

4/00147/FUL	DEMOLITION OF DETACHED DWELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF FIVE FLATS WITH REPOSITIONED ACCESS AND PARKING
Site Address	FAIRVIEW, HIGHFIELD LANE, HEMEL HEMPSTREAD, HP2 5JE
Applicant	Mr Pereira & Mrs D'Costa, Fairview
Case Officer	Andrew Parrish
Referral to Committee	Called in by Cllr W. Wyatt-Lowe

1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED**

2. Summary

2.1 The proposed redevelopment of the existing dwelling, Fairview, with a block of five 2 bedroom flats is acceptable in principle in accordance with Policy CS4 and is considered to cause no harm to the character or appearance of this residential neighbourhood. The conservation Officer has not raised any objection to the demolition of the existing dwelling on account of any heritage interest. The proposed size and scale would not be discordant with the street scene or appear visually overbearing in relation to the adjoining bungalow, Rosebank, and the proposed design and materials are considered to harmonise with the traditional character of the area. The proposal is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site or to result in a cramped appearance, and the proposed increase in density and flatted form of development would cause no material detriment to the character of the area. The proposal would not set an undesirable precedent as each application should be judged on its merits. There would be no harm to adjoining residential amenities and the proposal would provide a safe means of access and satisfactory off-road parking, landscaping, private amenity space and supporting facilities in accordance with Policies CS10, 11, 12, 13 and saved Policies 58, 99 and 100. In view of the above the application is recommended for approval.

3. Site Description

3.1 The application site comprises a detached two storey dwelling located on the southern side of Highfield Lane close to its junction with Queensway within the Adeyfield area of Hemel Hempstead. The site is approximately 2 km from the town centre. The surrounding area is residential and comprises a variety of designs and layouts of mainly mid to late C20 2 storey detached houses in a mature setting. The dwelling which is an extended Edwardian villa sits on a relatively large sloping site such that properties in Apple Orchard to the east are set approximately 2.55 m higher whilst the adjoining bungalow Rosebank immediately to the west sits approximately 1.3 m lower than the application property. The frontage is open with a lawn and hardstanding, set above pavement level with a brick retaining wall and the house is set back approximately 7 m from the front boundary. The east boundary with Apple Orchard properties is defined variously by close boarded fencing, chain link fencing and hedging. The rear boundary is defined by a 1.7 m high close boarded fence and the west boundary with Rosebank is defined by a 1.3 m high chain link fence with sporadic shrub planting. A number of trees have recently been felled but three remain

within the rear garden.

4. Proposal

4.1 Permission is sought to demolish the existing dwelling and to construct a two and a half storey block of five 2-bed flats with car parking to the frontage, relocated access and landscaping.

5. Relevant Planning History

5.1 None in last 12 years

6. Policies

6.1 National Policy Guidance

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

6.2 Adopted Core Strategy

Policies NP1, CS1, 4, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 29, 31, 32, 35

Appendices 1, 3, 5 and 7

6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policies 13, 54, 58, 99, 100, 111, 129

6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

- Residential Character Areas - HCA23 Adeyfield North
- Accessibility Zones for the Application of Parking Standards (July 2002)
- Environmental Guidelines (May 2004)
- Water Conservation & Sustainable Drainage (June 2005)
- Energy Efficiency & Conservation (June 2006)

6.5 Advice Notes and Appraisals

- Sustainable Development Advice Note (Dec 2016)
- Refuse Storage Guidance Note (Feb 2015)

7. Constraints

- None

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

The application follows pre-application advice and several amendment iterations during the course of the application.

Main issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Policy and principle and heritage impact
- Suitability of the site for residential development
- Impact on character and appearance of area
- Impact on highway safety
- Impact on residential amenity

Policy and principle and heritage impact

9.2 The proposal is to demolish the existing house and erect, in its place, a new detached building which would accommodate five flats, with car parking to the frontage.

9.3 As the property lies within the town boundary, there is no objection in principle to the development of the site in accordance with Policy CS4 of the adopted Core Strategy. The Character Area statement (HCA23) indicates that there is limited development opportunity in this area, but that redevelopment, infill development or conversion of dwellings into smaller units may be acceptable, subject to the general development approach for the area set out in the Development principles.

9.4 The proposed development would result in the demolition of the existing building. Whilst it has some period character, and is clearly a landmark building when entering Highfield Lane from Queensway, given the circumstances identified by the applicant in relation to its design, history of extensions and poor structural condition, and also the fact that the Conservation Officer has not indicated that it merits being locally listed, it is considered that no objection can be raised to its demolition in principle subject to an acceptable alternative development.

Suitability of the site for residential development

9.5 The application site lies within the Character Area of Adeyfield North which is described as, 'A residential area possessing extensive variety in design, layout and age. It is part of the wider Adeyfield neighbourhood together with the Adeyfield South Character..... Overall it has little unifying character.."

9.6 The site is considered highly suitable in location terms given its siting within the built up area, rather than a green field or Green Belt site. Its siting within an established residential area would be considered appropriate for residential development. It is relatively accessible to shopping facilities, schools, jobs, leisure and other facilities,

thereby limiting the need for motorised transport with walking, cycling or public transport options.

9.7 The site has good road access and its rectangular shape can provide good provision of private amenity space, car parking, landscaping and other facilities such as bin storage. Due to the proximity of surrounding residential properties, any proposal will need to be carefully designed to ensure there is no material harm to amenities.

9.8 The plot is larger than average within the area and therefore suitable for making more efficient use of land without significantly compromising the character or appearance of the area. The density of the development would be 48 dph which is above that set in the Development Principles of 30 to 35 dph. However, as a single building on the site, arguably the development will not appear as dense as say, a development of 5 individual houses with access road, each with their own individual garden, off-street parking space(s), bin storage and front entrance door. As a relatively large plot, the site can accommodate the size of development proposed in the form of flats and is not considered overdeveloped. Sharing facilities in the form of flats represents an efficient use of the site and is not considered to be achieved at the expense of the living environment of occupiers. The density achieved would not result in any material harm to the character of the local area in this case and would optimise the use of the site as required by saved Policy 10. The small uplift in density is also considered to be appropriate and in line with NPPF guidance that seeks to ensure policies and decisions "*promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.*"

9.9 The site is considered suitable for residential development, and would comply with Policies CS11 and 12.

Impact on character and appearance of area

9.10 Policies CS10, 11, 12 and 13 of the Core Strategy are overarching policies applicable to all development which seek a high quality of design in all development proposals.

9.11 The Development Principle in Character Appraisal HCA23 Adeyfield North set down a number of design and layout principles.

9.12 In terms of layout and scale, the proposed new building would be set back further from the frontage by some 7 m and occupy a larger footprint than existing. It would also result in the loss of some open space to its west side nearest the bungalow, Rosebank. However, there is no clearly defined building line in this part of Highfield Lane and the increase in overall footprint is not considered unacceptable given the larger than average size of plot in this instance, and the fact that the siting would still maintain a reasonable gap with Rosebank of some 4.8 m. The gap to the boundary with Apple Orchard properties would also be increased by approximately 0.5 m. In these terms the proposal would not appear cramped and is considered to accord with guidance in the Development Principles which states that spacing should be in the range 2m to 5 m.

9.13 Although there would be a large amount of hard surfacing to the frontage, the layout would still provide good opportunities for soft landscaping to both the frontage and the Rosebank side which, subject to full details, would ensure the proposed car parking area,

bin storage and footpaths would be well screened and landscaped, and would maintain the spacious and mature character and appearance of the area. Although a number of trees on the site were recently felled, the proposals include 5 replacement trees plus the retention of three existing trees within the rear garden. The proposals are considered to accord with Policies CS12, CS13, CS29 and saved Policies 99 and 100.

9.14 The proposal would accommodate a second floor within the roofspace. However, whilst the Development Principles state that housing should not normally exceed two storeys, the design of the building in this case would have the general appearance, height and scale of a two storey building with the exception of a single modest dormer to the front, a gable window to the front and rooflights to all other elevations. Given the distance from adjoining development, the mature setting and the fact that there is no consistent dwelling type visible in this immediate area, the proposal is not considered to be materially harmful to the street scene.

9.15 In terms of the adjoining bungalow, Rosebank, the height and scale of the proposed building is considered to maintain an acceptable relationship to the bungalow in street scene terms that would essentially be no worse than existing. The existing dwelling is already high and relatively deep in relation to Rosebank. The proposal will be closer to the boundary but the flank wall would be shallower in depth and broken up to reduce the bulk and mass of the flank wall. The hipped roof design will also soften the disparity in height and scale. Furthermore, in terms of height, the ridge of the element closest to Rosebank would be a metre lower than the existing dwelling whilst the eaves height would be 1.35 m lower than existing, being only 200 mm above the ridge of the bungalow in comparison to 2.1 m for the existing dwelling. It should also be noted that the bulk and mass of the building would be further broken up to the frontage with the element closest Rosebank set back by 0.6 m. Given these considerations, it is considered that the proposal would not be visually overbearing in relation to the adjoining bungalow or materially harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal would accord with the Development Principles that state that new housing should respect the type, size and mass of nearby and adjoining development.

9.16 In terms of the detailed design, there are no special requirements within the Development Principles. However, the proposal would be of traditional brick and tile appearance with a hipped roof form and a single modest dormer to the front. Modest sized rooflights are proposed to the sides and rear. The detailed design features within the building would reflect the traditional characteristics of the surrounding area. Although dormers are not a significant feature of the surrounding neighbourhood, there are nevertheless examples on nearby dwellings, including rooflights. But the question that would have to be answered is what the harm would be. In officers' view there is no harm and it is considered that the overall design approach is an acceptable one in this location.

9.17 In terms of the type of development proposed, comprising flats, the Development Principles state that there are no special requirements regarding the type of housing in this character area, but that proposals should pay respect to the type, style, size and mass of nearby and adjoining development. For the reasons given above, the proposal is not considered to result in any material harm to the surrounding area in terms of its built form, style, size or massing. With regards to the proposed flatted occupation of the building, there will be very limited external evidence that the building is divided horizontally into flats. The appearance of the building will generally be well assimilated into the surrounding character of single family dwellings. Whilst there will be a large

car park on the frontage this will be well screened and landscaped and finished in high quality materials comprising permeable block pavements and permeable resin bonded gravel. The flatted form in this case is not considered harmful to the character of the area. The proposal is therefore considered to respect nearby and adjoining development in accordance with the Development Principles.

