as NMPC are aware that **as at** the present date no residential planning permission is in place.

Would like the profile of 2nd floor extension to be defined

Some windows in extension still overbearing

What will the basement be used for?

renaming some second bedrooms as a "study" will not prevent use of these areas as bedrooms and accordingly the Planning application description is not accurate. Does DBC consider this renaming will have any implications re car parking provision?

Nash Mills Parish Council object to the proposed application.

Strategic Planning

Comments awaited.

Conservation & Design

CD is very keen to see the building restored from its current dilapidated state.

The reduction from 10 to 9 units is welcome, as is the provision of a community room on the ground floor with a ramped access and DDA compliant toilet. How the interpretation panel are to be produced and maintained in the longer term needs to be carefully conditioned.

The removal of the both bins to the side elevation is an improvement.

The partial use of the basement to provide a second bedroom for Flat 4 is an unfortunate modification – there is no clear rationale left for the use of the remainder of the basement, which has never been properly integrated into the scheme. It would be far preferable to leave Flat 4 as a 1 bed roomed flat, with a view to possibly carrying out a fuller public consultation on a future use for the basement.

Building Control

Comments awaited.

Trees & Woodlands

According to the information submitted the applicant advises no trees will be detrimentally

impacted by the development. The information has been examined and it is confirmed no trees are affected and subsequently have no objections to application being approved in full.

Strategic Housing

Due to the number of units being developed, the site will be exempt from any affordable housing contribution.

Noise & Pollution

Comments awaited.

Scientific Officer

Comments awaited.

Lead Flood Authority

LFA have been consulted previously on the same planning application as a major application as it considered the construction of 10 flats.

However, the current application concerns the construction 9 flats, which makes it a minor planning application.

As it is a minor application the LLFA are not a statutory consultee. Therefore the LFA can only offer our advice to place the LPA in position to make their own decision regarding surface water and drainage.

The LFA has reviewed the Environment Agency maps for surface water flood risk, and the proposed development is at a predicted low risk of flooding from surface water and we do not have any records of flooding in this location. Therefore the LFA have no objection in principle to this planning application.

However it is recommended the LPA to seek information of how the applicant intends to manage the surface water generated on site and how the proposed development site can be adequately drained. We note that there are no public surface water sewers within the vicinity of the site.

Should the LPA decide to grant the permission, it is recommend that a pre-commencement condition is imposed to obtain information regarding surface water management of the site. As a minimum the LPA should require a drainage strategy that includes the details of how the on-site surface water will be managed, where possible providing appropriate sustainable drainage techniques and the location of discharge off the site, along with any supporting calculations. In case the applicant proposes to infiltrate, LFA would recommend that infiltration tests are carried out to ensure that feasibility of the soakaway.

Should the LPA require further information from the applicant, the LFA can offer comments on any additional information related to surface water management.

Hertfordshire Council :Highways

Decision

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

The Highway Authority recommends inclusion of the following Advisory Notes (AN) to ensure that any works within the highway are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the

Highway Act 1980.

1. 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 willfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website: <http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

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

Description of the Proposal Roof extension, refurbishment and repair and use of building as 10 flats

This amendment supplies documentation for 9 flats

Analysis

The applicant has not submitted any transport information ie - Transport Assessment, Transport Statement or a Travel Plan. A Planning Design Statement has been submitted though as part of this submission. As part of a Design and Access statement, the application should take account of the following policy documents; • National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012); • Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) Local Transport Plan 3-2011-2031 • Roads in Hertfordshire Design Guide 3rd Edition • Dacorum Borough Councils parking provision as per their parking policy.

Trip generation and distribution

As there are no supporting/mitigating details from the applicant regarding trip generation and distribution that this level of development will generate. However, this level of development is unlikely to generate significantly high levels of movements which would ultimately lead to demonstrable harm to the highway network in terms of free flow and capacity.

Impact on Highway Network A review of accident data held by HCC (5 year, latest to date) identifies no reported collision / injury accidents at this location associated with the use of the access. The creation of nine flats on this site will only impact on the highway if the development fails to provide sufficient off street parking space. This includes visitor parking if applicable. New or additional trips associated with this development would be low.

