

4/02450/17/FUL	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE. CONSTRUCTION OF 5 3-BED HOUSES AND A BLOCK OF 3 X 1 BEDROOM AND 1 X 2 BEDROOM FLATS, TOGETHER WITH ANCILLARY 14 BAY CAR PARKING. PRIVATE GARDEN AMENITY SPACES AND EXTERNAL BIN STORES.
Site Address	143 BELSWAINS LANE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 9UZ
Applicant	Bull Homes Ltd
Case Officer	Elsbeth Palmer
Referral to Committee	At the request of Councillor Maddern

1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**.

2. Summary

2.1 This application seeks full planning permission for demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 5 x 3 bedroom dwellings and a block of 3 x 1 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom flats and 14 bay car parking, private garden amenity spaces and external bin stores.

2.2 The site is located within a designated residential area of Hemel Hempstead wherein, the principle of development is acceptable in accordance with Policies CS4 and CS17 of the Core Strategy (2013).

2.3 Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan (2004) also seeks to optimise the use of available land within urban areas. This proposal seeks to optimise the use of urban land.

2.4 There would not be an adverse impact to neighbouring properties as a result of the proposals and satisfactory parking is provided on site. The access to the development would not compromise highway safety and the site would be enhanced by additional planting and landscaping. The design and form of the development would be in character with the area which is already very diverse in accordance with CSPolicy 12.

3. Site Description

3.1 The application site is located between Belswains Lane and Pinecroft with access off Belswains Lane opposite the access to Dickinson Quay, Hemel Hempstead. The site is accessed via a long private drive leading to a single two storey dwelling. To the north lies Pinecroft where an existing pedestrian access and right of way allows access to the site via Pinecroft. To the east lies garden amenity space to the rear of 141 Belswains Lane and to the south a new housing development which has access directly from Belswains Lane. The site slopes gently from north to south.

4. Proposal

4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling and redevelopment to provide 9 new dwellings. The break down of dwelling types is 5 x 3 bedroom dwellings, 3 x 1 bedroom flats and 1 x 2 bedroom flat. The proposal includes provision of 14 car parking bays, private garden amenity spaces and external bin stores.

5. Relevant Planning History

5.1 None for the subject site.

5.2 The site to the west of the subject site has recently been redeveloped for housing at an increased density to the surrounding area.

5.3 Planning application 4/02329/12/FUL granted the comprehensive redevelopment of the site. The proposal included demolition of the existing buildings on the site and the development of four residential units. 1 x detached four bedroom dwelling and a row of three two bedroom terraces.

5.5 Planning application 4/00906/14/FUL sought to achieve an alternative scheme to the previously approved application under 4/02329/12/FUL, where the 4 bed provided at the front of the site would be provided as two 2-bed dwellings in an attached form. Planning permission was granted on 18 November 2014.

6. Policies

6.1 National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

6.2 Adopted Core Strategy –

NP1, CS1, CS2, CS4, CS8, CS9, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS13, CS17, CS18, CS19, CS23, CS28, CS29, CS30, CS31, CS32 and CS35

6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policies 10, 13, 18, 21, 51, 58,111
Appendices 3, 5 and 7.

6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

- Environmental Guidelines (May 2004)
- Area Based Policies (May 2004) - Residential Character Area HCA18 Belswains
- Water Conservation & Sustainable Drainage (June 2005)
- Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (July 2002)

6.5 Advice Notes and Appraisals [include only those relevant to case]

Sustainable Development Advice Note (March 2011)

7. Constraints

- 45.7M AIR DIR LIMIT
- Former Land Use
- LHR Wind Turbine
- CIL3

8. Representations

Consultation responses

8.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

8.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B

9. Considerations

Main issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Policy and principle
- Layout and Design
- Impact on Street Scene
- Amenity Space
- Impact on neighbours
- Trees and Landscaping
- Ecology
- Impact on Highway Safety and Parking Provision
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Contamination and Air Quality
- CIL

Policy and Principle

9.2 Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS1 states that Hemel Hempstead will be the focus for homes and Policy CS4 states that appropriate residential development within residential areas in the Towns and Large Villages is encouraged.

9.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) encourages the provision of more housing within towns and other specified settlements and the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed. Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan (2004) also seeks to optimise the use of available land within urban areas.

9.4 Policy CS 18 states that new housing will provide a choice of homes which will comprise a range of housing types and sizes.

9.5 The application site is located within an urban area in the existing town of Hemel Hempstead. As such the infrastructure in the immediate area has been developed to provide good transport links for existing land uses. There are also services and facilities available within close proximity of the site.

9.6 The site is also large in comparison to adjacent residential sites which vary from quite small in the recently developed Marina View Terrace to medium density along Pinecroft and larger sites along Belswains Lane. Densities are much higher across Belswains Lane in the Dickinson Estate.

9.7 Taking all of the above into account, the proposal would make a valuable contribution to the Borough's existing housing stock (in accordance with Policy CS17). As such, the development would be located in a sustainable location and seeks to optimise the use of previously developed land, the proposal is in accordance with Policies CS1, CS4 and CS17 and CS18 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan (1991) and the NPPF (2012).

Layout and Design

9.8 The proposed development will be five, two storey attached dwellings and four two storey

flats facing towards Pinecroft. There will be a slightly staggered appearance when viewed from Pinecroft. The development will be set back and down from the Pinecroft frontage with pedestrian access only to this road.

9.9 The proposed development will be approximately 1.2 metres higher than the adjacent dwelling 14 Pinecroft.

9.10 The access will stay the same by using the current private access road off Belswains Lane. The 14 parking spaces will be located along this access and on the western edge of the development.

9.11 The design of the development will be modern and will reflect characteristics of dwellings in Marina View Terrace and Pinecroft.

9.12 The site is located in an area with a wide range of densities and architectural types. On the left hand side of the entrance to the site is a small brick bungalow on a large plot, on the right hand side a cul-de-sac with 5 two storey dwellings, two semi-detached and 3 x terraced dwellings. Opposite the site is the entrance to Dickenson Quay which has two storey dwellings nearest Belswains Lane and then increases in height and density as you approach the canal. Along Pinecroft the predominant character is that of two storey semi-detached and detached dwellings with a two storey flat development nearer to the Tesco end of the road. The semi-detached dwellings along this road tend to have parking to the front of the dwelling. As the site has an existing access off Belswains Lane it was considered more appropriate to maintain this access and provide the parking adjacent to this access.

9.13 The proposed development will be in character with the surrounding area in terms of layout, design and scale and will therefore comply with CS 11 and CS 12.

Impact on Street Scene

9.14 Paragraph 60 of the NPPF states that, *'planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness*

9.15 In addition, paragraph 64 of the NPPF states that *'permission should be refused for development of poor design that fail to take opportunity available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.'*

9.16 Core Strategy (2013), Policies, CS1, CS4, CS10, CS11 and CS12 highlight the importance of good design in improving the character and quality of an area; seeking to ensure that developments are in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of size, mass, height and appearance. This guidance is reiterated in the Saved Local Plan (2004) Policies 10, 18 and 21.

9.17 Size, mass, height and appearance have been discussed in the previous section.

9.18 The site lies within two Character Appraisal Areas. The access is within HCA18 and the remainder of the site is within HCA19. The Area Character Appraisal for HCA18: Belswains describes the age, design and type of residential development as "variety throughout". The height is overwhelmingly two storey and density is generally medium range (25-35 dwellings/ha). There are no special requirements in terms of design and types but should normally not exceed two storeys. Development in the medium density range (30 to 35 dwellings/ha) is acceptable. Dwellings should normally front the road and follow established

formal building lines. The site also lies in HCA 19: Nash Mills where housing variety is acceptable and height must not exceed two storeys. The orientation and siting of buildings should follow the pattern set by those adjoining or nearby to the site.

9.19 The dwellings per hectare on the site as existing is 5.6 which is much lower than that advised in the Character Appraisal. The dwellings per hectare for the proposed development will be 50.6. The neighbouring development approved in 2012 allowed 40 dwellings per hectare. The development fronting Pinecroft is two storey and set down and set back from the street scene to mirror the development along this road. The development is similar in density and form to the new development on Marina View and the flat development at the beginning of Pinecroft.

9.20 As this site is located in an area of wide variety in terms of density and on the edge of the Belswains Character area adjacent to the Canal Estate it is considered that the proposed density is acceptable.

9.21 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) encourages the provision of more housing within towns and other specified settlements and the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed. Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan (2004) also seeks to optimise the use of available land within urban areas.

9.22 Based on the above the proposed development complies with the relevant sections of the NPPF and Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan (2004).

Amenity Space

9.23 The 5 new dwellings will have rear gardens with a depth of approximately 12.5 metres which is acceptable based on the minimum depth of 11.5 stated in Appendix 3 of the Local Plan.

9.24 The 2 ground floor flats will have their amenity space provided to the front and rear of the development. The two first floor flats do not have any amenity space but as they are located in close proximity to the canal and the open space around this beautiful water corridor it is considered acceptable.

Impact on Neighbours

Loss of privacy

9.25 There will be no loss of privacy as a result of the proposal as there are no windows proposed in flank elevations facing either of the adjacent neighbours.

9.26 The back to back distance between the development and the houses on Marina View Terrace is approximately 35.8 metres. This exceeds the minimum back to back distance of 23 metres between dwellings to ensure that there is no potential for overlooking.

9.27 The flank elevation of 15 Pinecroft will be facing the flank elevation of flat 1 and 3.

9.28 It is considered that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on the residential amenity of surrounding units in terms of overlooking, loss of light or overbearing. The proposal complies with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

Sunlight and daylight

9.29 The proposed development will not result in a loss of sunlight and daylight for either of the adjacent neighbours due to the alignment of the development and the set back from the side boundary.

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.30 The vegetation on site was predominantly cleared in late 2017. The hedge along Pinecroft will be retained as part of the development proposal. This will be achieved by the retaining wall along the road edge of the site. A landscaping condition will be placed on any approval.

Ecology

9.31 A Bat Survey with a mitigation strategy was requested by Hertfordshire Ecology - please refer to their comments.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking Provision

9.32 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision. In accordance with the NPPF, authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport; local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles.

9.33 Appendix 5 of the Local Plan lists Maximum Parking Standards for the Borough. The site lies within Accessibility Zone 4 for the application of Car Parking Standards SPG where 75-100% of maximum demand based standards should be applied.

9.34 5 x 3 bedroom dwellings - maximum standard is 2.25 spaces each.
3 x 1 bedroom flats - maximum standard is 1.25 spaces each.
1 x 2 bedroom flat - maximum standard is 1.5 spaces each.