9.18 The proposal would not set an undesirable precedent for flatted development as each application should be judged on its merits.

9.19 Subject to details of materials, fenestration, hard and soft landscaping, the proposal would comply with Policies CS10, 11, 12 and 13 of the Core Strategy.

Impact on highway safety and footpaths

9.20 Parking provision should accord with the maximum parking standards as assessed against saved Policy 58 and Appendix 5 of the Borough Plan.

9.21 Parking provision, comprising 8 parking bays on the frontage would more than comply with the requirement of 7.5 spaces set out in Appendix 5. Five of the spaces would be assigned and three would be visitor spaces in accordance with standards. The proposals would include off-road turning provision allowing cars to enter and exit the site in forward gear.

9.22 The existing access would be closed and a new vehicular access introduced into the centre of the frontage punching through the existing retaining wall.

9.23 Residents have expressed concerns regarding potential on-street parking, increased traffic generation and highway danger. However, there would be more than adequate off-road parking which can be accessed and egressed in a forward gear so the danger to the highway is not evidenced. Furthermore, the Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposal subject to conditions to cover visibility splays (which are shown on plan), access specification, stopping up existing access, laying out parking and approval of retaining wall details, together with informatives.

9.24 Subject to the above, the proposal would comply with Policy CS12 and saved Policy 51, 54 and 58.

Impact on residential amenities

9.25 There would be no material harm to adjoining residential amenities.

9.26 Rosebank - although proposed new building would be closer to the existing bungalow to the west and at a higher level, given its distance from the common boundary of 3.6 m and the proposed siting such that the first floor would be well behind a line drawn at 45 degrees from the nearest rear window serving a habitable room in the bungalow, there would be no material loss of light or overbearing impact on Rosebank. The existing boundary planting would also be supplemented which would help screen and soften the development from Rosebank. The ground floor rear projection would also be set behind the 45 degree line and set 4 m away. There are no windows in the side of Rosebank to suffer any loss of privacy. The only windows on the side of the development would be high level rooflights, so there would be no overlooking of the garden of Rosebank. A condition to secure this would be

recommended. Hedge planting on the side would ensure no material detriment as a result of car headlights from the car park.

9.27 1 The Apple Orchard - Whilst the proposed new building would be sited further to the south in greater line of sight of the rear of 1 The Apple Orchard, and would have a deeper first floor flank wall than existing, it would nevertheless be sited further from the rear boundary of No. 1 by approximately 0.5 m. Furthermore, given the angled orientation of No. 1, the flank wall of the development would be seen to recede in views from this property such that it would be more than 23 m away from the rear of No. 1 at its furthest extent. There is no adopted guideline for rear to side relationships in housing layouts. However, a distance of 12 to 14 m is often considered acceptable which the proposal, even at its closest (14.5 m) would more than satisfy in this case. Furthermore, it should also be noted that, given the favourable topographical levels in this case, the proposed development would not subtend an angle greater than 25 degrees to the horizontal. In such circumstances, the proposal would meet the BRE guideline with regards to acceptable lighting conditions. Given also the hipped roof design and the breaking up of the flank wall with the chimney stack, it is not considered that there would be any material harm by reason of overbearing appearance or visual impact. There would be no windows in the flank wall that would result in any overlooking issues subject to a condition securing the high level rooflights. First and second floor windows in the front elevation of the development would result in highly oblique overlooking of the rear garden. However, given the portrait form and that windows would be recessed by 90 mm which would further restrict direct overlooking, it is not considered that the harm would be so material as to warrant refusal in this case.

9.28 2 The Apple Orchard - the key concern here is with regards to overlooking from rear windows. However, it should be noted that No. 2 is already overlooked by first floor windows in the existing house. The proposed resiting of the rear wall between 4.2 m and 8.5 m further to the rear will have a beneficial effect on the privacy of No. 2 as the angle of overlooking will become more oblique. Furthermore, the nearest first floor window will serve an en-suite and will be obscure glazed and the second floor rooflights will be high level and therefore prevent any overlooking in most circumstances. All other first floor windows will serve bedrooms and therefore will be no worse than existing. Indeed, given their narrower width and the recessed windows, any overlooking will be restricted to the garden which is better than existing. Conditions to require obscure glazing and high level windows are recommended. With regards to visual impact, given the distance and meeting of 25 degree angle to horizontal, it is not considered that the proposal would be visually overbearing, nor result in a loss of light, notwithstanding the relocation of the flank wall more into line of sight of No. 2.

9.29 3 The Apple Orchard - the key concern here is again with regards to overlooking from rear facing windows. It should be noted that, as for No. 2, No. 3 is already overlooked by rear facing windows of the existing house. However, due to siting of the block further to the rear by between 4.2 and 8.5 m, the nearest first floor window in the development would be less than 23 m from the nearest window in the rear wall of No. 3 (21.5 m). However, given the angled line of sight, and the orientation of No. 3 away from the rear of the proposed development, there would be no material loss of privacy to No. 3. Indeed, it is doubtful in this orientation that the 23 m distance should be strictly applied as this is effectively a rear to side view where the 12 to 14 m distance would be more relevant. However, given the established distance of some 26 m, and the spacious character of the area, the proposed distance of 21.5 m is considered an acceptable compromise in the circumstances. All the other windows would meet or

exceed the 23 m distance. There would be no material loss of light or visual impact.

9.30 All other properties in The Apple Orchard are considered not to be materially affected by the development. Properties in Tannsfield Drive to the rear are sufficient distance not to be affected. No. 81 Highfield Lane opposite the site has raised concerns over headlight glare from cars exiting the site. However, given the boundary wall enclosure to the front, and the main orientation of that property at 90 degrees to Fairview, and given that the proposed access will slope down onto Highfield Lane, it is not considered that there would be any material detriment to the occupants of that property.

A number of residents have expressed concerns about an increase in noise and disturbance. Whilst there would be an increased number of residents as a result of the use, it is not considered that it is likely to be so intense to cause significant adverse impact on established residential amenities.

9.31 The proposal would accord with Policy CS12.

Sustainable Design and Construction

9.32 Any new development should be consistent with the principles of sustainable design as set out in Policies CS29, CS30 and CS31 of the Core Strategy.

9.33 A CS29 sustainability checklist has been submitted in accordance with Policy CS29 which is considered acceptable. It is recommended that the details be secured by condition.

Other considerations

9.34 The Scientific Officer raises no objection to the development in relation to noise, air quality and land contamination subject to the standard Phase I and II contamination reports, and a remediation statement as necessary. A construction management plan condition and demolition method statement is also recommended prior to commencement.

9.35 The site is abutted by public footpath 40 which runs along Highfield Lane. The Rights of Way Officer has advised that adequate site lines will be required form the site to ensure safe passage for pedestrians. Driver to pedestrian visibility splays will be provided as required by the Highway Authority and as shown on plan.

10. Conclusions

10.1 The proposed development would be acceptable in principle. The existing dwelling is not considered to be a heritage asset that should prevent its demolition, subject to a satisfactory design of replacement building. The proposed flatted scheme of 5 dwellings would cause no harm to the character or appearance of this residential area and there would be no material harm to residential amenities. The proposal is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site or an excessive density. Access and car parking for the site would be acceptable. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

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

referred to above and subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

No	Condition
1	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.</p> <p>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.</p>
2	<p>No development (other than demolition, site preparation, groundworks, site investigation and remediation) shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external walls and roof of the development hereby permitted shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (September 2013).</p>
3	<p>Notwithstanding any details submitted, no development (other than demolition, site preparation, groundworks, site investigation and remediation) shall take place until 1:20 details of the following to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.</p> <p>1:20 details of all windows and doors (including vertical cross section through the openings to show the set back from the reveals)</p> <p>Details of rooflights</p> <p>1:20 construction details of eaves, bargeboards and other external joinery.</p> <p>Details of any external flues, gas pipes, vents, extracts, metre cupboards</p> <p>Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (September 2013).</p>
4	<p>Development shall be carried out in accordance with the details on Drg. No. 0623/16 Rev F and, notwithstanding any details shown, no development (other than demolition, site preparation, groundworks, site investigation and remediation) 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:</p> <p>hard surfacing materials;</p> <p>soft landscape works which shall include planting plans (including replacement tree planting); 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;</p>

	<p>minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, 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).</p> <p>The approved landscape works shall be carried out prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted. Any tree or shrub which forms part of the approved landscaping scheme which within a period of five years from planting fails to become established, becomes seriously damaged or diseased, dies or for any reason is removed shall be replaced in the next planting season by a tree or shrub of a species, size and maturity to be approved by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area in accordance with Policies CS12, CS13 and CS29 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (September 2013) and Policies 99, 100 and 129 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.</p>
5	<p>The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels and relative heights shown on Drg. Nos.623/13 Rev E, 623/17 Rev B, 623/18 Rev A, 623/33 and 623/37.</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Policies CS11, 12 and 13 of the Dacorum Core Strategy September 2013.</p>
6	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sustainability checklist.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the sustainable development of the site in accordance with Policy CS29 of the Dacorum Core Strategy September 2013.</p>
7	<p>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.</p> <p>For the purposes of this condition:</p> <p>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.</p>

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32. The details are required before commencement of development as if they are deferred until after the development has begun, the opportunity to decontaminate the land will have been lost to the detriment of human health and other receptors.</p>
8	<p>All remediation or protection measures identified in the Remediation Statement referred to in Condition 8 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32 and the NPPF (2018).</p>
9	<p>No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan should consider all phases of the development.</p> <p>Therefore, the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan which shall include details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Construction vehicle numbers, type, routing b) Traffic management requirements c) Construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking) d) Siting and details of wheel washing facilities e) Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway f) Timing of construction activities to avoid school pick up/drop off times g) Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities h) Post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and