Parking

Although parking is a matter for the Local Planning Authority (LPA), the applicant should always provide details of parking provision and whether or not there will be any impact on the highway. In this case the applicant is providing a total of 11 off street parking spaces. The applicant will also need to provide cycle spaces. Roads in Hertfordshire highway design guide 3rd edition states that the dimension and location requirements for parking bays, driveways shall be in accordance with the guidance in DfT Manual for Streets. The LPA may wish to consider, if appropriate, either a condition or an informative covering the temporary increase of construction workers parking associated with this development. Whilst there are no current waiting restrictions, the highway authority (HA) would not wish for construction related vehicles to be parked close to the junctions on footways etc

Accessibility

Forward Planning Officers (Passenger Transport Unit) have not supplied any details of bus

services and bus infrastructure to identify gaps in the service. Refer to HCC's Bus strategy (<http://www.hertsdirect.org/docs/pdf/b/busstrategy.pdf>). The site lies in a reasonably sustainable location with access for vehicles direct to the principle road network. Bus stop provision is provided along Belswains Lane and the A4251 with bus services to Hemel Hempstead Town and Watford. HCC recognises that the proposal is not expected to significantly intensify vehicle trips to / from the site.

Servicing Arrangements Refuse and recycling receptacle storage has been provided.

Conclusion

The assessment does not indicate any significant issues with the proposal. The highway authority would not wish to restrict the grant of planning permission subject to the inclusion of the above conditions and informative notes.

Hertfordshire Ecology

Comments awaited.

Hertfordshire County Council: Historic Environment

As for the Original Scheme.

Hertfordshire Fire & Rescue Service (via HCC Highways)

Comments awaited.

Hertfordshire Constabulary: Crime Prevention

HC support this application, however cannot find crime prevention or security listed in the documentation.

Whilst it is imperative that the fire service should have unrestricted access to all floors in the event of an emergency security still needs to be considered to restrict unlawful free movement throughout the building,

Hertfordshire Property Services

Comments awaited.

Environment Agency

Comments awaited.

Thames Water

Comments awaited.

Affinity Water

Comments awaited.

NATS

Comments awaited.

Civil Aviation Authority

Comments awaited.

Archivist for the Apsley Paper Trail

My comments on these revised plans relate to the historic and heritage aspects of this important building's position in our community.

The revised plans do appear to have retained the unusual two door safe which were a feature of the original occupants of the building. This is good and goes some way to redress the broken promises made in 2009.

The previous developers had published their plans for reinstating the building, but these had proved to be empty words. In fact, the building was reduced to a sorry shell and an eyesore. Hopefully the current plans will restore this non-designated historic building to be the central landmark which it deserves to be.

In my view it is essential that the plans should incorporate the provision of suitable interpretation panels in Dickinson Square to describe three main areas.

The story of the mill from Domesday and its 250-year history of papermaking
The process of mechanical papermaking largely developed on this site
The story of its major occupants, their contribution to national and local affairs

The provision of such panels will guarantee an enhanced appreciation of the significance of the entire development. Draft ideas are available which would need to be taken forward by a professional designer.

Vice President & Honorary Secretary - Hemel Hempstead Local History & Museum Society

I write as someone who spent over 27 years working in Nash Mills House itself, during the days of John Dickinson's, DRG and Sappi.

To reiterate my comments of the 24th August last, as yet unacknowledged, I do believe that the current plans to make the building a 'residential only' establishment is totally out of keeping with its proud history. It was unforgivable that it was opened up like a can of beans and left open to all the elements, let alone being left, by totally inept security arrangements, to the attention of a number of vandals.

However, the current condition of the building is such that to pursue our cause is now probably unrealistic, and therefore I would not oppose the proposals. Nevertheless, The building, as you will be aware, was home to John Dickinson himself, and the universally known and revered Evans Family, and cannot be allowed to just fade away without some form of acknowledgement of its former glory, a colleague has suggested that history tablets be put in place on the outside wall of the building, or even as properly installed free-standing boards, to remind people of the historical past of what was a magnificent building – A request that I support totally.

As I say, I do not oppose use of the building as laid out. However, I sincerely hope that the relevant parties involved will take due notice of the request to commemorate the remarkable history of it. I believe that the provision of such as the plaques or free-standing history boards will alleviate some of the dismay that has built up over recent years concerning the disregard for Hemel Hempstead's History and Heritage.

I implore you to support this proposal, and encourage others to do the same. I can tell you, apart from our membership, there are many people who would support the proposed history boards. Apart from our own members, I can vouch for many other former employees who have been saddened by the demise of the mill itself, but in particular Nash House.

In closing may I applaud the bringing forward of the comments from the previous proposal. However, I am rather disappointed that none of the comments put forward by members of our Society were brought forward as well, as they are most certainly still current and, I believe, should be seen.

Dacorum Heritage Trust

As for the Original Scheme.

Response to Neighbour Notification/ Publicity

10 Butterfly Crescent

Too many units for the development of houses that surround it.