9.35 The maximum standards for this proposal is:
11.25 spaces for the houses;
3.75 spaces for the 1 bedroom flats
1.5 spaces for the 2 bedroom flat

This makes a total of a maximum of 16.5 spaces required.

9.36 The proposal includes provision of 14 car parking bays which is equivalent to 85% of the maximum. These parking spaces will be allocated accordingly:

- 3 of the 3 bedroom dwellings will have 2 spaces each; (6)
- 2 of the 3 bedroom dwellings will have 1 space each; (2)
- 3 x1 bedroom flats will have 1 space each; (3)
- 1 x 2 bedroom flats will have 1 space; (1)
- 1 visitor space; and (1)
- 1 disabled space. (1)

9.37 A shortfall from the maximum standards of 2.5 spaces is within the range acceptable for Accessibility Zone 4 and is therefore acceptable in this location which is close to public transport. The site is within walking distance of Apsley Railway Station, Belswains Lane bus routes and the Canal tow path.

9.38 The parking requirement set out in Saved Appendix 5 is 16.5 car parking spaces. However, for the reasons outlined above it is not considered that the scheme would have a significant

impact upon local parking provision. As such, it is considered that the parking provision is acceptable and in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS12.

9.39 Provision is made for cycle storage ie. 5 spaces - one for each one bedroom flat and two for each two bedroom flat within the scheme which is supported and accords with Appendix 5 of the Local Plan.

9.40 The County Council as Highway Authority have raised no objection to the proposal subject to conditions. The Highway Authority are satisfied that the car movements associated with the development would not result in an adverse impact on the existing road network and is unlikely to have an adverse impact on the safety or operation of the junction.

Flood Risk and Drainage

9.41 Flood risk and drainage matters have been adequately addressed in the submission noting the site's constraints and as such no objections have been received from Hertfordshire Lead Local Flood Authority, Thames Water or Affinity Water. Conditions have been requested from the above requiring further details of drainage.

Contamination and Air Quality

9.42 The site has been identified as a former land use site.

Contamination can be adequately dealt with by conditions as suggested by the Council's Environmental and Community Protection team to meet the requirements of Policies CS31 and CS32 of the Core Strategy.

CIL

9.43 Policy CS35 requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on the 1st July 2015. The development of 9 new dwellings will be CIL liable.

Response to Neighbour comments

9.44 These points have been addressed above.

10. Conclusions

10.1 The impacts of the proposal have been taken into consideration, along with representations received from consultees and the neighbouring properties. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design, impact on street scene and neighbours.

11. RECOMMENDATION – That planning permission be **GRANTED** for the reasons referred to above 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.**

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

- 2 No development shall take place until samples of the materials proposed to be**

used on the external surfaces of the development shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved materials shall be used in the implementation of the development. Please do not send materials to the council offices. Materials should be kept on site and arrangements made with the planning officer for inspection.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with CS 11 and 12.

- 3 **No development shall take place until details of protection measures for The hedge fronting Pinecroft shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved details shall be put in place prior to the commencement of development and kept in place until the development is complete.**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area and to comply with CS 11 and 12.

- 4 **Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order amending or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within the following classes of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written approval of the local planning authority:**

Schedule 2 Part 1 Classes A, B, C, E, F and G

Reason: To enable the local planning authority to retain control over the development in the interests of safeguarding the residential and visual amenity of the locality and to comply with CS 11 and 12.

- 5 **No development shall take place until, a ‘Construction Traffic Management Plan’ or “Method Statement” shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. Thereafter, the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan. The ‘Construction Traffic Management Plan’ or Method Statement shall identify details of:**

- **Access Route which shall incorporate adequate provision for addressing any abnormal wear and tear;**
- **Methods for accessing the site, including number of vehicle movements and routing;**
- **Location and details of wheel washing facilities; and**
- **Associated parking areas and storage of materials clear of the public highway.**

Further details required by Environmental Health include:

- **Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway**
- **Timing of construction activities to avoid school pick up/drop off times**
- **Post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and temporary access to the public highway**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and free and safe flow of traffic and comply with CS 12.

- 6 **No development shall take place until a scheme detailing changes required to**

the access onto Belswains Lane, including alterations to the mini roundabout location, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and free and safe flow of traffic and to comply with CS 12.

- 7 **No development shall take place until a swept path diagram showing that a large vehicle is able to access the improved access from all four arms of the mini roundabout, especially approaching from the South East, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and free and safe flow of traffic and to comply with CS 12.

- 8 **Vehicular visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m shall be provided, and thereafter maintained, in both directions from the access, within which there shall be no obstruction to visibility between a height of 0.6m and 2m above the carriageway.**

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to comply with CS 12.

- 9 **Pedestrian visibility splays of 2m x 2m shall be provided, and thereafter maintained, on both sides of the new vehicle crossover, within which there shall be no obstruction to visibility between 0.6m and 2m above the carriageway.**

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to comply with CS 12.

- 10 **The proposed car parking spaces shall all have measurements of at least 2.4m x 4.8m respectively. Such spaces shall be maintained as a permanent ancillary to the development shall be paved and shall be used for no other purpose.**

Reason: The above condition is required to ensure the adequate provision of off-street parking at all times in order to minimise the impact on the safe and efficient operation of the adjoining Highway.

- 11 **Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted details of the surfacing of the on site vehicular areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority's and shall be carried out as approved. Arrangements shall be made for surface water from the site to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge into the highway.**

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction, and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the premises and to comply with CS12.

- 12 **Occupation of the development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the site access has been constructed and completed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority and the highway authority.**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the free and safe flow of traffic and comply with CS 12.

- 13 **Prior to the commencement of the development, 2 dusk emergence / dawn re-entry surveys should be undertaken during May - August inclusive (possibly September if the weather remains warm) to determine with confidence whether**

bats are roosting and, should this be the case, the outline mitigation measures (ref : Additional Information [for bat mitigation strategy] by Cherryfield Ecology, 01/05/2018) should be modified as appropriate based on the results and then be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

Reason: To ensure the continued ecological functionality of bats and their roosts is maintained in accordance with European and national legislation and to comply with CS26.

- 14 **No development, shall take place until a Phase I Report to assess the actual or potential contamination at the site has been 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 the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.

- 15 **All remediation or protection measures identified in the Remediation Statement referred to in Condition 15 above shall be fully implemented within the timescales and by the deadlines as set out in the Remediation Statement and a Site Completion Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted.**

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

Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32 and the NPPF (2012).

16 **No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include:**

- **hard surfacing materials;**
- **means of enclosure;**
- **soft landscape works which shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate;**
- **trees to be retained and measures for their protection during construction works;**
- **proposed finished levels or contours;**
- **car parking layouts and other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;**
- **minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc);**
- **proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc, indicating lines, manholes, supports etc);**
- **retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.**

The approved landscape works shall be carried out prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area and to comply with CS 11 and 12.

17 **An air quality report assessing the impacts of the proposed redevelopment is to be provided to the Local Planning Authority, having regard to the Environment Act 1995, Air Quality Regulations and subsequent guidance. The report should indicate areas where there are, or likely to be, breaches of an air quality objective. If there are predicted exceedances in exposure to levels above the Air Quality Objectives then a proposal for possible mitigation measures should be included.**

Reason: To ensure the amenities of the neighbouring premises are protected from increased air quality arising from the development; in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS32 of the Core Strategy (2013).

18 **All possible mitigation measures identified in the Air Quality Report referred to in Condition 18 above shall be fully implemented within the timescales and by the deadlines as set out in the Report and a 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.**

Reason: To ensure the amenities of the neighbouring premises are protected from increased air quality arising from the development; in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS32 of the Core Strategy (2013).

- 19 **The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment carried out by Ridge & Partners LLP reference 5004062 dated 05 January 2018 and the following mitigation measures;**
- 1. Limiting the surface water run-off to a maximum of 5l/s with discharge into the Thames surface water sewer.**
 - 2. Providing attenuation to ensure no increase in surface water run-off volumes for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.**
 - 3. Undertake drainage strategy to include to the use of permeable asphalt and attenuation tank.**

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants to comply with CS12 and 32.

- 20 **No development shall take place until the final design of the drainage scheme is completed and sent to the LPA for approval. The scheme shall also include:**
- 1. Final design of the drainage scheme including detailed engineered drawings of the proposed SuDS features including their, location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features including any connecting pipe runs and all corresponding calculations/modelling.**
 - 2. Investigate the use infiltration features to dispose some surface water from the site where possible.**
- 2. Final detailed management plan to include arrangements for adoption and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.**

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of and disposal of surface water from the site.

- 21 **Prior to the occupation of the development a GreenTravel Plan shall be provided to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall contain details of measures that will be taken to encourage sustainable travel behaviour, targets for mode shift and procedures that will be followed should the targets not be met.**

Reason: To encourage sustainable travel behaviour and to comply with CS8 Sustainable Transport and CS 28 Carbon Emission Reductions.

- 22 **No development shall take place until information on the number and position of fire hydrants shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The relevant details shall include information on how the hydrants will be incorporated into the mains water services whether by means of existing water services or new mains or extension to or diversion of existing services or apparatus. The fire hydrants shall be implemented prior to occupation of the dwellings hereby approved.**

Reason: In the interests of health and safety; in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

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

Site Location Plan 200
Existing Site Plan 201
Existing Floor Plans 202
Existing Elevations 203
Proposed Site Plan showing Ground Floor and Vehicle Manoeuvring plan (in and out) 204 Rev L
Proposed Ground & First Floor Plans (Houses) 206 Rev D
Proposed Roof Plan (Houses) 207 Rev B
Proposed Floor Plans (Flats) 208 Rev H
Proposed Combined Elevations (Flats and Houses) 209 Rev H
Proposed Block Plan 210 Rev M
Proposed Street Elevation, Proposed Site Section and Proposed Bin Store 211 Rev F

Proposed Access and Car Parking Layout DWG/2467/001 - Integrated Transport Planning Ltd.