	<p>temporary access to the public highway.</p> <p>i) Construction or Demolition Hours of Operation</p> <p>j) Dust and Noise control measure</p> <p>k) Asbestos control measure where applicable</p> <p>Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS8. The details are required before commencement of development as if they are deferred until after the development has begun, the measures will not be in place to deal with all the matters listed.</p>
10	<p>Prior to demolition works commencing a Demolition Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for a management scheme whose purpose shall be to control and minimise emissions of pollutants from and attributable to the demolition of the development. This should include a risk assessment and a method statement in accordance with the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance published by London Councils and the Greater London Authority. The scheme shall set out the secure measures, which can, and will, be put in place.</p> <p>Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS8.</p>
11	<p>The development shall not be brought into use until the new vehicle crossover has been constructed to the current specification of the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to ensure the development provides adequate access and egress to and from the on-site parking facilities in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy September 2013 and saved Policy 51 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.</p>
12	<p>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 (accept as may be approved as part of any landscaping scheme) between a height of 0.6m and 2m above the carriageway.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy September 2013 and saved Policies 51 and 54 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.</p>
13	<p>Pedestrian visibility splays of 2 m x 2 m shall be provided before any part of the development is first brought into use, and they shall thereafter be maintained, on both sides of the entrance to the site, within which there shall be no obstruction to visibility between 0.6 m and 2 m above the carriageway.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy September 2013 and saved Policies 51 and 54 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.</p>
14	<p>Prior to commencement of development, full details of the construction of any retaining wall associated with construction of the dwelling, including any necessary Approval In Principle certification issued in accordance with the requirements of the Department for Transport's DMRB Standard BD 2/12: Technical Approval of Highway Structures, shall be submitted to and approved</p>

	<p>in writing by the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of public safety to ensure that construction of the development hereby permitted does not affect the stability of the public highway</p>
15	<p>Prior to first occupation of the development and the new access being brought into use, the existing access point not incorporated in the development hereby permitted shall be permanently closed by raising the existing dropped kerb and reinstating the footway and highway boundary to the same line, level and detail as the adjoining footway verge and highway boundary.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to limit the number of access points along the site boundary for the safety and convenience of the highway user in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy September 2013 and saved Policies 51 and 54 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.</p>
16	<p>Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed access / on-site car parking / turning areas shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of the parking /manoeuvring area, in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy September 2013 and saved Policies 51, 54 and 58 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.</p>
17	<p>The window at first floor level in the southern (rear) elevation of the development hereby permitted shown as obscure glazed shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass and non opening below a height of 1.7 metres from internal floor level of the room being served.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the residential amenities of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy September 2013.</p>
18	<p>The pairs of rooflights in the side and rear elevations of the development hereby permitted shown on plan as having a height dimension of 1700 mm shall have a cill height of not less than 1.7 metres above internal floor level of the room being served.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the residential amenities of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy September 2013.</p>
19	<p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:</p> <p>Location Plan 0623/01 Rev B 0623/03 0623/04 0623/05 0623/11 Rev D</p>

0623/12 Rev D
0623/13 Rev E
0623/14 Rev C
0623/15 Rev C
0623/16 Rev F
0623/17 Rev B
0623/18 Rev A
0623/33
0623/34
0623/36 Rev A
0623/37

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 proactively through positive engagement with the applicant during the pre-application stage and determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted proactively 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:

Highway Authority

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

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. Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

5. Highway structural considerations: The applicant is advised that in order to comply with Condition 14 of this permission it will be necessary for the developer of the site to contact the Hertfordshire County Council Bridge Asset Manager in connection with the requirements of Department for Transport Standard BD 2/12: Technical Approval of Highway Structures. Further details can be obtained from the Highway Authority at County Hall, Pegs Lane, Hertford, Herts, SG13 8DN (Telephone: 0300 1234047).

Environmental Health

Piling Works

If piling is considered the most appropriate method of foundation construction, prior to commencement of development, a method statement detailing the type of piling and noise emissions, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All piling works shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of residents of neighbouring properties and in accordance with and to comply with Dacorum Borough Councils Policies

Noise on Construction/Demolition Sites

The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Control of Pollution Act 1974 relating to the control of noise on construction and demolition sites. And the best practicable means of minimising noise will be used. Guidance is given in British Standard BS 5228: Parts 1, 2 and Part 4 (as amended) entitled 'Noise control on construction and open sites'.

Construction hours of working – plant & machinery

In accordance with the councils adopted criteria, all noisy works associated with site demolition, site preparation and construction works shall be limited to the following hours: 0800hrs to 1800hrs on Monday to Friday 0800hrs to

	<p>1230hrs Saturday, no works are permitted at any time on Sundays or bank holidays</p> <p>Dust</p> <p>As advised within the application documentation, dust from operations on the site should minimised by spraying with water or by carrying out other such works that may be necessary to suppress dust. Visual monitoring of dust is to be carried out continuously and Best Practical Means (BPM) should be used at all times. The applicant is advised to consider the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance, Produced in partnership by the Greater London Authority and London Councils.</p> <p>Bonfires</p> <p>Waste materials generated as a result of the proposed demolition and/or construction operations shall be disposed of with following the proper duty of care and should not be burnt on the site. Only where there are no suitable alternative methods such as the burning of infested woods should burning be permitted.</p> <p>Unexpected contamination</p> <p>In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority with all works temporarily suspended because, the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.</p>
--	--

Appendix A

Consultation responses

DBC - RIGHTS OF WAY	08/06/2018	<p>Site is abutted by Hemel Hempstead public footpath 40. Access to the site requires crossing this footpath which will require site lines to be adequate as to allow safe passage for pedestrians.</p> <p>No further comments.</p>
---------------------	------------	---

DBC - CONTAMINATED	25/04/2018	20/06/2018	Please be advise that we have no objection to the proposed development in relation to Air
--------------------	------------	------------	---

LAND	<p>Quality and Land Contamination.</p> <p>Therefore, the following planning condition and informative are recommended should planning permission be granted.</p> <p>1). Construction Management Plan Condition</p> <p>No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan should consider all phases of the development.</p> <p>Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved plan. The Construction Management Plan shall include details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Construction vehicle numbers, type, routing b) Traffic management requirements c) Construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking) d) Siting and details of wheel washing facilities e) Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway f) Timing of construction activities to avoid school pick up/drop off times g) Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities h) Post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and temporary access to the public highway. <p>Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS8.</p> <p>2). Un-expected Contaminated Land Informative</p> <p>In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority with all works temporarily suspended because, the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.</p> <p>3). Construction Hours of Working – (Plant & Machinery) Informative</p> <p>In accordance with the council's adopted criteria, all noisy works associated with site demolition, site preparation and construction works shall be limited to the following hours: 0730hrs to 1830hrs on Monday to Saturdays, no works are permitted at any time on Sundays or bank holidays.</p> <p>4). Construction/Demolition Dust Informative</p>
------	---

		<p>Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or by carrying out of other such works that may be necessary to suppress dust. Visual monitoring of dust is to be carried out continuously and Best Practical Means (BPM) should be used at all times. The applicant is advised to consider the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance, produced in partnership by the Greater London Authority and London Councils.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant must ensure any concern with an asbestos release during demolition work where this is applicable is adequately addressed.</p> <p>5). Noise on Construction/Demolition Sites Informative</p> <p>The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Control of Pollution Act 1974 relating to the control of noise on construction and demolition sites.</p> <p>Should you have any further query in respect of this application, please do not hesitate to contact me on extension 2719 quoting Flare reference 539058.</p> <p>(25/04/18)</p> <p>The site is located within the vicinity of a potentially contaminative land use (infilled pond) situated approximately 230 metres to the north-northwest. BGS data indicates the site and immediate area to the north and south to be underlain by superficial deposits of the Clay with Flints Formation. Due to the distance of this feature from the site and relatively impermeable underlying geology, it is unlikely that a viable pollutant linkage exists connecting the potential source of contamination with the application site.</p> <p>As a precaution, I recommend that the developer be advised to keep a watching brief during ground works on the site for any potentially contaminated material. Should any such material be encountered, then the Council must be informed without delay, advised of the situation and an appropriate course of action agreed.</p> <p>(2/02/18)</p> <p>Please be advise that we have no objection to</p>
--	--	--

	<p>the proposed development in relation to Noise, Air Quality and land contamination.</p> <p>However, considering the nature of proposed end use i.e. residential with communal amenity area, the following planning conditions and informative are recommended should planning permission be granted.</p> <p>1a). Contaminated Land Condition</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For the purposes of this condition:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32.</p> <p>1b). All remediation or protection measures</p>
--	--

		<p>identified in the Remediation Statement referred to in Condition 1a 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32 and the NPPF (2012).</p> <p>Informative:</p> <p>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</p> <p>2). Construction Management Plan Condition</p> <p>No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan should consider all phases of the development. Therefore, the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan which shall include details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Construction vehicle numbers, type, routing b) Traffic management requirements c) Construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking) d) Siting and details of wheel washing facilities e) Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and
--	--	---

		<p>the adjacent public highway</p> <p>f) Timing of construction activities to avoid school pick up/drop off times</p> <p>g) Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities</p> <p>h) Post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and temporary access to the public highway.</p> <p>i) Construction or Demolition Hours of Operation</p> <p>j) Dust and Noise control measure</p> <p>k) Asbestos control measure where applicable</p> <p>Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS8.</p> <p>3). Demolition Method Statement</p> <p>Prior to demolition works commencing a Demolition Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for a management scheme whose purpose shall be to control and minimise emissions of pollutants from and attributable to the demolition of the development. This should include a risk assessment and a method statement in accordance with the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance published by London Councils and the Greater London Authority.</p> <p>The scheme shall set out the secure measures, which can, and will, be put in place.</p> <p>Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS8.</p> <p>4). Un-expected Contaminated Land</p> <p>Informative</p> <p>In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority with all works temporarily suspended because, the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.</p> <p>I hope the above clarify our position on the submitted application?</p> <p>Should you have any further query in respect of the application, please do not hesitate contact me on Ext 2719 quoting Flare reference 551132.</p>
--	--	--