Nowhere near enough parking spaces, as evidenced at the estate overflow car park and Red Lion Lane.

Where will the contractors park in the construction stage. Concerns regarding vehicles parking in front of no. 10's drive as it's a controlled parking areas. When residents move in will parking restrictions be enforced?.

Object due to cramming as many units as possible in what should have been a historic focal point and building, the lack of parking and the extra noise and pollution due to extra traffic etc.

19 Croxley Road

This will not provide any significant difference to the original plans. The developer is still cramming properties into a building that should be left to show its natural character and not be extended to cram properties in where there isn't enough parking provided.

The development already has a number of parking issues and even though most of the flats that will be built within this property are mainly 1 bed there is likely to have more than one car per property which will have huge impact on the parking within this area. There just isn't enough parking for this many flats to be built.

When originally advised of the plans for Nash House 6 years ago it was only going to have 4 flats and having 9 is a huge increase which is right for the development. The property should bring something to the community or the number of flats significantly reduced to ensure sufficient parking is available otherwise it won't work!

33 Butterfly Crescent

Given the intention to create 9 units, the provision of 11 parking spaces is not sufficient. Dacorum and Hertfordshire County Council have already noted existing parking issues with this development which has resulted in the addition of double yellow lines in the roads adjacent to the development and near which (in reference to Red Lion Lane), is still an issue.

The development at present is in urgent need of parking measures to improve the current situation. Developers would need to prove that they would be improving the parking situation and not exacerbating if they would like to gain support.

Further, the application does not state how it would intend to carry out the work with minimal disruption to residents. The roads on the development are not designed for goods vehicles.

3 Francis Mews

Object.

The application makes a mockery of the original planning consent regarding the use and refurbishment of Nash House. What is the point of planning agreements if they are flouted? This is such an obvious developer trick it would be laughable if it wasn't so serious.

A gross over development of the site. Car parking is under provisioned already as evidenced by the surrounding roads and footpaths covered in cars which is really dangerous. 9 flats will generate more than 11 cars - it is extreme naivety to believe otherwise.

The irony of the situation is as the Nash House development has been left to last there are no way that the contractors lorries will be able to actually access the site - blocked by residents cars. Have Dacorum council actually viewed the site?

7 Phelps House

'What genius decided that it would be a good idea to build a new estate around this building before redeveloping it?'

Surely the redevelopment of Nash House should have been carried out along with the rest of the estate and not when there are hundreds of new homes around it with people living in and a childrens play area right next to the site. If an application is approved it should have very severe restrictions on deliveries of materials, working hours and noise and pollution levels as it will cause severe disruption to the whole estate.

In favour of the building being restored but not extended as I do not feel that the estate needs any more properties or cars as it is already overcrowded. What we do not have is community space, shops or restaurants and believe that a cafe or coffee shop or other small businesses would benefit the area far more than more flats'.

11 Butterfly Crescent

In the updated proposal, little of consequence has really changed and is concerned by the new proposal as by the original proposal. By reducing the number of flats proposed by just 1, there are still many of the same issues outstanding as the original planning application as referred to the initial response . This is still an inappropriate proposal for the space for the following reasons:

A project consisting of 9 flats is inappropriate cramming and over-development of this space. We have objections to its greatly increased size and the number of units proposed - this is too large and not appropriate for the estate. The building is historic and the proposed increase in size of plot will take away from the attractiveness of the estate, making the estate more cramped and less open.

There are huge traffic and parking problems in the area. The car park on Lower Lane is frequently full and overcrowded. There are already many cars parking along Red Lion Lane which makes it more difficult to turn out of Rose Lane onto this road. With only 11 parking spaces allocated to the new building development, the parking and traffic issues on the estate will only exacerbate these issues further. Furthermore, with such a large project as this, the amount of builders traffic during the construction process through the estate will be massive.

An increase in noise, both throughout the construction of the project, but also with the introduction of the new 10 flats. We already experience noise from the flats across Mill Stream, particularly during the evenings towards the end of the week, and are concerned about additional noise on the estate, particularly for those families with young children.

1 Francis Mews

When we purchased on we assured that the historic nature & design of Nash House would be maintained, clearly these were empty words. The site is already over developed.

Reducing number of flats by one will not make one iota of difference to the parking issues. 9 flats with only 11 parking spaces are quite unrealistic & frankly a joke, parking & traffic problems in the area are already a real problem which this will only add to.

11 Francis Mews

There seems to have been little change from the previous application. This is not in keeping with the original plans which we told about when we bought our house which is almost opposite Nash House. 9 flats is still far too many and a over development. Where will the owners park 2nd cars in a development which already has major parking problems?!