Floor Areas - Houses and Flats - GIA Schedule dated January 2018
Planning Statement and Design and Access Statement dated May 2018.
Transport Technical Note: November 2017
Bat Report prepared by Cherryfield Ecology dated 6/9/17
Bat Roost Outline Mitigation Strategy prepared by Environmental Business Solutions on 23rd February, 2018
Mitigation Table prepared by Cherryfield Ecology, Martin O'Connor dated 1/5/18

Drainage Strategy Part 1 and 2 prepared by HR Wallingford dated 14/12/17
Site surface water - Drainage Plan C85763-SK-001 by JNP Group dated 10.12.17
Drainage Construction Details sheet 1 of 2, C85763-SK-002 by JNP Group dated 10.12.17
Drainage Construction Details sheet 2 of 2, C85763-SK-003 by JNP Group dated 10.12.17

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

Article 35 Statement:

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

Informatives:

Highways:

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.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

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

<http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

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

<http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047

4. Construction standards for works within the highway: All works to be undertaken on the adjoining highway shall be constructed to the satisfaction and specification of the Highway Authority, by an approved contractor, and in accordance with Hertfordshire County Council's publication "Roads in Hertfordshire - Highway Design Guide (2011)". Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. Further information is available via the website

<http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Contaminated Land:

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

Appendix A

Consultation responses

1. Town/Parish Council

None

2. Strategic Planning

(i) Principle of residential use

Within Core Strategy Policy CS1 (Distribution of Development) Hemel Hempstead is identified as the focus for homes. The site lies within a designated Residential Area (detailed in Policy CS4: The Towns and Large Villages) which seeks to guide development to the appropriate areas within settlements. Therefore, the principle of new housing in this general location is encouraged.

(ii) Design

Development in the Borough is further guided by saved DBLP Area Based Policies SPG (Development in Residential Areas section). It falls within residential character areas of HCA18 (the access road) and HCA19 (the main bulk of the site). HCA18 character area is called Belswains (identified as an opportunity area) and HCA19 character area is called Nash Mills. These character areas provide more detailed advice regarding design and layout, although HCA19 is recognised as an area of minimal change. It is recognised that there is a mix of provision made on site.

At first appearance this seems to be a tandem form of development. The Development in Residential Areas SPG states the following on tandem development:

“the positioning of usually one (but sometimes more) new houses behind an existing dwelling and sharing access arrangements is a common form of backland development, but certainly the most inefficient, problematic and unsatisfactory. The area policy statements make no reference to tandem development. It is the Council's view that this is a generally unsatisfactory form of accommodating new housing.”

Although, consideration needs to be given to whether there are other approved examples of this type of development in the locality. Furthermore, in this particular instance, it appears that the proposal will have a principal frontage onto Pinecroft as it is effectively infilling the space occupied by the existing property.

Generally, we note that this proposes a much higher form of development density than currently found along Pinecroft and marks a shift away from semi-detached properties to terraces and apartments.

You would need to ensure that the new residents can safely and conveniently access the properties from the rear parking area.

Garden depths should generally be a minimum of 11.5m (saved DBLP Appendix 3).

(iii) Parking provision

14 parking spaces and 5 covered cycle spaces are proposed. Appendix 5 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (adopted April 2004) states the following car parking standards for the C3 use class (located outside of accessibility zones 1 and 2):

1 bedroom dwellings/bedsits	1.25 spaces
2 bedroom dwellings	1.5 spaces
3 bedroom dwellings	2.25 spaces
4 or more bedroom dwellings	3 spaces

We recognise that national policy is no longer seeking to apply maximum parking standards.

(iv) Conclusion

The proposals fits in with the broad principle of providing housing in appropriate locations although the Case Officer needs to assess the matters listed above, as well as other normal DM considerations (such as effects on neighbouring properties (Policy CS12)). As part of this, the Case Officer will need to decide if this is an appropriate form of development in this immediate locality.

3. Hertfordshire County Council – Highway Authority

Comments dated 23/4/18

Vehicular and pedestrian access is currently via a vehicular crossover onto Belswains Lane. There is a mini roundabout just South West of the site, which limits the ability of vehicles to turn right into the site from Belswains Lane.

The proposal is to widen this access to enable vehicles entering the site to wait clear of the highway if another vehicle is exiting. The driveway is currently 8.3m wide, and this will be maintained at 4.8m, with parking spaces along its southern edge.

The applicant will need to submit plans both for the improvements to this access and also for moving the roundabout further south east, so that vehicles are easily able to turn right into the driveway from Belswains Lane. This must then be demonstrated to be possible by swept path analysis drawings.

The main current and proposed pedestrian access to the site is from Pinecroft, to the front aspect of the site. It is also proposed that utility vehicles will approach the new properties from this road.

Belswains Lane is an Unnumbered "C" Classified, while Pinecroft is an unclassified local access road. Both have a 30mph speed limit.

S278 Agreement

Any works within the highway boundary (including alterations to the footway and the proposed site access) will need to be secured and approved via a S278 Agreement with the HCC

REFUSE STORAGE AND COLLECTION

Storage and collection for refuse for the dwellings will be at the front of the properties, on Pinecroft.

PARKING

The proposal includes 14 parking spaces and one disabled space. Eight of these will be along the southern edge of the driveway, leaving 4.8 m clear for vehicles to enter the site. There is a turning head within the site to allow vehicles to enter and leave the site in forward gear.

On balance, the highway authority would not wish to restrict the grant of planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives provided.

Comments dated 18/12/17 - same as above.

Comments dated 4/12/17 - same as above.

Comments dated 9/11/17

Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:

HCC objects to the proposed development, due to a lack of information provided by the applicant justifying that the proposal will not impact on the highway safety.

This amendment proposes a revised Proposed Block Plan, drawing no 1579/210 rev F, and a revised Proposed Site Plan Showing Ground Floor and Vehicle Manoeuvring Plan (in and out) drawing no 1579/204 Rev F.

The following issues need to be resolved by the applicant:

Appropriately generated swept path assessments are required to demonstrate that all vehicles, including refuse vehicles and fire trucks, are able to access the site from all arms of the mini-roundabout on Belswains Lane.

Appropriately generated swept path assessments are required to demonstrate that all vehicles, including refuse vehicles and fire trucks, are able to leave the highway, have adequate space on site to manoeuvre to turn around and enter the highway in forward gear.

The proposed dropped kerb access shown on diagram 1579/204 rev F is inadequate for the proposed development and is required to be a full bellmouth access. Switching parking to the opposite site of the driveway access does not address the Highway issues and reasons for refusal.

No adequate measurements have been provided for the access driveway, but it appears to be less than 4.8metres, which is the specified width in Roads in Herts to allow two-way movement.

S278 Agreement Any works within the highway boundary (including alterations to the footway and the proposed site access) will need to be secured and approved via a S278 Agreement with the HCC.

4. Trees and Woodlands

Comments dated 13/2/18

Drawing 210, revision G shows retaining wall along road edge of site.
This should satisfactorily retain the bank/soil and privet hedge which acts as a screen.

There is no existing vegetation within this site that will be a constraint to development.

There is a hedge on the NE boundary with Pinecroft that serves a useful function, it appears to be just off site and at a slightly higher level than the proposed housing site. Its long term future would be assisted by some means of soil retention.

There is an established hedge within the site running along much of the SW boundary, I assume this will remain.

In the event of permission being granted, please condition landscaping, there is some scope for modest tree planting.

5. Rights of Way

No public rights of way over the site.

6. Hertfordshire Ecology

Comments dated 1/5/18

With these outline mitigation measures in place, I consider this report has enough information to enable the LPA to fully consider the impact of the proposal on bats prior to determination.

I advise the outstanding surveys are secured by Condition of Approval and can suggest the following wording:

“Prior to the commencement of the development, 2 dusk emergence / dawn re-entry surveys should be undertaken during May - August inclusive (possibly September if the weather remains warm) to determine with confidence whether bats are roosting and, should this be the case, the outline mitigation measures (ref : Additional Information [for bat mitigation strategy] by Cherryfield Ecology, 01/05/2018) should be modified as appropriate based on the results and then be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

Reason: To ensure the continued ecological functionality of bats and their roosts is maintained in accordance with European and national legislation.”

It is acknowledged that if bats will be affected by the proposals, appropriate mitigation measures

must be carried out under the legal constraints of an EPS development licence obtained from Natural England. I have no reason to believe that a licence will not be issued. Natural England will require a number of activity surveys for a licence to be issued, consequently these need to be factored in to any development timescale.

Comments dated 26/4/18

Following previous comments from us (Neil Harvey 10/01/2018 and 17/01/2018), a *Bat Roost Outline Mitigation Strategy (by Environmental Business Solutions, 23 February 2018)* has been submitted in support of this application. This attempts to provide mitigation in the assumed event that bats are present and affected. *However, although the measures are what would be expected to be applied to avoid harming bats, it is not what we expect as suitable outline compensation for impact to an assumed bat roost from the development proposals involving demolition.*

On a positive note, the report does state works should not be undertaken after 1 hour prior to sunset or 1 hour after sunrise; and suggests restrictions of use of artificial lighting; and what to do in the event that bats are found – which is commendable.

Unfortunately, I cannot accept this report as being appropriate and consequently there is still not enough information on bats prior to determination.

Hopefully this can be resolved with a simple statement from a suitable qualified / experienced ecologist, which should include the following (not exhaustive):-

Seasonal timing considerations; Toolbox Talk to contractors; Pre-commencements checks; Supervise stripping of the roof (Watching Brief); Roost closure; Bat roost provision – roost retention/reinstatement; Bat roost provision – additional roost provision – Bat box and/or integrated units; Monitoring.

Comments dated 17/1/18

Further to our earlier comments, dated 10th January 2018, a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment carried out in September 2017 has now been submitted. It is noted that there was limited access to the loft space during the survey, but no explanation of a reason. The report concludes moderate potential for bats and it is clear that, from the exterior, there is free access to the loft for bats.

The report recommends two emergence surveys to determine whether or not bats are using the building, one of which should be between May and August. In order to be sure that the maternity period is covered, my recommendation is that one of the surveys should be between late May and early August. Given the lack of access to the loft, the survey will need to be carefully designed to ensure that a likely absence of species with quieter echolocation (specifically Long-eared Bat) can be safely concluded. This may include the deployment of a static detector in the loft over a suitable period, which would best be achieved by an ecologist with an appropriate Natural England licence.

The report does not consider the potential impacts of the proposals, although this would clearly be the loss of any roost that is present. There is no mitigation strategy within the report and so it is not currently possible for the Local Planning Authority to fully consider the impact of the proposals on bats, as highlighted in our previous comments. The strategy should assume the presence of bat roosts proportionate to the location and can be modified if necessary once the results of any recommended follow-up activity surveys are known.

Once a satisfactory outline mitigation strategy has been submitted to the LPA and approved, I would advise any outstanding surveys are secured by Condition of Approval. I can suggest Condition wording if required.