DBC - TREES & WOODLANDS - CLEAN SAFE AND GREEN	14/06/2018	<p>I've just been looking through my applications and seems I've mixed a couple up and didn't realise this was the application where trees have been removed. I have visited this site and a number of trees to the side of the current building have been felled. I have looked at their footprint and I would advise they would not be considered mature or of significance if they were in place. I believe they were leylandii, from what I could see from the remnants of bark I could see.</p> <p>I know you suggested a requirement for replacements for the trees lost. I'm happy for this to be specified but the applicant should submit a scheme for landscaping. This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Species, · Size · Planting methods · Aftercare.
HERTS PROPERTY SERVICES HERTS COUNTY COUNCIL	06/02/2018	Herts Property Services do not have any comments to make in relation to financial contributions required by the Toolkit, as this development is situated within Dacorum CIL Zone 3 and does not fall within any of the CIL Reg123 exclusions. Notwithstanding this, 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.
HCC - Dacorum Network Area HERTS COUNTY COUNCIL	23/02/2018 04/06/2018	<p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority considers that the proposal would not have an increased impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways and does not object to the development, subject to the conditions and informative notes below.</p> <p>CONDITIONS</p>

		<p>1. The development shall not be brought into use until the new vehicle crossover has been constructed to the current specification of the Highway Authority and to the Local Planning Authority's satisfaction.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of highway safety and amenity and to ensure the development makes adequate provision for on-site parking and manoeuvring of vehicles likely to be associated with its use.</p> <p>2. Prior to the first occupation vehicular and pedestrian (and cyclist) access to and egress from the adjoining highway shall be limited to the access shown on drawing no 0623/16 only. Any other access or egress shall be permanently closed, and the footway / highway verge shall be reinstated in accordance with a detailed scheme to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, concurrently with the bringing into use of the new access.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of highway safety.</p> <p>3. 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of highway safety.</p> <p>4. 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of highway safety.</p> <p>5. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed access /on-site car and cycle parking / servicing / loading, unloading / turning /waiting area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan drawing no 0623/16 and retained thereafter available for that specific use.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of the parking /manoeuvring area, in the interests of highway safety.</p> <p>6. Retaining Wall Prior to commencement of development, full details of the construction of any retaining wall associated with construction of the dwelling, including any necessary Approval In Principle certification issued in accordance with the requirements of the</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Department for Transport's DMRB Standard BD 2/12: Technical Approval of Highway Structures, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of public safety to ensure that construction of the development hereby permitted does not affect the stability of the public highway</p> <p>INFORMATIVES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Highway Authority requires the alterations to or the construction of the vehicle crossovers to be undertaken such that the works are carried out to their specification and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.), the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. The applicant may need to apply to Highways (Telephone 0300 1234047) to arrange this, or use link:- https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/droppedkerbs/ 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/transroads/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
--	--	---

		<p>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/transects/highways/ or by telephoning 0300 1234047</p> <p>4. Highway structural considerations. The applicant is advised that in order to comply with Condition 6 of this permission it will be necessary for the developer of the site to contact the Hertfordshire County Council Bridge Asset Manager in connection with the requirements of Department for Transport Standard BD 2/12: Technical Approval of Highway Structures. Further details can be obtained from the Highway Authority at County Hall, Pegs Lane, Hertford, Herts, SG13 8DN (Telephone: 0300 1234047).</p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <p>This application is for Demolition of detached dwelling and construction of four flats and one duplex apartment with repositioned access and parking</p> <p>PARKING</p> <p>The proposal includes nine parking spaces on a new hard standing to be constructed to the front of the property, giving onto Highfield Lane, which is an unclassified local access road, so vehicles are not required to enter and leave the highway in forward gear. Provision is also made for cycle parking to the rear of the building.</p> <p>ACCESS</p> <p>There is an existing vxo giving onto a garage from Highfield Lane. This vxo must be stopped up and the pavement and kerb reinstated before the proposed property is occupied. A new vxo is proposed central to the front boundary.</p> <p>I notice that there is a retaining wall along the front boundary of the site and the back edge of the footpath. Since this abuts onto the Highway, the applicant is required to contact Bridge Asset Manager to ensure compliance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.#</p> <p>REFUSE STORAGE AND COLLECTION</p> <p>Provision has been made for refuse storage and collection on site.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council as Highway</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Authority considers the proposal would not have an increased impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways.</p> <p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>This amendment has reduced the number of parking spaces from 10 to 8 Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority considers that the proposal would not have an increased impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways and does not object to the development, subject to the conditions and informative notes below.</p> <p>CONDITIONS</p> <p>1. The development shall not be brought into use until the new vehicle crossover has been constructed to the current specification of the Highway Authority and to the Local Planning Authority's satisfaction.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of highway safety and amenity and to ensure the development makes adequate provision for on-site parking and manoeuvring of vehicles likely to be associated with its use.</p> <p>2. Prior to the first occupation vehicular and pedestrian (and cyclist) access to and egress from the adjoining highway shall be limited to the access shown on drawing no 0623/16 only. Any other access or egress shall be permanently closed, and the footway / highway verge shall be reinstated in accordance with a detailed scheme to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, concurrently with the bringing into use of the new access.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of highway safety.</p> <p>3. 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of highway safety.</p> <p>4. 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.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Reason: In the interest of highway safety.</p> <p>5. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed access /on-site car and cycle parking / servicing / loading, unloading / turning /waiting area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan drawing no 0623/16 and retained thereafter available for that specific use.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of the parking /manoeuvring area, in the interests of highway safety.</p> <p>6. Retaining Wall Prior to commencement of development, full details of the construction of any retaining wall associated with construction of the dwelling, including any necessary Approval In Principle certification issued in accordance with the requirements of the Department for Transport's DMRB Standard BD 2/12: Technical Approval of Highway Structures, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of public safety to ensure that construction of the development hereby permitted does not affect the stability of the public highway</p> <p>INFORMATIVES:</p> <p>1. The Highway Authority requires the alterations to or the construction of the vehicle crossovers to be undertaken such that the works are carried out to their specification and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.), the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. The applicant may need to apply to Highways (Telephone 0300 1234047) to arrange this, or use link:- https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/droppedkerbs/</p> <p>2. Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free</p>
--	--	---

	<p>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/transects/highways/ or by telephoning 0300 1234047.</p> <p>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/transects/highways/ or by telephoning 0300 1234047</p> <p>4. Highway structural considerations. The applicant is advised that in order to comply with Condition 6 of this permission it will be necessary for the developer of the site to contact the Hertfordshire County Council Bridge Asset Manager in connection with the requirements of Department for Transport Standard BD 2/12: Technical Approval of Highway Structures. Further details can be obtained from the Highway Authority at County Hall, Pegs Lane, Hertford, Herts, SG13 8DN (Telephone: 0300 1234047).</p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <p>This application is for Demolition of detached dwelling and construction of four flats and one duplex apartment with repositioned access and parking. This amendment has reduced the number of parking spaces from 10 to 8.</p> <p>PARKING</p> <p>The proposal includes eight parking spaces on a new hard standing to be constructed to the front of the property, giving onto Highfield Lane, which is an unclassified local access road, so vehicles are not required to enter and leave the highway in forward gear. Provision is</p>
--	---

		<p>also made for cycle parking to the rear of the building.</p> <p>ACCESS</p> <p>There is an existing vxo giving onto a garage from Highfield Lane. This vxo must be stopped up and the pavement and kerb reinstated before the proposed property is occupied. A new vxo is proposed central to the front boundary.</p> <p>I notice that there is a retaining wall along the front boundary of the site and the back edge of the footpath. Since this abuts onto the Highway, the applicant is required to contact Bridge Asset Manager to ensure compliance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.</p> <p>REFUSE STORAGE AND COLLECTION</p> <p>Provision has been made for refuse storage and collection on site.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority considers the proposal would not have an increased impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways</p>
--	--	---

DBC - NOISE POLLUTION & HOUSING	08/02/2018	<p>I write in regards to the above listed application, Environmental Health comments are as follows:</p> <p>Development of the property (including demolition) to ensure that all hazardous substances including asbestos are to be removed and handled in a manner to limit or eliminate exposure to the environment</p> <p>Development including demolition is to be undertaken using methods that are as reasonably quite as possible given the nature of the development to minimise nuisance to other properties.</p> <p>No further comments in regards to this application.</p>
---------------------------------	------------	---

Consultees: not responded

DBC - LEAD OFFICER - HOUSING DEVELOPMENT			
--	--	--	--

DBC - BUILDING CONTROL			
THREE VALLEYS WATER PLC (AFFINITY WATER) AFFINITY WATER			
THAMES WATER UTILITIES DEVELOPMENT CONTROL			
REFUSE - CUPID GREEN DEPOT			
DBC - CONSERVATION			
DBC - STRATEGIC PLANNING			

Appendix B

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

Objections

Neighbour reps on latest amended plans

6 The Apple Orchard - I feel that this site will be overdeveloped, as all the other houses in the area are detached so flats would look out of place.

I also feel that the extra traffic that will be created from these flats will be quite dangerous as the corner of Highfield Lane is quite narrow.

I feel that these plans should be rejected, as it will change the look of the area and block some of the light from The Apple Orchard.

(25/10/18)

5 The Apple Orchard - As the owners and residents of 5 The Apple Orchard, we write to STRONGLY OBJECT to the revised Planning Application Ref: 4/00147/18/FUL.

The latest amended application has changed very little from the previous one and therefore our objections still stand as before and are stated below.

The specific grounds for objection to the proposed housing development of five flats at Fairview, Highfield Lane, HP2 5JE are set out below.

Disparity between existing footprint of Fairview property and proposed development

There is a huge difference between the footprint of the existing Fairview building and the proposed block of flats on drawing number 0623/26 Rev-. With the scale at 1:200 the existing Fairview building is 127.79 sq meters, however, the proposed block of flats footprint is 245.44 sq meters. This means that the proposed development will have a footprint that is 1.92 times bigger than the current building. In addition, the ground floor and first floor of the existing Fairview building has an internal floor area of 212.86 sq meters, which includes the internal garage. However, the internal floor area of the proposed flats is quoted on the drawing as 442sq metres, which means it is 2.07 times bigger than the current building. We believe that this increase in size, massing and positioning of the proposed property within the site area will result in an enormous loss of visual privacy, overshadowing whilst giving rise to potential noise and disturbance to the rear gardens of The Apple Orchard and to all nearby houses.