Bins will be unsightly not to mention attracting rats which is a problem on the estate.

We will also be overlooked.

We also have concerns with all the noise, mess and traffic which will be caused by all the building work.

6 Francis Mews

When we moved in to this new estate we were assured of a design which appears to being altered. Given the significance of the building it should try to be as close to the original design as possible.

The new plans include extensions which will be overbearing and overshadow neighbouring properties.

The amount of properties will add to existing parking issues on the estate, which is already overflowing onto Red Lion Lane and Nash Mills Lane , obscuring traffic and pedestrian access.

While altering use from commercial to residential is understandable , the crowding of accommodation , enlarging external dimensions , and problems that will ensue from these new plans, is not.

I object.

10 Longdean Park

The original agreed application was for no flats now we have 9 proposed! I strongly object.

This is cramming at its worst. It is pleasing to note the Boxmoor Hall was turned down for similar reason on January 18 2018. The footprint must not be extended on the 2nd floor, this is overdevelopment. Three flats are really 2 beds as showing studies.

DBC are still not showing 8 known objections received in written form on this website, i.e. misleading the public. Already badly let down by DBC Planning Dept not monitoring what was to be the flagship of the development. There were planning conditions of an agreed time scale in Application n4/01382/09/MFA , so why has this not been monitored & upheld? Over development with inadequate parking should not be the panacea for DBC negligence & failings to the community.

Nash House is an important & historic building which must urgently be refurbished with some community use as originally intended, with no more than three one bed flats & perhaps a communal bedsit for visitors.

5 Butterfly Crescent

9 residential remains an over-development of the site. 3 of the one bed units contain a study which could be used as a bedroom!?! In reality this is 7 x two beds and 2 x one beds. This is cramming and the developers are being disingenuous and 'massaging' the facts.

We still object to the 2nd floor extension and the huge mass of building this will create - it will be an overbearing and overshadowing block and will, in particular, affect us at 5 Butterfly Crescent.

The parking allowance remains totally inadequate - parking is already a major problem in the area with dangerous and thoughtless parking on nearby roads especially Red Lion Lane.

The siting of the bins stores is of concern - the bin stores need to be sited on the canal side of the building away from other homes.

In summary, we firmly object to this current application and ask that the developer reviews all the objections and submit a plan which allows for community space, fewer flats and no 2nd floor extension.

5 Butterfly Crescent

1) The use has expired. Explanations, please as to why commercial units are not viable. A mix would be far more popular.

2) The purchasers in Butterfly/Frances Mews were assured by the developers that the historic design of the building would be left unchanged; those who bought the newbuilds are adamant that this was the case.

3) DBC has since lost control of this aspect and of the constant intervening sales of the building. It has failed over its accountability here, to keep residents apprised of developments, to insist that new owners are aware of their above responsibilities & has allowed the building to deteriorate to its present state. Granting this would thus seriously let down the present residents of Butterfly/Frances in particular.

3a) The design seeks to confuse and thus introducing a mistrust between developers and residents. The studies in the one bed flats will inevitably be used for second bedrooms. The true numbers of occupants is thus far greater than the plan would suggest.

b) This amounts to cramming & is inappropriate for the nature of the estate on this side of the canal, both as planned by the developers and as purchased by the occupants.

c) The above will only make the parking situation even worse & would therefore contravene Dacorum's planning guidance.

d) On purchase, the position of the sun was a major factor for us and with it, Linden homes assurances as to the eventual design of Nash House. The upward extension would be overbearing and would block out the sun for much of the day.

e) Given the recent rodent problems experienced by the estate, the location of the dustbin area is not acceptable and should be on the other side of the building.

f) We need firm and acceptable proposals as to the building operations during the construction process.

34 Butterfly Crescent

The revised application remains completely inappropriate.

It's disgraceful DBC are not upholding the original planning to keep the historic character. This has been completely over-ridden by greed on behalf of the current developer - intent on cramming dwellings in for profit.

The site already has serious parking issues. You can't even turn right safely onto Red Lion Lane due to parked cars opposite the central island. Allowing only 11 spaces for 9 new flats is a blatant under-provision, exacerbating the existing parking problems onsite and in surrounding roads.

The original plans kept the building at it's current height. This new application is far higher and encroaches unacceptably on our light and privacy.

How will the developer get their construction vehicles in to Nash House? The access roads are too narrow. The original lorries that started work on Nash House completely destroyed the front lawns of the properties at the front of Butterfly Crescent. Will DBC pay for damage?