As bats are European Protected Species (EPS), this outline mitigation information is required to be submitted to the LPA **prior to determination** - so the LPA can fully consider the impact of the proposals on bats and discharge its legal obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

It should be noted that if bats are found to be roosting within the property and will be affected by the proposals, appropriate mitigation measures will need to be carried out under the legal constraints of a European Protected Species (EPS) development licence. Natural England may require a number of activity surveys for a licence to be issued, consequently these need to be factored in to any development timescale.

To conclude, and consistent with my previous comments, I cannot recommend this application is determined until an appropriate mitigation strategy is provided to the LPA for written approval.

Comments dated 10/1/18

This application is not accompanied by any ecological information. The application consists of the demolition of an existing house and will also require the removal of trees in the property's garden. If bats are present, in the house or trees, they will be affected by the works. At present there is no information available as to the likelihood of bats being present in the building or trees and so the Council cannot be satisfied that local populations of bats will not be affected.

I advise that a professional **Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment** is undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist to evaluate whether bats, or evidence of them, are present and will be affected by these proposals. This will consider the need for further bat surveys and mitigation.

Such surveys can be undertaken at any time of year but should follow established best practice as described in the Bat Conservation Trust Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition, 2016.

A. If no bats or evidence of bats is found, the application can be determined accordingly.

B. In the event that evidence, or potential for bats, is found, further surveys (dusk emergence / dawn re-entry surveys) may be required, which can only be carried out when bats are active in the summer months between May and August, or September if the weather remains warm. As we are now within the unfavourable time of year to undertake these bat activity surveys, an Outline Mitigation Strategy with appropriate recommendations should be included within the bat report if the Local Planning Authority is to fully consider the impact of the proposals on bats. In this respect, we only advise this approach outside the optimum bat activity survey. This strategy should assume the presence of a bat roost proportionate to the location and can be modified if necessary once the results of any recommended follow-up activity surveys are known. In this situation only (i.e. once an outline mitigation strategy has been submitted to the LPA and approved), I would advise any outstanding surveys are secured by Condition of Approval. I can suggest Condition wording if required.

As bats are European Protected Species (EPS), this outline mitigation information is required to be submitted to the LPA **prior to determination** - so the LPA can fully consider the impact of the proposals on bats and discharge its legal obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

It should be noted that if bats are found to be roosting within the property and will be affected

by the proposals, appropriate mitigation measures will need to be carried out under the legal constraints of a European Protected Species (EPS) development licence. Natural England may require a number of activity surveys for a licence to be issued, consequently these need to be factored in to any development timescale.

To conclude, I cannot recommend this application is determined until the requested information on bats and any appropriate mitigation is provided to the LPA for written approval.

7. Affinity Water

You should be aware that 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".

8. Thames Water

Waste Comments

Surface Water Drainage - With regard to 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. The contact number is 0800 009 3921. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval should be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building or an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of, a public sewer. Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new buildings, but approval may be granted for extensions to existing buildings. The applicant is advised to visit thameswater.co.uk/buildover

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

Water Comments

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

9. Contaminated Land

Comments dated 21/3/18

We will like to advise that we have no objection to the proposed application as it relates to contaminated land and Air Quality.

However, having consider the historical land use for this site and it's environ, relevant planning conditions and informatives are recommend for the proposed development should planning permission be granted.

Comments dated 9/1/18

I have no specific comments to make in respect of contamination. The resulting contamination report must take into account all amendments to site layout.

Additional information:

- Site Surface Water Drainage Plan
- Drainage Construction Details
- Drainage Assessment
- Greenfield Runoff Estimation

Change of description:

'Demolition of existing house. Construction of 3 x 1 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom flats, together with ancillary 14 bay car parking. Private garden amenity spaces and external bin stores'

Amended plans:

- Proposed Site Plan – vehicle manoeuvring (Revision G)
- Proposed Floor Plans Flats (Revision D)
- Proposed Elevations (Revision E)
- Proposed Block Plan (Revision G)
- Proposed Street Elevation and Site Section (Revision C)

Comments dated 24/11/18

The site is located within the vicinity of the following potentially contaminative former land uses:

- 2no. paper mills
- Builders yard
- Depot
- Coal depot
- Plastics factory
- Unknown filled ground

BGS data indicates the site to be underlain by Head (superficial deposits) over Chalk (bedrock), a viable pollutant migration pathway may therefore be present linking the potential sources (as listed above) with the receptor (application site). I recommend that the standard contamination conditions (CONT 1 and CONT2) be applied to this development should permission be granted.

10. Lead Local Flood Authority

Comments dated 12/1/18

Following a review of the Flood Risk Assessment carried out by JNP reference C85763 RE001 dated 20 December 2017, we can confirm that we have no objection on flood risk grounds and advise the LPA that the proposed development site can be adequately drained and mitigate any potential existing surface water flood risk if carried out in accordance with the overall drainage strategy.

We note that proposed drainage strategy is based upon attenuation and discharge into Thames surface water sewer at a maximum rate of 5l/s. We acknowledge that infiltration tests have been carried out and infiltration rates of 1.0×10^{-6} were recorded. This infiltration rate is not adequate to cater for the whole development site and due to layout of the development; appropriate stand-off distance from infiltration features and building is unlikely to be achieved. Therefore it is not proposed to infiltrate and we acknowledge there are no watercourses within the vicinity of the site.

The drainage strategy includes the use of permeable asphalt and attenuation tank to provide the required attenuation volumes. Micro-drainage calculations have also been provided to support the proposed scheme.

We therefore recommend the following conditions to the LPA should planning permission be granted - these conditions have been added to the report.

Comments dated 10/11/17

In the absence of an acceptable surface water drainage assessment we object to the grant of planning permission and recommend refusal on this basis for the following reasons.

The information submitted with this application does not provide a suitable basis for assessment to be made of the flood risks arising from the proposed development. In order for the Lead Local Flood Authority 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;

- An drainage strategy which includes providing appropriate SuDS in line with the non-statutory national standards, industry best practice and HCC Guidance for SuDS.
- Drainage plan including location of all the drainage features and feasible discharge mechanism for surface water off the site.
- Detailed calculations of existing/proposed surface water storage volumes and flows with Initial post development calculations and/or 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 a 40% allowance for climate change.

Overcoming our objection

To address the above points, please see the comments below:

Following a review of the proposed block plan (Drawing No. 210 Rev E), it is shown that some areas of hardstanding will be constructed on permeable surfacing. No further information on surface water management has been submitted. The drainage strategy should include details of how the on-site surface water will be managed by provide appropriate sustainable drainage techniques and the location of discharge off the site (utilising the SuDS hierarchy), along with supporting calculations. Previously developed sites should aim to discharge at the pre-development greenfield rate for the whole site area where possible. If not, a significant reduction in the current rate of discharge should be achieved and evidence provided as to why greenfield rates are not viable.

The applicant can overcome our objection by submitting a surface water assessment which covers the deficiencies highlighted above and demonstrates that the development does not increase risk elsewhere and where possible reduces flood risk overall, and gives priority to the use of sustainable drainage methods. If this cannot be achieved we are likely to maintain our objection to the application.

We 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.

11. Building Control

No comments to make.

12. Environmental Health

No objection.

13. HCC - Development Services

Based on the information provided to date we would seek the provision of fire hydrant(s), as set out within HCC's Planning Obligations Toolkit. We reserve the right to seek Community Infrastructure Levy contributions towards the provision of infrastructure as outlined in your R123 List through the appropriate channels.

All developments must be adequately served by fire hydrants in the event of fire. The County Council as the Statutory Fire Authority has a duty to ensure fire fighting facilities are provided on new developments. HCC therefore seek the provision of hydrants required to serve the proposed buildings by the developer through standard clauses set out in a Section 106 legal agreement or unilateral undertaking.

Buildings fitted with fire mains must have a suitable hydrant provided and sited within 18m of the hard-standing facility provided for the fire service pumping appliance.

The requirements for fire hydrant provision are set out with the Toolkit at paragraph 12.33 and 12.34 (page 22). In practice, the number and location of hydrants is determined at the time the water services for the development are planned in detail and the layout of the development is known, which is usually after planning permission is granted. If, at the water scheme design stage, adequate hydrants are already available no extra hydrants will be needed.

Section 106 planning obligation clauses can be provided on request.

Justification

Fire hydrant provision based on the approach set out within the Planning Obligations Guidance - Toolkit for Hertfordshire (Hertfordshire County Council's requirements) document, which was approved by Hertfordshire County Council's Cabinet Panel on 21 January 2008 and is available via the following link: www.hertsdirect.org/planningobligationstoolkit

The County Council seeks fire hydrant provisions for public adoptable fire hydrants and not private fire hydrants. Such hydrants are generally not within the building site and are not covered by Part B5 of the Building Regulations 2010 as supported by Secretary of State Guidance "Approved Document B".

In respect of Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 the planning obligations sought from this proposal are:

(i) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Recognition that contributions should be made to mitigate the impact of development are set out in planning related policy documents. The NPPF states "Local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Conditions cannot be used cover the payment of financial contributions to mitigate the impact of a development (Circular 11/95: Use of conditions in planning permission, paragraph 83).

All developments must be adequately served by fire hydrants in the event of fire. The County Council as the Statutory Fire Authority has a duty to ensure fire fighting facilities are provided on new developments. The requirements for fire hydrant provision are set out with the Toolkit

at paragraph 12.33 and 12.34 (page 22).

(ii) Directly related to the development;

Only those fire hydrants required to provide the necessary water supplies for fire fighting purposes to serve the proposed development are sought to be provided by the developer. The location and number of fire hydrants sought will be directly linked to the water scheme designed for this proposal.

(iii) Fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development.

Only those fire hydrants required to provide the necessary water supplies for fire fighting purposes to serve the proposed development are sought to be provided by the developer. The location and number of fire hydrants sought will be directly linked to the water scheme designed for this proposal.

14. Cupid Green Depot

Supports the application.

The 5 houses will each require space for 3 x wheeled bins and a kerbside caddy. The 4 flats will require space for 2 x 1100ltr eurobins and a 140ltr wheeled bin for food waste.

The plan shows access to the bins from Pinecroft via a ramp.

I am concerned that the distance for some of the bins to be wheeled especially the eurobins for the flats is too far. It would be better if the slope was at the flats side or sloped from both directions instead of steps.

There should be sufficient space to move the eurobins without causing damage to edges of walls etc. There should be no steps between the waste storage areas and the collection vehicle and any frames, gates or doors should be suitably robust.

Appendix B

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

Objections

1 Marina View Terrace - Objects (dated 9/11/17)

With the parking now situated against the perimeter of my property, my concern is for security and noise levels. With cars parked there, it would be easy enough for potential intruders to jump on to a car and over the fence. I don't disapprove of the plans, but some assurance for a barrier such as a tall wall in brick/organic form would be prudent. It would also limit the amount of noise from moving / parking of cars.