In addition, a building of this nature and size will:

1. Affect Highway Safety by causing a considerable amount of congestion, increase in local and additional traffic on Highfield Lane and cause obstruction to the footway as well as increasing parking pressure.
2. Visitors to the proposed block will park in Highfield Lane and in The Apple Orchard (which is a very narrow road) and this additional parking is likely to block access to and from this road for residents and visitors alike. Additional parking from visitors to the flat's occupants, particularly in the road bend, would lead to further loss of visibility and increase the potential for road accidents. It should be noted that Highfield Lane accessing Queensway has a dangerous bend with poor sightlines. The provision is for 8 cars – five flats will in all likelihood have two vehicles each and therefore two vehicles will be parked on High Street Green close to the property. This will cause an increase in danger to traffic and pedestrians on this already dangerous corner of High Street Green.
3. An additional concern is the increased danger caused by vehicles turning in and out of the proposed construction with restricted sightlines.
4. Layout and density of building will be totally out of keeping with the rest of the housing along Highfield Lane and in The Apple Orchard. The proposed roof line will be considerably higher than neighbouring properties and will completely change the current street scape.
5. Residents in The Apple Orchard and surrounding roads will be overlooked by the height of the proposed building and will suffer from a lack of privacy as well as a loss of light caused by the overshadowing of the proposed building.

Loss of Amenity to residents in The Apple Orchard and Tannsfield Drive

The proposed building will mean that 9 & 11 Tannsfield Drive will not only be directly overlooked but the number of overlooking windows will greatly affect visual privacy.

Number 1 The Apple Orchard will be directly overlooked by the front of the proposed building. There will also be loss of light to the garden.

Overshadowing of resident's property in The Apple Orchard

Number 2 The Apple Orchard will be directly looking at a brick wall. The windows in the

proposed east facing elevation will give light pollution. The proposed building also impacts the light to the property.

Number 3 The Apple Orchard will suffer a partial loss of light to the garden due to the height and massing of the new development.

Number 4 The Apple Orchard will have the rear garden overlooked with a loss of visual privacy. With five flats with occupants on upper floors, we will be constantly overlooked

In addition, a large number of trees have already been removed from the Fairview site last month. No regard was given to the fact that birds were nesting and how their removal would impact on local wildlife.

Unsympathetic to the character of the Area

In the Area Policy for Adeyfield, HCA23 notes that any new proposals should pay respect to the style and house type close by. It also specifically lists The Apple Orchard as 'Notable in Design.'

The houses on Highfield Lane are also very distinctive in character but the proposed new building would be entirely out of keeping with the area in terms of architectural style and materials, with its height and massing also being significantly out of proportion with the buildings in the surrounding area. The vast majority of the surrounding properties, on The Apple Orchard, Nicholas Way, The Grazings and the lower section of Highfield Lane are detached houses.

The large scale, the height exceeding two stories, and nature of the proposed development would be considerably oppressive relative to the size of the plot, exacerbated by the proposed building line being very close to the boundaries to either side of the property, consequently affecting daylight and visual privacy to the several adjoining properties (as previously mentioned).

Noise and Disturbance

We are concerned that there will be a significant increase of noise and disturbance to all residents in The Apple Orchard particularly those which will be directly adjoined by the proposed communal garden.

Dacorum Borough Council Planning Policies: Adopted Core Strategy

Policy CS11 (Quality of Neighbourhood Design), we feel the proposal hasn't fully considered points a, b and f:

'Within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should: (a) *respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and general character*; (b) *preserve attractive streetscapes and enhance any positive linkages between character areas*; (c) co-ordinate streetscape design between character areas; (d) protect or enhance significant views within character areas; (e) incorporate natural surveillance to deter crime and the fear of crime; and (f) *avoid large areas dominated by car parking*.

Policy CS12 (Quality of Site Design) the proposal again hasn't met points c, f and g

On each site development should: a) provide a safe and satisfactory means of access for all users; b) provide sufficient parking and sufficient space for servicing; c) *avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties*; d) retain important trees or replace them with suitable species if their loss is justified; e) plant trees and shrubs to help assimilate development and softly screen settlement edges; f) *integrate with the streetscape character*; and g) *respect adjoining properties in terms of: i. layout; ii. security; iii. site coverage; iv. scale*;

v. height; vi. bulk; vii. materials; and viii. landscaping and amenity space.

Reference to a previous rejected application (4/03915/15/FUL – Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of two dwellings, 24 Tannsfield Drive), close by to the proposed development of Fairview.

The case officer's reason for turning down the application in summary included:

'This arrangement would not only be nearly double the intended density of the area but, as before, is considered to give rise to a cramped and over-developed form of development that would be out of keeping with the established character of detached dwellings.'

'Although, as before, the proposals do include a strip of low level planting along the frontage, either side of a shared access, this provision is considered insignificant and would fail to mitigate or break up the impact of the hard surfacing and parking within the street scene and would need to be kept below 600 mm height to enable suitable visibility to be maintained. The proposal is in this respect contrary to Policies CS12 (e and g) and CS13 (f).'

'The scale of the car parking is considered excessive and detrimental to the amenity of the local area and not in keeping with other properties.'

'A swept path analysis to ensure that vehicles can park, turn around and re-enter the highway in a forward gear.'

We feel that all of these points raised on this case are also applicable to rejecting the proposed development of Fairview.

We would ask that our detailed objections are taken into account in the council's consideration of planning application Ref: 4/00147/18/FUL and for the reasons set out we are of the strong view that it should be refused.

This planning application is completely inappropriate for this area and is not adhering to DBC's Adopted Core Strategy policies as mentioned earlier. In addition the work proposed will cause a considerable amount of traffic, disruption and noise to what is a quiet and well-kept area of Hemel Hempstead.

We remain totally opposed to this proposal and wish to register for the third time our disapproval to this whole project. It would appear that as long as the Fairview property owners and developers can make financial gain the impact on everyone living nearby is of little interest to Dacorum Borough Council who only seem concerned with fulfilling their housing quotas.

(25/10/18)

85 Highfield Lane - As a resident of Highfield Lane I would say that these plans show a huge over-development of this site and are not in keeping with any of the properties in Highfield Lane or The Apple Orchard and surrounding area.

I am particularly concerned that visitors to the flats will almost certainly park their cars on Highfield Lane, which is quite a narrow road. This will add more congestion to the road and make driving up and down the lane even more hazardous. It would also make backing out of our own driveways more difficult because parked cars would probably be in our eyeline and stop us from having a clear view of the lane. Heaven

forbid that the lane becomes a permanent car park for some cars! The site is very near a sharp bend in the road which is an even bigger worry - an accident waiting to happen.

Consideration has not been given to the current owners of the properties in this area some of whom will have a huge three storey building sitting right at the end of their back gardens, taking away their privacy and blocking some light.

(24/10/18)

4 The Apple Orchard - As the owners and residents of 4 The Apple Orchard, we write to object to the Planning Application Ref: 4/00147/18/FUL. We do not feel enough has been changed on the recent amended plans to address our concerns.

Marketing the properties as 3 bedroom properties: Both flats on the ground floor and one on the first floor have either studies or utility rooms (or both) with windows. These could easily be altered to provide a third bedroom in place of the proposed study or utility. This would lead to an intensification of use, with associated changes to the character of the area as a consequence of increased levels of movement, noise and disturbance. The parking provision set out in the plans would be inadequate, the density well above the medium range and the local environment compromised with the emissions from added vehicles.

The plot would be overdeveloped and the building grossly oversized:

The size and bulk do not reflect the other properties adjacent to it. It is significantly larger (even when dug into the ground) than that of neighbouring dwellings and is approximately 1.7x the size of the existing building. The Local Development Plan states that buildings up to three storeys will be permitted provided they harmonise with local surroundings. The immediate roads (Highfield Lane, The Apple Orchard, Nicholas Way, The Grazings and Tansfield Close) surrounding Fairview are made up of over 60 one or two-story houses. The developers in this case are ignoring local design in their proposed plans; there are no three-story buildings in the roads close by.

Although Area Policy for Adeyfield, HCA23 lists 'Design: no special requirements' it does note that any new proposals should pay respect to the type, style and mass to the properties close by. Although slightly reduced in size, the proposed building still appears oppressive relative to the adjoining bungalow property; Rosebank. Its height and massing is still also significantly out of proportion with the other buildings in the surrounding area. The extremely large and bulky development would have an adverse impact on the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS11, 12 & 13 and the guidance in HCA23.

The plot would be cramped: Whilst Fairview is one of the larger properties in the area it currently has a sizeable green corridor between it and the bungalow next door. This makes the area feel open and spacious. The proposed building would severely compromise the sense of openness that the site currently provides to the street scene and the property would be overbearing to the immediate neighbours.

CS12 Appendix 3, A3.1 details that '*Proposals should be guided by the existing topographical features of the site and its immediate surroundings. They should respect the character of the surrounding area, and in particular there must be adequate space for the proposed development without creating a cramped appearance.*'

Density: The site area of Fairview is 1010sq metres with 5 dwellings proposed = 0.10 Hectares. Therefore this equals a density of 50 dph (net), which is well over the

recommended medium range of 30 to 35 dph (net)

The amended plans for Fairview still don't take into consideration the detriment to our environment (increased number of cars, noise, street parking etc.) and our current healthier living conditions (low density living, open green corridors between properties). NPPF Paragraph 117 states '*meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.*' This also must be relevant for the current residents?