One other concern that I discussed with Peter Hollingberry a few weeks ago, was the roundabout at the entrance to 143 Belswains Lane. In the space of a month, my wife has witnessed two accidents at this roundabout. With potentially the frequent use of an additional exit at this roundabout, I feel it is in need of an overhaul of design, signposting and general wear and tear.

Many cars whizz through the roundabout as if there wasn't one there. Perhaps speed traps a few metres away would help safeguard against potential accidents.

As stated before, I welcome any development, but safety must come before maximising a return of investment for the applicant.

(dated 28/10/17)

We've witnessed accidents at the roundabout by No. 143. Please don't make the road more dangerous.

Locals compete for limited parking with rail commuters. Proposals for No.143 don't provide enough off-road spaces. We have 9 spaces for 10 bedrooms. They propose only 14 for 23 bedrooms. Their turning /drop-off area appears too small.

The drain for No.143 runs under No 145 & was renewed recently but will not cope with sewage from 9 properties- we would like the drain moved to the driveway of No 143. We do not want a blockage to flood our gardens and driveway with sewage.

Our gardens get waterlogged in wet weather. Recent removal of trees at No.143 & proposed buildings & patios could lead to more rain running downhill onto our properties causing damage.

We were saddened by the felling of the mature, majestic trees at No.143. Native trees are a habitat for wildlife & all play make an important contribution to air quality & local character. We would like more space for trees in the proposals.

3 Marina View Terrace - objects

(dated 20/11/17)

First of all I was most shocked when I returned from work one day to witness the site being cleared. The large number of trees were providing homes to a great deal of wild life, which has now been taken. There were a number of extremely large oak trees that were ripped down, I struggle to believe these did not have any sort of protection order on them?

I have looked at the proposed plans and what has been proposed. Firstly, although the flats will not overlook my property, the five 3 bed houses will, made easier now that all of the trees that once lined my back fence have been removed. This is not acceptable to have my privacy taken away in a way completely out of my control, not to mention the detrimental visual effect this will have. The proposed parking is not adequate. I don't believe that if anyone has a vehicle anything longer than your average car, there will not be enough space to turn around at the development meaning they will have to reverse out into the main road, which will be extremely hazardous.

(dated 4/11/17)

First of all I was most shocked when I returned from work one day to witness the site being cleared. The large number of trees were providing homes to a great deal of wild life, which has now been taken. There were a number of extremely large oak trees that were ripped down, I struggle to believe these did not have any sort of protection order on them?

Although the flats will not overlook my property, the five 3 bed houses will, made easier now that all of the trees that once lined my back fence have been removed. This is not acceptable to have my privacy taken away in a way completely out of my control, not to mention the detrimental visual effect this will have.

The proposed parking is not adequate. I don't believe that if anyone has a vehicle anything longer than your average car, there will not be enough space to turn around at the development meaning they will have to reverse out into the main road, which will be extremely

hazardous.

4 Marina View Terrace ("MVT"), 145 Belswains Lane - objects

(dated 6/11/17)

The planned provision for parking and manoeuvring of occupier cars, delivery vans, & visitors' cars is inadequate.

There is a shortage of local parking already and people are constantly trying to find places to park.

Using the access drive as parking will be a noise nuisance for the occupiers of MVT. Why are No's 1&2 MVT not shown on the plan? The residents of 'MVT' will also be affected by vehicles entering and leaving 143.

The access point is not big enough and the mini roundabout already causes problems let alone with more traffic turning.

It is a terrible shame all those mature trees were brutally and suddenly cut down without any warning to neighbours.

These new plans show residents looking straight into my master bedroom! No privacy at all! Will the access to 143 be wide enough for emergency services, parked cars and cars to access?

What a shame- this could be beautiful, too much on too little space!

(dated 26/10/17)

The planned provision for parking and manoeuvring of occupier cars, delivery vans, & visitors' cars is inadequate. There is a shortage of local parking already and people are constantly trying to find places to park.

Using the access drive as parking will be a noise nuisance for the occupiers of MVT. Why are No's 1&2 MVT not shown on the plan? The residents of 'MVT' will also be affected by vehicles entering and leaving 143. The access point is not big enough and the mini roundabout already causes problems let alone with more traffic turning.

It is a terrible shame all those mature trees were brutally and suddenly cut down without any warning to neighbours. These new plans show residents looking straight into my master bedroom! No privacy at all!

Will the access to 143 be wide enough for emergency services, parked cars and cars to access?

What a shame- this could be beautiful, too much on too little space!

5 Marina View Terrace ("MVT"), 145 Belswains Lane - objects

The planned provision for parking and manoeuvring of occupier cars, delivery vans, & visitors' cars is inadequate.

There is a shortage of local parking already.

Using the access drive as parking will be a noise nuisance for the occupiers of MVT. Why are No's 1&2 MVT not shown on the plan? They are close to the access drive to No 143 and will also be affected by vehicles entering, leaving and parking.

It is a terrible shame all those mature trees were brutally and suddenly cut down, please don't cut down more.

Currently the drain for No 143 runs through the garden of 5, MVT and the shared driveway/planting of MVT. It will be a major concern if this drain is used for 9 new properties. I hope it will be routed down their own driveway.

Winton House, Gravel Path - Objects

(dated 19/10/17)

I am the owner of 5 Marina View Terrace ("MVT"), 145 Belswains Lane.

The planned provision for parking and manoeuvring of occupier cars, delivery vans, & visitors' cars is inadequate.

There is a shortage of local parking already.

Using the access drive as parking will be a noise nuisance for the occupiers of MVT. Why are No's 1&2 MVT not shown on the plan? They are close to the access drive to No 143 and will also be affected by vehicles entering, leaving and parking.

It is a terrible shame all those mature trees were brutally and suddenly cut down, please don't cut down more.

Currently the drain for No 143 runs through the garden of 5, MVT and the shared driveway/planting of MVT. It will be a major concern if this drain is used for 9 new properties. I hope it will be routed down their own driveway.

137 Belswains Lane - Objects

(dated 3/11/17)

This proposal is too dense for the area. Adjacent properties will be overlooked and lose privacy.

A block of flats and a close packed terrace is against the character of the area which is mainly detached or semi-detached houses.

There is no space for soft landscaping and tree planting in an area that has been cleared, in a locality that retains a "green" character.

Rain run-off from paved areas will exacerbate flooding in Belswains Lane.

14 parking spaces; maybe 2 per house and one per flat is inadequate, in local experience. It won't allow for growing families and guests.

On-street parking on Belswains Lane would obstruct traffic and access to adjacent properties; use of Pinecroft would impede emergency access. The access lane is unsuitable for the traffic volume generated by the homes. Parking here will cause serious disturbance to existing homes. Bin access from Belswains Lane is not in the proposal."

137 Belswains Lane - Objects (different person to above)

(dated 3/11/17)

I object to this development on the following grounds:

1. Over Development - Significantly more dense development than any other site in the area.
2. Parking & Road Safety
 - Not enough parking spaces provided
 - Insufficient turning within the site, increasing the chances of the multiple cars reversing out onto the roundabout. Nash Mills Wharf has been built with far too few car parking spaces

leading to issues on Red Lion Lane and accidents, this could happen here.

- Access doesn't appear sufficient for emergency services. Only 2.4m wide spaces shown, cars won't be so close to the wall in reality.

- Pineroft parking will increase with pedestrian access, this road already has significant access issues.

3. Privacy - Apartment windows overlook Pineroft houses

4. Right to Light - Pineroft house has light blocked

5. Sustainability - Significant vegetation and trees cleared, how will this be reinstated?

6. Bin storage - Logistics of two awkward site entrances?

139 Belswains Lane - Objects

(dated 29/1/18)

Work has clearly been commenced on site, large trenches have been dug and pipes appear to have been laid. Also earth has been raised against the fence which is owned and maintained by us at 139 Belswains Lane. The consultation period has not ended and no attempt at communication with neighbouring properties has been made. We feel this is in contempt of the process.

(dated 7/11/17)

We feel that the proposed development is an enormous over development of this section of Belswains Lane. The type of housing proposed is out of keeping with the surrounding roads, which consist of detached and semi-detached properties.

The access for the proposed development will be adjacent to a busy mini-roundabout at the entrance to Apsley Lock. There have been a number of accidents and many near-misses at this roundabout. The new entrance is very likely to lead to greater safety issues.

14 parking spaces are proposed which are insufficient for 9 properties. There is no facility for off-road parking in any of the surrounding roads which are already grossly overcrowded with parked cars.

Our property immediately borders the proposed development. We are a single-storey house. We are likely to be overlooked and our privacy will be severely compromised by the proposed parking area.

Our local drains experience many problems, can they cope with more?

Local schools very over-subscribed.

(dated 3/11/17)

As your records likely show, there is no 141 Belswains Lane, so we are immediately next door to the proposed development.

We feel that the proposal represents an enormous over development of this section of Belswains Lane. There are several reasons for this outlined below.

Access: The access for the proposed development is to be onto Belswains Lane, it will be adjacent to a busy mini-roundabout at the entrance to Apsley Lock. There have been a number of accidents at this roundabout and another entrance onto this roundabout, which will also be slightly offset, is very likely to lead to further safety issues. When the development at 145 Belswains Lane was granted permission, it was on the instruction that they moved the access to the furthest point from the roundabout.

Parking: In the proposal it states that there will be 14 parking bays. This is insufficient for 9 properties as most are now 2 car households. There is no facility for off-road parking in any of the surrounding roads. The Apsley Lock development opposite is grossly overcrowded with parked cars.

Type of housing: All residences in this section of Belswains Lane and the surrounding roads, i.e. Pinecroft and Great Elms Road, are one or two storey detached or semi-detached houses, no blocks of flats. This style of housing is out of keeping with the local area.

Loss of Privacy/ overlooking: We are a single storey property with huge potential to be overlooked, especially along the side where residents will be parking and accessing their cars. Young children live and play here, we feel their safety may be compromised by loss of privacy.

Drainage: The sewer, which runs along this section of the road is overloaded. Ourselves and a number of neighbours have experienced multiple problems with the drains over the past few years. Even in heavy rain, the drains struggle to cope and back flow into the street.

Other: All the local schools in this part of Hemel Hempstead are massively over-subscribed. More and more housing appears to be being built with little evidence of any measures to provide more school places. We cannot see that our local area will be enhanced by this particular development.

145 Belswains Lane Management Company Ltd - objects
(not dated)

145 Belswains Lane Management Company Ltd manages the common areas including the driveway at Marina View Terrace, 145 Belswains Lane. The proposed development wraps around Marina View Terrace on two sides and will have a significant impact. Our main concerns are:

Road Safety: We have already witnessed accidents at the roundabout by No. 143. We presume that the experts at Herts Highways will not permit any access arrangement which makes the road more dangerous.

Parking and Turning: There is a shortage of parking locally. Local residents compete for roadside parking with commuters parking for Apsley Station. The Apsley marina development uses a residents parking scheme to control their spaces. We do not consider that the proposed development at No. 143 provides enough off-road spaces. We have 9 spaces for 10 bedrooms. No. 143 has planned only 14 spaces for 23 bedrooms and their turning area/drop off area appears very small given that the access driveway seems too narrow for a 3 point turn (it is to be expected that delivery drivers will use the driveway to access the properties unless they are to have a Pinecroft address and postcodes).

Sewage drainage: The drain for No 143 was renewed when the land at No. 145 was developed but it was not envisaged that it would need to accommodate the waste-water and sewage from 9 properties. If the land at No. 143 is developed, then we would much appreciate it if the current sewage drain were to be closed off and a new one built under the access driveway of No. 143. We would not like to see the results of a blockage flooding over our gardens and driveway.

Rainwater drainage: Our gardens quickly become waterlogged in wet weather. We are concerned that the recent removal of trees at No. 143 and the construction of buildings and patios covering a larger area could lead to more rain running off the land and driveway at No. 143 and downhill into our properties. This would harm our fences and bee-friendly planting and make our lawns unusable. We would appreciate it if every effort could be made to ensure that rainwater is contained well within the boundaries of No. 143.

Greenery: We were shocked and saddened by the sudden felling of the mature and majestic trees in the garden of No. 143. Native trees such as Oak provide a habitat for local wildlife and all trees play an important role in air quality and contribute to the character of the area. We miss them and would have liked to see more trees and less buildings in the proposed

development.

147 Belswains Lane - Objects

(dated 28/10/17)

I very strongly object to the above application on the following grounds:

1. The plan will create excessive over development of the site, with insufficient parking provided.
2. Home owners vehicles would create both major parking problems in Pinecroft and major hazards exiting on to the Apsley Lock roundabout.
3. The development is NOT in keeping with the area.

149 Belswains Lane - Objects

(dated 10/4/18)

Extreme over development and is out of character in our neighbourhood. Shows no green landscaping especially considering the devastating loss of trees we have already experienced from the site. There will be overlooking of adjacent properties, an increase in noise and a consequent loss of privacy. People already park on the pavement outside 145 Belswains Lane. Proposed parking is highly inadequate. Proposed access off a roundabout is highly dangerous. Local residents have difficulty siting traffic when leaving driveways due to parking on the pavement. The development of Marina View was only allowed to proceed, by having its entrance offset, away from the Apsley Lock roundabout. The length and narrowness of the access lane is unsuitable and will pose a problem for deliveries and emergency services. Existing traffic congestion already exist in Pinecroft. The area already suffers inadequate foul drainage, sewage spills and local flooding. Further development will make the situation worse.

Briffa Phillips Design and Access statement states "we have thought carefully about how disabled people will be able to use this proposed development". In my professional opinion, the extreme compact nature of the scheme, means these houses do not lend themselves to being adapted for wheelchair users. There is a vast shortage of family homes in Dacorum that can be made wheelchair adaptable. The more the Council keep agreeing to compact home designs the worse the situation will become. These small cramped homes have no breathing space and exclude the needs of people who have disabilities.

(dated 12/1/18)

The description just mentions the flats but the drawings still show 5 terrace houses. Please correct your information. Extreme over development and is out of character in our neighbourhood. Shows no green landscaping especially considering the devastating loss of trees we have already experienced from the site. There will be overlooking of adjacent properties, an increase in noise and a consequent loss of privacy. People already park on the pavement outside 145 Belswains Lane. Proposed parking is highly inadequate. Proposed access off a roundabout is highly dangerous. Local residents have difficulty siting traffic when leaving driveways due to parking on the pavement. The development of Marina View was only allowed to proceed, by having its entrance offset, away from the Apsley Lock roundabout. Existing traffic congestion already exist in Pinecroft. The area already suffers inadequate foul drainage, sewage spills and local flooding. Further development will make the situation worse.

(dated 15/11/17)

Extreme over development and is out of character in our neighbourhood. Shows no green landscaping especially considering the devastating loss of trees we have already experienced from the site. There will be overlooking of adjacent properties, an increase in noise and a consequent loss of privacy. People already park on the pavement outside 145 Belswains Lane. Proposed parking is highly inadequate. Proposed access off a roundabout is highly dangerous. Local residents have difficulty siting traffic when leaving driveways due to parking on the

pavement. The development of Marina View was only allowed to proceed, by having its entrance offset, away from the Apsley Lock roundabout. The length and narrowness of the access lane is unsuitable and will pose a problem for deliveries and emergency services. Existing traffic congestion already exist in Pinecroft. The area already suffers inadequate foul drainage, sewage spills and local flooding. Further development will make the situation worse.

(dated 30/10/17)

- We already suffer an increase in noise in the summer months from our new neighbours and increased parking issues.
- The proposal shows no green landscaping especially considering the devastating loss of trees we have already experienced from this site. Including more than one tree which we believe had TPOs attached to them.
 - There will be overlooking of adjacent properties, an increase in noise and a consequent loss of privacy.

Parking/Access:

- Since the construction at 145 Belswains Lane an increased number of people are parking on the pavement outside 145 Belswains Lane. The proposed 14 car parking bays for 9 dwellings, 23 bedrooms is highly inadequate and does not allow for growing families and visitors parking.
- Proposed access off a roundabout is highly dangerous. There are already accidents in this location. Local residents have difficulty siting traffic when leaving driveways due to people parking on the pavement outside the new development (145 Belswains Lane). Please note that the development of Marina View Terrace (145 Belswains Lane) was only allowed to proceed, by having its entrance offset, away from the Apsley Lock roundabout.
- The length and narrowness of the access lane is highly unsuitable for the associated flow of traffic. Parking on this lane will pose a problem for deliveries, Fire and Ambulance services to the site. Parking on the Lane will also cause disturbance and noise to the neighbouring properties.
- Making use of access via Pinecroft will also be highly opposed by residents. Existing access problems and traffic congestion already exist in Pinecroft, due to customers using The Denes and other companies based on Pinecroft. Access to a further 9 homes from Pinecroft will exacerbate the problem and will become an overflow carpark for the new development.
- Neither access location will cope with such a highly over developed site.

Infrastructure:

- Drainage:- The area already suffers inadequate foul drainage. We have personally had two huge sewage spills across our drive in recent years. Heavy rainfall also causes local flooding to Belswains Lane. Further development will only make the situation worse. Putting pressure on the sewers and reducing porous green land to soak up rain water.
- Local amenities:- A 23 bedroom development puts pressure on local resources such as nearby GP surgeries, schools and recreational facilities. In particular the local schools are oversubscribed. Have the council addressed these issues?

Local Character:

- I have already mentioned the loss of green landscaping. The architecturally unimaginative and highly compact proposed terrace housing along with the block of flats are out of character in our neighbourhood which is predominantly detached or semi-detached houses which sit amongst green spaces.

I hope that you take the above comments on board and reject such a scheme from ever taking place.

6 Pinecroft - Objects

(dated 14/11/17)

I wholeheartedly agree with all other objections. I object on these grounds:

1. Over Development - Significantly more dense development than any other site in the area
2. Parking & Road Safety
 - Not enough parking spaces provided
 - Insufficient turning within the site, increasing the chances of the multiple cars reversing out onto the roundabout. Nash Mills Wharf has far too few car parking spaces leading to issues on Red Lion Lane and accidents, this could happen here.
 - Access doesn't appear sufficient for emergency services. Only 2.4m wide spaces shown, cars won't be so close to the wall in reality.
 - Pineroft parking will increase with pedestrian access, this road already has HUGE access issues.
3. Privacy - Apartment windows overlook Pineroft houses
4. Right to Light - Pineroft house has light blocked
5. Sustainability - Significant vegetation and trees cleared, how will this be reinstated?
6. Bin storage - Logistics of two awkward site entrances.

8 Pineroft - Objects

(dated 7/11/17)

- **Access** from the Belswains lane proposed development to Pineroft via the existing "hole in the hedge" access. It seems painfully obvious to us that by allowing this pedestrian access to continue, the residents at the new development will simply park in Pineroft and walk through to their houses. There is nothing like enough parking spaces allowed in the plans for the amount of houses proposed.
- **Dangerous access/egress from the proposed site:** having looked at the plans, I would like to see the exact measurements allowed for emergency vehicle access/egress into the proposed development? When the cars are parked up the road (in the parking spaces allotted to the houses), what space is left for Fire engines/ambulances?
- **Site traffic:** Does this mean the site traffic for the build will use Pineroft as an easy access to the site?
- **Red Lion Lane:** we only need look to the dangerous parking that has appeared since the new Nash Mills developments have sprung up. Why are we allowing such huge volume of houses to be built with no thought to the amount of parking that it *actually* requires? 1.5 parking spaces per house (I believe this is how its calculated?) is just sheer greed on the half of the developers.
- **Parking** on Pineroft is already becoming squeezed. I watch people (on a daily basis) who do not live on the road, park here *all day* (presumably to walk to Apsley Station?). People already park across our drive and have no consideration for the residents.
- I fear the only solution will be a **residents parking permit scheme**, but I would be really loathed to see this as it has a huge cost implication for all of the residents.
- **Tescos and shops** at the mouth of Pineroft already cause congestion into the road, add to that the **builders merchant** and all their lorries, access/egress is already fairly awful for Pineroft residents.
- **Extra cars:** what happens when a further **8 houses** have access to park their cars on the street? A potential of **well over 16 extra vehicles?**
- **Overdevelopment:** having watched (to my horror), the extension of the house on the Cart Track (which backs onto my garden) I simply cannot believe we are considering yet more in-filling in this area? I believe there is also another huge extension / new house being built on the Cart Track too?

- **Destruction of 200 year old oak:** I understand that a 200 year old oak tree that had preservation order on it, was felled by the developers / owners of this site? I am utterly disgusted by this. I would like to know what action is being taken about this? A simple fine is *not* enough, after all, what is a few thousand pounds to someone who has enough money to build 8 houses?