- Highway Safety – Increase in local traffic, obstruction to the footway and parking pressure With the increased occupation density on the site and level of parking provision (8 spaces) this will give rise to an increase in local traffic and emission levels. It is likely that visitors to the flats or the inhabitants overspill vehicles will be parked in and on the pavement of Highfield Lane.
- Buildings and hard surfacing consume the front garden: The area in front of the development would be entirely given over to eight parking spaces. This would present a hard and engineered frontage, and the parking allocation would appear cramped. Although the proposals do include foliage to be planted (and now also) a wall and fence at the front of the building to minimise the impact of the car park, the foliage would need to be kept at a specific height to maintain good visibility. Due to the fact of where the car park entrance is situated, we have concerns that this foliage maybe eventually be removed to increase visibility for safety reasons and to enable easier access. The entrance is situated on a narrow lane with a blind bend. Any foliage that is allowed to grow too high and block visibility would increase the chances of an accident. If the foliage is reduced or removed for safety reasons, the street scene would be then dominated by hard surfacing car park.

The scale and dominance of hard surfacing and car parking is excessive and detrimental to the amenity of the local area and not in keeping with other properties. This is noted in CS12 Appendix 5, A5.17 states that *Large unbroken expanses of parking or excessive hard surfacing areas at building frontages are undesirable.*

- Loss of Privacy: The amended plans show that Number 1 The Apple Orchard will suffer loss of privacy in their bedroom windows and number 2 The Apple Orchard will suffer a loss of privacy due to the stepped back position of the first and second floors on the amended plans. Numbers 3 & 4 The Apple Orchard (our property) will have the rear gardens overlooked. There would also be a loss of privacy from the first and second floor windows to all adjoining properties - with five flats with occupants on upper floors, we will be constantly overlooked.

Listed on the Dacorum Borough Council Planning Policies, Adopted Core Strategy, Policy CS11, we feel the amended proposal still hasn't fully considered points a, b and f. And especially on Policy CS12 point c – '*avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties.*'

We also feel that the amended plans again have not taken into consideration CS12 Appendix 3, A3.6 More detailed aspects of layout and design should be treated as follows: *Privacy - Residential development should be designed and laid out so that the privacy of existing and new residents is achieved.*

- Other concerns:
- Concerns over potential noise rise and disturbance to the rear gardens of the adjoining properties with the proposal of a communal garden.
- Who will maintain the front and rear gardens to ensure that they don't become overgrown and impact the surrounding neighbours?

- The amended plans show that the new building would still be set back in the plot is out-of-character in the area.
- Soakaways have been indicated on the plans; will they be sufficient to cover the runoff from the hard surfacing at the front of the property?

Conclusion

We feel that the amended plans have still not addressed the majority of our concerns. Whilst we fully appreciate there is a need for new housing within Dacorum, we feel that the proposed building on the site of Fairview, specifically relating to the size, mass and relocation within the plot is totally out of character with the other houses in the roads surrounding the property. The majority of new builds going up around our area are flats, we feel a proposal of one or two 2-storeys family homes of proportionate mass to the surrounding houses would instead be a better option and offer a wider range of housing.

We would ask that our detailed objections are taken into account in the council's consideration of planning application Ref: 4/00147/18/FUL and for the reasons set out we are of the strong view that it should be refused.

(24/10/18)

9 Tannsfield Drive - I appreciate the owners have made an effort to reduce the height of the proposed block and slightly move its position. However, I can't help thinking that the area is full of domestic, residential, detached properties and with bungalows (one chalet) either side of the plot. Certainly, from my point of view, if the 2nd floor flat/duplex was removed and a standard roof fitted the property would look pretty much the same as a normal house and presumably would be much more acceptable to all neighbours.

However, I suppose the need to, shall we say, maximise profits takes preference over the neighbours. Sorry but still opposed but would be happy to agree if it just consisted of a ground floor and a 1st floor.

(24/10/18)

Anonymous address - With regard to the further amended plans submitted for this house, we are still not happy and therefore oppose this planning application as it is still not in keeping with the surrounding area. We will be overlooked and have no privacy with this number of flats bearing down on us.

(24/10/18)

9 The Apple Orchard - I have seen the most recent revision of these plans dated 'October' 2018, posted on Dacorum website 11th October 2018, regarding the proposed demolition of the 2-storey 4 bedroomed house known as Fairview in Highfield Lane, and construction of a 3 storey block of 5 double bedoomed 'luxury' flats on the plot. The revisions fail to address any of my original or subsequent objections. I write to express my continued objection to this development as revised. This is on the following grounds, the same as before:

- Completely out of character for the area

- Highways concern regarding increased traffic
- Impact on my property

Details of my objection on these grounds are at the end of this letter, pages 3-4.

The points set out in the Aitchison Rafferty statement regarding the National Policy Planning Framework cause me to comment further:

4.5 This proposal does not work to improve the economic, social or environmental conditions of the area. The applicants have already had an adverse impact on the local area by chopping down the majority of the trees on the proposed development site, perhaps in anticipation of being granted this application.

4.7 I have no faith that any developer will take account of any conditions, as it does not appear that there are any sanctions the planning authorities can or will take for breaking conditions.

5.10 I have no objection to the demolition of Fairview and replacement with a well-designed building. The proposal is not a well-designed building for the area as it is far bigger than surrounding residential dwellings and has an adverse impact on neighbouring properties.

5.29 The proposed block of flats, being larger and occupying much more of the plot than the existing house, would have an unacceptable and negative impact on the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The properties would be overlooked and presented with a large walled structure of an as yet unspecified colour and material. I feel that the points regarding windows in section 5.35 are at best disingenuous and at worst, intentionally misleading.

5.37 The parking level of less than 2 spaces per flat will inevitably lead to parking on the road

5.38 It is a stretch to call the additional landscaping 'substantial', and it does not change sufficiently the visual aspect of the front parking area.

6.1, 6.2 I have no objection to the site being used for residential development. It is stating the obvious to say this is a good place to build housing, since it is in the middle of a housing area. I would support plans for a suitable development in keeping with the scale of surrounding properties, that made adequate provision for parking adjacent to such a sharp bend, and did not impact surrounding properties or mine.

In addition, the internal dimensions are now missing from the plans, allowing the development of the ground floor 'study' rooms as bedrooms. This would then invalidate the claims regarding living space, recreational space and parking made in the statement.

(23/10/18)

10 the Apple Orchard - Please note that I and my parents strongly object to the proposed demolition and building of flats on the site of Fairview in Highfield Lane. It would change the area and cause a great deal of noise and disruption, to us and our neighbours.

Highfield Lane is a narrow road and access would be a problem.
The flats are still planned for three floors.
We feel the site will be very overdeveloped.

(23/10/18)

Kinsale - We write in connection with the above revised planning application. We have noted the revisions and essentially the development is still a substantial block of five, two bedroom flats which goes against the unifying character of the lane, of mainly detached one and two story family dwellings. We live two doors down Highfield Lane from Fairview and feel if this development went ahead, it would set a precedent for future developers for the demolition of other houses with big gardens to make way for more blocks of flats. Eventually spoiling the country feel and character of the lane.

We wish to object strongly to the development of these flats in this location. We think the proposal is contrary to the Dacorum Core Strategy September 2013 policies CS11 (a) (b) (f) and CS12 (c) (f) (g) in regards to the following:

- Three storey dwelling out of scale in this narrow lane.
- The proposed development is out of character with existing adjoining properties.
- The proposed development doesn't integrate with the streetscape character.
- There is a loss of garden land due to the large size of the revised development, the re-siting of the living area (encroaching into the back garden) plus the hard standing for eight cars (completely swallowing the front garden – albeit that a few more bushes are to be planted). Not only will this have a negative visual impact, but it will increase pollution and result in a loss of habitat for wildlife.

POLICY CS11: Quality of Neighbourhood Design

Within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should:

- (a) respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and general character;
- (b) preserve attractive streetscapes and enhance any positive linkages between character areas;
- (f) avoid large areas dominated by car parking.

POLICY CS12: Quality of Site Design

On each site development should:

- c) avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties;
- f) integrate with the streetscape character; and
- g) respect adjoining properties in terms of:
 - i. layout;
 - iii. site coverage;
 - iv. scale;
 - v. height;
 - vi. bulk;

viii. landscaping and amenity space.

In addition, we have concerns with regard to the increase of traffic in a narrow lane with the property exit near a bend. On street parking will be increased as the number of parking spaces on the property has been reduced on the revised plan. Visitors and service vehicles to the property will have to park on the road outside, thereby narrowing the lane further or restricting pavement access for pedestrians (Please see photo below taken outside Fairview today illustrating the point). In the DBC Local Plan 1991-2011 it states:

POLICY 51 DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT IMPACTS

The acceptability of all development proposals will always be assessed specifically in highway and traffic terms and should have no significant impact upon:

(e) the environmental and safety implications of the traffic generated by the development.

The new National Planning Policy Framework was issued on 24 July 2018 and paragraph 70 states:

“Where an allowance is to be made for windfall sites Plans should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens”

Historically, Highfield Lane is mentioned as early as 1890 in Hemel Hempstead, long before the new town was developed. It has a “country lane” character consisting of mainly detached family dwellings with front and back gardens of a picturesque and traditional nature. As far as we know, this is the first application for a three story apartment block in this lane according to the planning records.

(23/10/18)

1 The Apple Orchard - All the houses in the area are detached, we do not want the look and feel of the area spoilt by standing up flats. The High Field lane area in Adeyfield is highly sought after and flats will detract from the natural beauty of the area and will not be aligned with the look, feel and build style that all the houses have in the vicinity.

Furthermore the bend at the bottom of High Field Lane is narrow and very sharp, if access to the Fairview plot is to be opened up then that could well become a safety hazard.

(21/10/18)

1 The Apple Orchard - I feel this will ruin the look and feel of the area, it will detract from the natural set-up that we currently have and I am opposed to the demolition and building of these new flats.

(21/10/18)

1 the Apple Orchard - We object to the above proposal for reasons shown below

Overlooking / Loss of Privacy

The revised plans have some minor changes which have improved the situation slightly, however the front windows on storeys 2 and 3 will still overlook our property resulting in loss of privacy, as you saw on your visit to our property recently.