Aside from everything I've mentioned above, for the residents of Pinecroft, especially those nearest to the proposed development, the idea of yet more houses being crowded onto such a small space and everything that will come with that is untenable.

Where is the infrastructure to support all these new developments? I don't see any so far? No new schools, No new hospital, Drs, road systems...?

11 Pinecroft - Objects
(dated 5/11/17)

We would like to formally object to this development. The reasons are;

- Car parking; because of the access to Pinecroft, it will be geographically more convenient for new residents to park in Pinecroft than the car parking offered along the new access road (off Belswains Lane). It is a certainty that Pinecroft would be used as an overflow car park. The majority of the time I cannot currently park in front of my house, before adding potentially 23 + car drivers into the equation.
- Design appearance; this current proposal is "over developing" the plot (e.g. 23 bedrooms and if the current Pinecroft Street Scene was kept it would be 12 bedrooms!). Pinecroft is a street of semi detached properties each with clear gaps between each property, which would now be truncated with terraced properties. Therefore, the overall appearance is not in keeping with the current appearance of the Pinecroft street scene.
- Safe Access; access to Pinecroft is frequently limited with cars queuing on Barnacles Road to access and park in "The Deans" car park adjacent to the shops. This can lead to waiting times of up to 10 minutes to access Pinecroft. This encourages residents of Pinecroft to try to weave through the waiting cars to return to their residence and it is highly probable that increased demand to access Pinecroft will result in an accident.

We really want to stress we are positive about 143 Belswains redevelopment in general, however the current plans are excessively detrimental to the residents of Pinecroft.

12 Pinecroft - Objects

(dated 2/11/17)

The application proposes 9 new homes fronting onto Pinecroft. This constitutes a very significant increase in the number of homes on a small cul-de-sac which already suffers from parking and access problems at peak times. Although limited parking provision for the new homes is proposed to the rear of the properties its clear that many owners of the proposed properties will find it more convenient to park on Pinecroft to the front of their properties rather than potential tens of metres away to the rear of their properties. This appears likely to cause a significant increase in the number of properties on Pinecroft will contribute to additional traffic and noise pollution in the road.

13 Pinecroft - Objects

(dated 20/12/17)

Our neighbour Peter Hollingberry has passed on a copy of your letter to him dated 7 December re amended and /or additional information for the above mentioned planning application.

We have read his comments concerning the new view of the proposed new properties facing Pinecroft , & the existing semi-detached houses 13 &14 Pinecroft , and agree with Peter's comments in his email to you dated 12 December, & concur that the current proposal by the Developer is 'over development' & not in line with the existing properties on Pinecroft.

I submitted my original comments to you on 2 November 2017. Looking at the Council's Planning Applications Website yesterday, I noticed that as well as the applicants submission to you on 7 December, a Transport Technical Note was included, dated 13 November(after the date of my submission).

I have read through the applicant's Transport Technical Note and refer you to paragraph 5.5 on page 13. They have not looked at the effects of additional vehicles and of their journeys in & out of Pinecroft. I would also refer you to Dacorum Core Strategy 2006-2031, Policy CS9, paragraph 2.10, on page 4, particularly consideration of 'the cumulative effects of incremental developments'. In addition to the above mentioned Planning Application, there is also the proposed Planning Application No 4/01584/17/MFA for a Mosque in Barnacres.

Pinecroft is a cul-de-sac which is mainly residential , but also provides access to the Denes Shops & a Builders Merchants. The only exit to get in & out of Pinecroft, is onto Barnacres. This is a very busy junction & is often congested with existing parked vehicles, & others vehicles waiting to visit the Denes Shops. This already causes a tailback into Barnacres. Both the proposed Planning Applications mentioned, will make the current difficult situation, impossible.

(dated 2/11/17 and 13/11/17)

I strongly object to the above mentioned planning application, on behalf of my family, on the following grounds :-

The proposed development is out of character with the other properties in Pinecroft. The five 3 bedrooed terrace of houses, will not be in keeping with the mostly 3/4 bedrooed semidetached houses, together with at least two detached houses, currently there.

The Planning Application represents an over-development of this small plot of land, when there is currently one house on the site, which was surrounded by trees,(swiftly felled in August this year). The proposal will mean loss of garden land & of its open aspect.

The proposed pedestrian access onto Pinecroft will result in our road becoming an overspill car park for the new residents of the development, and their friends & family, together with additional delivery vehicles. This will increase existing problems, with vehicle access in & out of Pinecroft, causing queues in Barnacres at peak times (Pinecroft is a cul-de-sac).

14 Pinecroft - Objects

(dated 18/4/18)

20 Bedroom in a continuous terrace for given frontage is out of keeping with Pinecroft housing:

-

- All Pinecroft houses are semi-detached or detached
- The frontage ratio of bedrooms of Pinecroft to new development is 1:2 (Double the density of existing Pinecroft properties)

Access to Pinecroft via footpath to new development: -

- A throughway to Apsley station, via Apsley Lock will exist, due to no indicated gate.

- No pavement is provided for pedestrians who use this short cut route in the new development's access drive to Belswains Lane

Bins collected from Pinecroft

- Bin collection day, Blue and Green Bins day: -
- 5 x 2 large Bins for houses
- 1 x 2 large Bin for Flats
- 1 x 1 large Kitchen waste bin for Flats
- 5 Kitchen waste caddies for houses
- Totalling 13 large Bins and 5 caddies
- Restrictive Pavement access in Pinecroft for pedestrians using this shortcut.
- Attraction to park in Pinecroft, due to the short cut to station for commuters
- Additional parking and delivery problems for both residents and existing businesses in Pinecroft and the Denes.

Dedicated Parking spots for residents of the new development: -

- Is there a facility to ensure that non-residents do not park on the dedicated allocated parking spaces of the residents?
- Are there any restrictions on residents of the development selling their parking spaces to non-residents, leaving subsequent dwellers of the same property without parking?

Lighting restrictions: -

14 & 15 Pinecroft will have restriction of natural light into their properties, due to the height and close vicinity of the proposed development.

(dated 21/12/17)

Additional view provided of 143 Belswains Lane proposed development, with a Pinecroft semi-detached house.

The detached house consists of: -

- one 3 bedroom house, (13 Pinecroft)
- one three bedroom house, converted to 4 Bedroom, (14 Pinecroft)
- Sum of 7 bedrooms for the two properties
- Frontal length ratio of detached house is 1 : 2.4 of proposed development
- Using 1:2.4, frontage ratio, gives a relative 16.8 bedrooms for the new development, compared to the 23 bedrooms proposed.

What has not been shown is: -

- Each semi-detached property, in Pinecroft, has at least one dedicated parking place, with room for another car or more to be parked in front of the property.
- A 3.4 metre gap exists between each semi-detached house

Therefore Frontal length ratio of detached house is 1:2.15 of proposed development

Working to this frontal length to bedrooms ratio gives: -

- 15.5 bedrooms for 7 bedrooms per completed detached house (e.g. 13 and 14

Pinecroft, as displayed)

· 17.2 bedrooms for 8 bedrooms per detached house (if both houses were 4 Bedroom)

This is major overdevelopment. If gaps were incorporated between residencies, to be in keeping with Pinecroft, this would further lower the bedroom count for the proposed development.

(dated 30/10/17)

My concerns about the effects upon my family, due to the plans for the proposed development of 143 Belswains Lane are: -

- The housing density proposed is an over development, being far above anything in existence in this vicinity.
- The design of the proposed properties is out of keeping with the properties of Pinecroft, which only has semi-detached and detached houses.
- The proposed allowance of 14 parking spots, with 23 bedrooms, where locally most families now have 2 plus cars, is insufficient and likely to end up making Pinecroft an overflow car park, due to the proposed access gate. With there already being major parking and traffic flow problems, at the junction of Barnacres Road and The Denes, due to the Tesco's Express, the Builders Merchants and the MOT/repair garage, this would exacerbate an already bad situation.
- The majority of natural light that comes into our study would be blocked off.
- Privacy has already been affected with the removal of the considerable number of trees, that were upon the property, making it possible for residents of Marina View Terrace to now see directly into our house and vice-versa. The proposed new development itself, should it be approved, could further infringe upon our privacy and therefore the reinstatement of trees and appropriate fencing already needs to be addressed.

15 Pinecroft - Objects

(dated 5/11/17)

More than anything, we were shocked to learn about the extent of the construction that is being planned by Bull Homes Ltd. This is for the following reasons, that would greatly impinge on our living conditions:

1. Loss of sight or overshadowing.

The flats are planned to be constructed right next to our property on land that extends beyond the back of our house and into our garden. Their construction lead to a significant loss of light to our home in addition to that which falls in our garden.

2. Overlooking/ loss of privacy

For the above reasons, we are very concerned about the consequent unacceptable loss of privacy for us, following the construction to the levels mentioned in the proposal

3. Adequacy of parking

The back entrance to 143 Belswains Lane, lies just outside our driveway. As you can understand, we are very concerned about the consequences of cars being parked in such a limited cul-de-sac area. We can only imagine how many visitors these proposed homes would invite. There is already significant disruption getting into the Pinecroft cul-de-sac due to the cars attempting to park at the Denes Shopping Centre.

4. Noise and disturbance resulting from use

The proposed plans include the construction of garden spaces for a huge number of people and houses. Consequently, we are worried about the inevitable noise and disturbance resulting from the completion of so many houses and flats.

5. Visual intrusion

The construction of the multi-storey flats will obviously enable the resident to have a view into our personal home and garden space. This again we feel is unacceptable.

We sincerely hope that all of the above significant reasons will prevent the construction of the proposed plans. We are aware that many of our neighbours are equally concerned about this and are hoping for a similar outcome.

18 Pinecroft - Objects (dated 7/11/17)

With regard to the proposed development at 143 Belswains Lane whilst we are opposed to this we are more concerned about the access from this into Pinecroft.

We assume that anyone can walk up from Belswains Lane and through the proposed gate leading for us to a greater security risk as I have a van parked on my driveway with a lot of tools in side and could make a quicker getaway back through the way they came.

Also further up from our garden an extension was built a couple of years ago, This house is in another road and we received notification informing us of this and asked us if we approved, We have had nothing about this proposed development.

I have a large driveway at the end of Pinecroft so parking for me is not a problem but will be for some residents.

19 Pinecroft - Objects (dated 23/4/18)

One further point regarding the application (which I forgot to include below) is that the proposed building elevations differ to the existing elevation of 14 Pinecroft (and that side of the street in general). In order to ensure continuity of street character and scene, any development (in whatever the final form may be) should respect the existing building elevations and not have a higher elevation.

(dated 17/4/18)

Updated plans submitted in April'18 do not address any of the concerns previously raised by local residents. The developer is still ploughing ahead with a proposal that aims to maximise the number of dwellings on the site with scant consideration for the nature and character of the surrounding area and properties.

Statements in the application that suggest the proposed development is a 'natural continuation' of the Pinecroft street-scene and will 'add to the quality of the built environment' in the area cannot be given any credence by anyone who has been in the area and has seen it for themselves. These statements have probably been included in the application documents as a cynical attempt to distract from the simple fact that these plans are in no way suitable for Pinecroft or the wider area.

I would also highlight the potential material loss of privacy due to windows overlooking living areas and the garden at 19 Pinecroft - an issue which nothing in the plans aims to mitigate.

Briffa Phillips Design and Access statement states "we have thought carefully about how disabled people will be able to use this proposed development". In my professional opinion, the

extreme compact nature of the scheme, means these houses do not lend themselves to being adapted for wheelchair users. There is a vast shortage of family homes in Dacorum that can be made wheelchair adaptable. The more the Council keep agreeing to compact home designs the worse the situation will become. These small cramped homes have no breathing space and exclude the needs of people who have disabilities.

(dated 18/12/17)

The recently submitted additional drawing that shows the view of the proposed development from Pinecroft only goes to show how out of keeping with the existing buildings this proposal is. Any new development should be of a similar nature and character with the existing properties on Pinecroft (i.e. semi-detached, generous plot sizes, ample on-site parking and plenty of garden/green space).

It is also worth noting that the proposed development is toward the end of Pinecroft where a number of the properties have larger driveways/gardens and internal areas - this should be taken into consideration in the design of any new proposed developments to ensure continuity of street scene and character of the area.

(dated 6/11/17)

I object in the strongest terms. Main reasons:

-The proposed scheme is an example of gross over-development and 'garden grabbing'. Clearly not enough parking provision. This is a case of packing in as many dwellings as possible with no consideration given to the character and nature of surrounding properties and area

-A major concern is that Pinecroft may become an overflow car park for the scheme, particularly as a direct access route from the development to Pinecroft is being proposed

-The scheme design is not in keeping with existing properties on Pinecroft (4 and 5 bedroom houses with generous plot sizes)

-There will be significant visual intrusion from the scheme and it will adversely affect the street scene at Pinecroft (in fact, it already has given the recent felling of the large, mature trees that were on the plot. This will only be exacerbated if the scheme is approved)

(dated 3/11/17)

1. Overdevelopment and Parking Provision

The proposed scheme is of a high density that is not in keeping with the area and, in our view, inappropriate given the total land area available. The scheme proposes 14 car parking spaces. Given the clear tendency for most residences to have more than one vehicle, this provision does not appear adequate – one only needs to observe the parking situation at nearby areas such as Apsley Lock, and the more recently developed Nash Mills Wharf, to understand the consequences of ill-thought-out parking provision and design.

Of primary concern is the possibility that residents in the new development may use Pinecroft as an additional car parking facility given the plans suggest there will be a direct access route from the development into Pinecroft.

Consideration must be given to reducing the density of any site development and closing off any direct access from the site to Pinecroft (and enforcing it via planning conditions/legal covenants) to avoid exacerbating parking and access issues that already exist.

Images 1 and 2 submitted demonstrate the land area of the proposed development is very similar to the land area of the nearby Marina View development, however it is clear that the density of the proposed development at 143 Belswains Lane is significantly higher than that seen at Marina View. Image 3 submitted was taken recently and demonstrates a situation often seen on Pinecroft (particularly on evenings and weekends) where vehicles are parked along the road causing obstruction and the potential for accidents when vehicles are travelling to/from the turning area outside 17/18/18a Pinecroft.

2. Design and Appearance

Section 2.1 of the Design and Access Statement states that this is "...an opportunity to reinforce the established 'urban grain' and character of development of Pinecroft" and "The proposals are laid out as a natural continuation of dwellings forming the street scene of Pinecroft". However, the nature of the properties proposed (small terraced houses and apartments) does not tie in with the character and nature of the properties on Pinecroft (four and five bedroom semi-detached properties with generous plot sizes) at all. It also appears from the planning submission that proposed building materials will not match those used in the existing properties on Pinecroft. In order to ensure any new development is sympathetic to existing areas, there must be a requirement to use materials that match existing properties (e.g. a requirement to use LBC Heather facing bricks, match roof tiles to surrounding properties etc) and, just as importantly, the design and nature of properties must be in keeping with the existing properties in the area. Image 4 submitted below demonstrates the vastly different nature of the existing properties at Pinecroft versus those proposed in the planning application.

3. Visual Intrusion

During summer 2017, the site at 143 Belswains Lane was cleared of a number of large, mature, and healthy trees. This has had a significant detrimental effect on the street scene at Pinecroft, and has already led to 'visual intrusion' from the site. It would appear that the owners/developers of the site have attempted to 'game the system' by removing trees prior to submitting the planning application, on the basis that leaving the trees on the site while the application was being considered may have reduced the chances of the application being seen in a favourable light.

Redevelopment of the site, particularly in the form proposed by the submitted application, will result in further deterioration of the street scene and character of Pinecroft. It is important that the natural screening that was provided by the mature trees on the site, which have now been felled, be restored. Furthermore, the hedges that currently exist on the boundary between the site at 143 Belswains Lane and Pinecroft should be retained and protected to ensure they cannot be removed at any point in the future.

It is considered that the proposed development at 143 Belswains Lane is unreasonable and the application should be rejected on the grounds that the proposed scheme is a clear case of over-development and 'garden-grabbing' with little consideration given to the character of surrounding properties and the potential impact on the amenity of local residents.

20 Pinecroft - Objects
(dated 2/11/17)

I wish to point to several observations over the period of time that have had, and will continue to be experienced, and probably in a more serious way if this proposed new development is approved in it's current form.

The original plans had no other accesses onto Pinecroft even when the road was adopted by the local authority from private ownership.

The cul-de-sac has been just that since its inception, with only one entrance via the Deans, but over the years this access has become more difficult at times due to the substantial increase in traffic due to expanding businesses towards the entrance (namely the building suppliers, the garage and Tesco's).

The statement relating to 'In keeping with the local area' does not tie in with semi-detached or detached properties adjacent to the proposed development. A typical household in Pinecroft supports 2-3 vehicles and owners of these properties have altered frontages to attempt to support the parking of these, but the extent of parking needs.

21 Pinecroft - Objects
(dated 5/11/17)

I wish to oppose the proposed development on the following basis:

The density of development is excessive both in terms of number of dwellings and bedrooms in relation to the size of the site.

There is inadequate parking provision on the site for the number of dwellings and habitable rooms which, together with the proposed pedestrian access onto Pinecroft, will lead to parking on Pinecroft exacerbating the extreme access difficulties caused by traffic using the shops at the Denes with traffic frequently backing up onto Barnacres Road causing a hazard.

The nature of the development with terraced housing and flats is out of keeping with both Pinecroft and Belswains Lane which are predominantly detached and semi detached houses on large plots.

The proposed access and egress from the site onto the roundabout in Belswains Lane will cause a significant hazard to traffic as there is insufficient visibility splay.

25 Pinecroft - Objects
(dated 30/10/17)

Firstly, I feel the proposed development is far too dense and not in keeping with the surrounding buildings. A precedent for this is the recent development undertaken at 145 Belswains Lane, Marina View Terrace, which I believe is of a similar area and has far fewer dwellings.

Secondly, is the proposed footpath access from the proposed development site into Pinecroft. I appreciate there is an existing gate from the garden of 143 Belswains Lane but I do not believe this should remain for an access into any proposed development. Having such an access is not required to visit the Denes shops, as the Cart Track is already available for that purpose from Belswains Lane. All that would happen is that Pinecroft would be used as an additional parking area for the proposed development and their visitors. Available road parking at Pinecroft is already full at evenings and weekends. When combined with the already congested situation with the egress and ingress to Pinecroft, which I'm sure you're aware of, because of the Denes shopping and Anderson's builders merchants, the ability to access the proposed development via Pinecroft should be declined.

97 Evans Wharf - Objects
(dated 29/1/18)

This planning application continues to appear to ride roughshod over normal considerations.

1. There was evidence of badger activity on the site, but this has recently been flattened. Is it in order to start groundworks (laying drains etc.) before planning permission is granted and the final layout of the site is known?
2. Soil has been built up against a neighbours fence, this is structurally inadvisable and may jeopardise the condition of the fence.

(dated 3/11/17)

1 I live in Evans Wharf which runs parallel to Belswains Lane.

2. Parking. These proposed plans for 143 Belswains Lane show overdevelopment of the site with inadequate parking for the accommodation planned. Parking in this area is already very limited and vehicles park on the verges of Belswains Lane. This reduces visibility at the junctions with the Apsley Lock development. If the proposed development at 143 goes ahead it is likely that this kind of parking will increase, making the junctions more hazardous.

3. Drainage. When there is heavy rain, the water runoff from Belswains Lane already creates mini rivers in Evans Wharf, more hard surfacing is unlikely to improve this.

4. Environmental impact. Local residents were very distressed by the felling of the mature trees and hedgerows on the site, there is no evidence of planned replanting.

Builders Yard, The Denes - Objects

(dated 6/11/17)

We are a successful company that has for many years provided services to the building industry and the public, based on the junction of Barnacres Rd & The Denes.

Our concerns are-There is an existing traffic/parking issue at Barnacres Rd&The Denes which leads to Pinecroft. This is mainly due to Tesco Express&at school times parents parking to walk to Nash Mills School. Causing access issues to Tune Tech,the shops& ourselves. We try to keep the road clear for our lorries, artics delivering to us and Tesco. This is made difficult by Tesco customers just parking any where they can down Pinecroft due to the lack of spaces.

The number of cars per family is currently 2 but the majority on Pinecroft having 4 +. Therefore it is likely that should the proposed have the indicated access into Pincroft the existing traffic/parking issues will be compounded, affecting all business noted and the residents of the Denes & Pinecroft.

6 Great Elms Road - Objects

(dated 6/11/17)

28 Wroxham Avenue, Hemel Hempstead - Objects

(dated 10/11/17)

I frequently use Belswains Lane & visit family there.

It is a very busy road & the parking in the vicinity is woefully inadequate. As far as I can see the proposed development can only make matters worse. The plans contain insufficient parking spaces for the likely number of residents which will adversely impact on the surrounding area.

This appears to be a prime example of over development. The main driver being the maximising of profit rather than sympathetic development of the site.