Size of Building

Even with the modest changes the building is still an extremely large / bulky development which is out of character, and far too big for the plot

Highway Safety / Parking

The proposed entry/ exit to the new property is a few yards away from a virtual blind bend in the road in both directions. The road is also quite narrow at this point, it can just take 1 vehicle parked on the blind bend to create a potential problem.

The number of new properties will attract more visitors, deliveries etc who have nowhere to park except the road. You really have to know the road to understand what I am saying ! It has to be driven with extra care.

(21/10/18)

3 The Apple Orchard - As the owners and residents of 3 The Apple Orchard, we write to OBJECT to the above planning application reference.

From the first objection there were some changes on the second plans, however this time hardly anything, other than the slight reduction of the roof line, there has been minimal change to the plans or size of the overall building they are proposing.

- With reference to drawing number 0623/13 the outline marked for Rosebank gives an indication of the sheer size, which will be overbearing and completely out of character with all the surrounding area.
- There are no other 3 story buildings in the surrounding area, or indeed multi-faceted roofed buildings which do nothing to hide the mass and bulk of the building, and will in turn become an over developed, cramped accommodation which will be out of keeping with the established character of existing detached properties.
- With the single story having been introduced on the ground floor the windows on the first floor will now have an even clearer view of our property, reducing the privacy in our home and garden which will be detrimental to our quality of life.
- As there are no roof lights on the flat roofs there will be nothing to stop these becoming balconies or roof gardens, once again imposing further on our light and privacy, which will have a negative effect on our health.
- These are proposed as 2 bedoomed flats with a study, should the study become a bedroom (as properties are sold) the car parking allowance will be below the requirements and will overspill onto our neighbouring roads.
- The road that Fairview sits on already is a narrow road with a tight bend within a couple of metres of the existing driveway. This part of Highfield

Lane was not designed to cope with the inevitable increase in traffic that this development will bring along with the associated parking difficulties.

Neither has there been any provision made for visitor parking. Highfield Lane is a narrow road and vehicles will therefore park partly on the pavements resulting in obstructions to walkways and the associated dangers this will present.

- In regard to Policy CS12 (Quality of Site Design) the proposal again hasn't met points c, f and g;
- (c) 'avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties.'
- (f) 'integrate with the streetscape character.'
- (g) 'respect adjoining properties in terms of: i. layout; ii. security; iii. site coverage; iv. scale; v. height; vi. bulk; vii. materials; viii. landscaping and amenity space.'

To conclude, we request that the Planning Department takes this planning rejection and all of our objections into account and rejects the planning application Ref: 4/00147/18/FUL.

(20/10/18)

2 The Apple Orchard - Amended Plans

The roofline at the rear has been reduced but the floor plan is much the same. The development is still Five Flats the impact on the amenity is still the same and not **appropriate**. See policy CS4

Aitchison Raffety Design Access Statement

6.1 In conclusion, the site is located in the Adeyfield North area of Hemel Hempstead, where the principle of redevelopment is acceptable. The development of this site is also supported by Policy CS4 of the Dacorum Core Strategy, which states that "*residential development is encouraged*" in locations such as this. The provision of housing on this site would also reflect the Council's general hierachal approach to development, with Hemel Hempstead being the focus for housing growth.

POLICY CS4: The Towns and Large Villages

Development will be guided to the appropriate areas within settlements.

In residential areas **appropriate residential development is encouraged**. Non-residential development for small-scale social, community, leisure and business purposes is also encouraged, provided it is compatible with its surroundings.

As an immediate neighbour to the development we are of the view that the proposal will have a serious impact on our lives and should not be passed.

VISUAL INTRUSION / IMPACT ON AMENITY

The Apple Orchard, Highfield Lane and Tannfield Drive consist of detached low-density houses and bungalows.

The house Fairview sits with a green space to the front, side and rear that affords a pleasant green space enjoyable to all nine homes that adjoin the property.

The Flats would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity.

The proposed FLATS are :

Totally out of character, over-bearing, crammed into the site, on a scale of Commercial proportions, almost twice the size and higher than the existing property

The mass, bulk and proximity of the Flats would appear overbearing and intrusive.

Dacorum Borough Council Planning Policies Adapted core Strategy
Policy CS 11 Quality of Neighbourhood Design

Within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should:

- respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and general character;
- a preserve attractive streetscapes and enhance any positive linkages between character areas;
- b co-ordinate streetscape design between character areas;
- c protect or enhance significant views within character areas;
- d incorporate natural surveillance to deter crime and the fear of crime; and
- e avoid large areas dominated by car parking.

We believe the proposal has not fully considered points a,b,d, and f

LOSS OF LIGHT / OVERSHADOWING

The bulk and proximity of the FLATS will cast a shadow over our house and garden.

Dacorum Borough Council Planning Policies Adapted core Strategy
Policy CS 12 Quality of Site Design

On each site development should:

- c. Avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties
- e. plant trees and shrubs to softly screen development and settlement edges;
- f. integrate with the streetscape character; and
- respect adjoining properties in terms of: (i) layout; (ii) security; (iii) site coverage; (iv) scale; (v) height; (vi) bulk; materials; and (vii) landscaping and amenity space.

We believe the proposal has not fully considered point's c,e and f

OVERLOOKING/LOSS OF PRIVACY

Our property is open plan and has eight floor to ceiling windows on the ground floor. The rear bedrooms have a continuous wall of windows seven in total. Therefore being over looked and privacy from the upper floors would be a major issue.

NOISE AND DISTURBANCE RESULTING FROM USE

Noise from 10 cars

Increased noise from communal garden,
Over occupancy up to 20 residents

ADEQUACY OF PARKING/TURNING

5 flats means probably 10 cars parking for only 8
There is no additional parking for visitors
Parking in the lane is a hazard

Parking bays not future proof

The minimum recognized width of parking bays 2.4M has remained the same since 1994 while car dimensions have continued to grow as extra safety features have been fitted.

DESIGN APPEARANCE AND TYPE OF MATERIALS

National Planning Policy Framework

Guidance Design

Paragraph: 025 ref ID: 26-025-020140306

CONSIDER SCALE

This relates both to the overall size and mass of individual buildings and spaces in relation to their surroundings, and to the scale of their parts.

Decisions on building size and mass, and the scale of open spaces around and between them, will influence the character, functioning and efficiency of an area.

In general terms too much building mass compared with open space may feel overly cramped and oppressive, with access and amenity spaces being asked to do more than they feasibly can. The size of individual buildings and their elements should be carefully considered, as their design will affect the: overshadowing and overlooking of others; local character; skylines; and vistas and views. The scale of building elements should be both attractive and functional when viewed and used from neighbouring streets, gardens and parks.

The design of the Flats is to maximize the occupancy of the site.

Additional bedroom could be configured with removal of study.

Extremely large/awkward over developed.

Front/rear gardens are mainly buildings/hardstanding.

Most of the existing trees and shrubs removed.

I cannot see how the development meets the planning guidance.

Aitchison Raffety Design Access Statement

2.2 Heritage

Although the house Fairview has not met Heritage criteria it is a local landmark House that fits well within the street scene.

5.29 The proposed dwellings would not have any unacceptable impact on the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

This statement is hard to comprehend how a 3 story block of flats disguised to look like a large house with a large extension on the side have no impact on the neighbouring

properties
Is beyond belief.

Given these objections we believe the development should not go ahead

(19/10/18)

12 Apple Orchard - Please register our strong objection to this amended planning application.

The proposed building is still far too big for the site, it is completely out of character with the surrounding area, and would dwarf and overlook all the surrounding properties.

The thought of an extra 8 cars coming out onto Highfield Lane at the most dangerous corner of this narrow lane is unthinkable. Any visitors to any or all of the five flats would be left parking in the road. This leads to cars parked on the footpath of Highfield Lane and also the corner of The Apple Orchard. This leaves pedestrians no choice but to walk in the road and also blocks the view of the cars exiting The Apple Orchard, both which are extremely dangerous.

More importantly, dwellings in Highfield Lane and The Apple Orchard are desirable detached properties. Any development which deterrs from this specification would be completely out of character in this delightful area.

Lastly, but no less important, is the passing of this application will inevitably lead to other planning requests for blocks of flats on other large detached properties in Highfield Lane or indeed The Apple Orchard.

(18/10/18)

Rosebank - As the owners and residents of Rosebank Highfield Lane HP2 5JE we write to OBJECT to Planning Application Ref:4/00147/18/FUL. Demolition of detached dwelling and construction of 4 flats and one duplex at Fairview, Highfield Lane HP2 5JE.

When affected residence became aware of the situation a meeting was arranged of about 20 to discuss how we felt about it , and it was felt that their privacy and loss of light and intrusion was compromised also a block of flats was out of character with the surrounding area. Despite making minor adjustments they do not address the fundamental problems of overdevelopment.

Rosebank, bungalow

All hedging from Fairview has been removed plus mature trees except for three trees at the rear of communal amenity. How will the proposed planting be managed from intruding into my property.

Headlights and noise will still be intrusive to our bedroom in the front, all hedges indicated will take many years to grow to be effective and these will not cut out conversations and door slamming at night.

Size

Size should respect type, size and mass of existing nearby development. The

proposed flats respect none of these , The footprint of the flats is 2 times larger and three times higher than Rosebank. Two flats each of 107.6 m.sq are each larger than Rosebank. The flats that contain studies can be altered into bedrooms. The angles used on roof design have been used to minimise the appearance of bulk.

The Area Policy for Adeyfield, HCA23, notes that any new proposals should pay respect to the style and house type close by. This proposal will give rise to an over-developed form that would not be in keeping with the established character of dwellings in the Lane.

The propose building of a block of flats, replacing a Victorian Villa, Fairview, is totally out of place for Highfield Lane.

Highway danger from street parking

With traffic leaving Queensway at 40mph, confronted immediately by a blind bend and facing oncoming cars on the wrong side of the road, due to parked cars in the lane there has been many accidents and near misses as result of the blind bend. The last one I know about happened in 2017, the car lost control and crashed into the 40 mph sign, Fortunately the sign stopped the car careering into Queensway, the bent sign can still be seen. Two oak trees have also been damaged due to cars losing control, therefore let us not increase the danger with additional street parking. It really horrifies me to think of the disruption the demolition and rebuild will cause particularly the heavy lorries that will constantly be using the Lane

With reference to Aitchison Raffety's statement that the provision of housing on this site would also reflect the Council's hierachal approach to development, I would respond by saying that the large number of flats already under construction within the area,I am sure the Council would like to see more family homes with a garden available which would be more suitable to the site.

I would like to bring your attention aspects of the proposed development which significantly affects Rosebank. The height of the building will be bigger than the existing one, Rosebank is on land that drops down which exaggerates the difference in scale.

LOSS OF PRIVACY, the side entrance of the flats take people and goods to and from the car park, also to the rear of the property, patio area and communal amenity. Also cycle path to cycle shed, therefore, a busy access route with no privacy.

In conclusion may I say that our objections are genuine and are the result of over development which will cause intrusion, loss of light, failure to respect adjoining properties and parking problems, also it will be setting a precedent that should it be necessary for Rosebank to be sold the same situation will arise from a future developer, and for these reasons we believe that Planning Application 4/00147/18/FUL should be refused.

(16/10/18)

5 The Apple Orchard - This latest application has only made minor changes and has not addressed many of the concerns and objections already made against previous applications.

For example, it still has not addressed the fact that three storeys are proposed which is contrary to the SPD and is 'hiding' the third storey in the roof space by design to appear as a two-storey building.

The major concern is the placement of the building on the site which will impact many of the local residents as has been stated in previous objections.

The parking provision is still above the maximum allowed by the Parking Standard - the application admits that it is 'slightly higher' - surely a maximum is a maximum and is not negotiable.

This is an application made with maximum profit in mind over consideration for local residents.

In conclusion, I strongly object to this proposal and can not see how the planning department can do anything else but reject this planning application in its present form.

(15/10/18)

Neighbour reps on intermediate amendments

9 Tannsfield Drive - The greed of property owners and lack of consideration for local residents by property developers continues to amaze me. If this application had been mainly developed on the footprint of the present property it would have been intrusive but perhaps tolerable. However by moving the development to a more central position on the plot it would appear residents in The Apple Orchard and the adjacent property in Highfield Road will have a very large wall blocking the current view from their back gardens and perhaps more importantly blocking the sun and light. Surely some consideration should have been given to this aspect when the plans were being drawn up but perhaps that was too much to expect.

(3/02/18)

6 The Apple Orchard - I object to the proposed plans as I feel this is an overdevelopment of the area, I feel if this is allowed to go ahead it will totally change the character of Highfield Lane and the Apple Orchard as all the houses are detached properties.

I also feel with the increase in traffic this will become dangerous as where the development is being proposed is on the corner of Highfield Lane which is very narrow, also the noise from deliveries and building work.

I also feel that the light will be affected in the Apple Orchard as the development will back onto the gardens.

We have also got one overdevelopment in The Apple Orchard overlooking the road.

(10/06/18)

XX Tannsfield Drive - We are still worried and therefore would like to object to the amended plans as they will still have a large impact on our property and the surrounding area.

Even though the original plans have been reduced we still feel that the five flats would not be appropriate in an area of only two storey houses and bungalows.

There was a planning application in our own road (Tannsfield Drive) not so long ago for flats, then re-applied for three-storey semi-detached houses which was refused

as it was not in keeping with the surrounding area.

(1/06/18)

5 The Apple Orchard - As the owners and residents of 5 The Apple Orchard, we write to STRONGLY OBJECT to the revised Planning Application Ref: 4/00147/18/FUL.

The specific grounds for objection to the proposed housing development of five flats at Fairview, Highfield Lane, HP2 5JE are set out below.

Disparity between existing footprint of Fairview property and proposed development

There is a huge difference between the footprint of the existing Fairview building and the proposed block of flats on drawing number 0623/26 Rev-. With the scale at 1:200 the existing Fairview building is 127.79 sq meters, however, the proposed block of flats footprint is 245.44 sq meters. This means that the proposed development will have a footprint that is 1.92 times bigger than the current building. In addition, the ground floor and first floor of the existing Fairview building has an internal floor area of 212.86 sq meters, which includes the internal garage. However, the internal floor area of the proposed flats is quoted on the drawing as 442sq metres, which means it is 2.07 times bigger than the current building. We believe that this increase in size, massing and positioning of the proposed property within the site area will result in an enormous loss of visual privacy, overshadowing whilst giving rise to potential noise and disturbance to the rear gardens of The Apple Orchard and to all nearby houses.

In addition, a building of this nature and size will:

- f Affect Highway Safety by causing a considerable amount of congestion, increase in local and additional traffic on Highfield Lane and cause obstruction to the footway as well as increasing parking pressure.
- Visitors to the proposed block will park in Highfield Lane and in The Apple Orchard (which is a very narrow road) and this additional parking is likely to block access to and from this road for residents and visitors alike. Additional parking from visitors to the flat's occupants, particularly in the road bend, would lead to further loss of visibility and increase the potential for road accidents. It should be noted that Highfield Lane accessing Queensway has a dangerous bend with poor sightlines.
- An additional concern is the increased danger caused by vehicles turning in and out of the proposed construction with restricted sightlines.
- Layout and density of building will be totally out of keeping with the rest of the housing along Highfield Lane and in The Apple Orchard. The proposed roof line will be considerably higher than neighbouring properties and will completely change the current street scape.
- Residents in The Apple Orchard and surrounding roads will be overlooked by the height of the proposed building and will suffer from a lack of privacy as well as a loss of light caused by the overshadowing of the proposed building.

Loss of Amenity to residents in The Apple Orchard and Tannsfield Drive

The proposed building will mean that 9 & 11 Tannsfield Drive will not only be directly overlooked but the number of overlooking windows will greatly affect visual privacy.

Number 1 The Apple Orchard will be directly overlooked by the front of the proposed building. There will also be loss of light to the garden.

Overshadowing of resident's property in The Apple Orchard

Number 2 The Apple Orchard will be directly looking at a brick wall. The windows in the proposed east facing elevation will give light pollution. The proposed building also impacts the light to the property.

Number 3 The Apple Orchard will suffer a partial loss of light to the garden due to the height and massing of the new development.

Number 4 The Apple Orchard will have the rear garden overlooked with a loss of visual privacy. With five flats with occupants on upper floors, we will be constantly overlooked

In addition, a large number of trees have already been removed from the Fairview site last month. No regard was given to the fact that birds were nesting and how their removal would impact on local wildlife.

Unsympathetic to the character of the Area

In the Area Policy for Adeyfield, HCA23 notes that any new proposals should pay respect to the style and house type close by. It also specifically lists The Apple Orchard as 'Notable in Design.'

The houses on Highfield Lane are also very distinctive in character but the proposed new building would be entirely out of keeping with the area in terms of architectural style and materials, with its height and massing also being significantly out of proportion with the buildings in the surrounding area. The vast majority of the surrounding properties, on The Apple Orchard, Nicholas Way, The Grazings and the lower section of Highfield Lane are detached houses.

The large scale, the height exceeding two stories, and nature of the proposed development would be considerably oppressive relative to the size of the plot, exacerbated by the proposed building line being very close to the boundaries to either side of the property, consequently affecting daylight and visual privacy to the several adjoining properties (as previously mentioned).

Noise and Disturbance

We are concerned that there will be a significant increase of noise and disturbance to all residents in The Apple Orchard particularly those which will be directly adjoined by the proposed communal garden.

Dacorum Borough Council Planning Policies: Adopted Core Strategy

Policy CS11 (Quality of Neighbourhood Design), we feel the proposal hasn't fully considered points a, b and f:

'Within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should: (a) *respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and general character;* (b) *preserve attractive streetscapes and enhance any positive linkages between character areas;* (c) co-ordinate streetscape design between character areas; (d) protect or enhance significant views within character areas; (e) incorporate natural surveillance to deter crime and the fear of crime; and (f) *avoid large areas dominated by car parking.*

Policy CS12 (Quality of Site Design) the proposal again hasn't met points c, f and g

On each site development should: a) provide a safe and satisfactory means of access for all users; b) provide sufficient parking and sufficient space for servicing; c) *avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties*; d) retain important trees or replace them with suitable species if their loss is justified; e) plant trees and shrubs to help assimilate development and softly screen settlement edges; f) *integrate with the streetscape character*; and g) *respect adjoining properties in terms of: i. layout; ii. security; iii. site coverage; iv. scale; v. height; vi. bulk; vii. materials; and viii. landscaping and amenity space.*

Reference to a previous rejected application (4/03915/15/FUL – Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of two dwellings, 24 Tannsfield Drive), close by to the proposed development of Fairview.

The case officer's reason for turning down the application in summary included:

'This arrangement would not only be nearly double the intended density of the area but, as before, is considered to give rise to a cramped and over-developed form of development that would be out of keeping with the established character of detached dwellings.'

'Although, as before, the proposals do include a strip of low level planting along the frontage, either side of a shared access, this provision is considered insignificant and would fail to mitigate or break up the impact of the hard surfacing and parking within the street scene and would need to be kept below 600 mm height to enable suitable visibility to be maintained. The proposal is in this respect contrary to Policies CS12 (e and g) and CS13 (f).'

'The scale of the car parking is considered excessive and detrimental to the amenity of the local area and not in keeping with other properties.'

'A swept path analysis to ensure that vehicles can park, turn around and re-enter the highway in a forward gear.'

We feel that all of these points raised on this case are also applicable to rejecting the proposed development of Fairview.

We would ask that our detailed objections are taken into account in the council's consideration of planning application Ref: 4/00147/18/FUL and for the reasons set out we are of the strong view that it should be refused.

This planning application is completely inappropriate for this area and is not adhering to DBC's Adopted Core Strategy policies as mentioned earlier. In addition the work proposed will cause a considerable amount of traffic, disruption and noise to what is a quiet and well-kept area of Hemel Hempstead.

We remain totally opposed to this proposal and wish to register for the second time our disapproval to this whole project. It would appear that as long as the Fairview property owners and developers can make financial gain the impact on everyone living nearby is of little interest to Dacorum Borough Council who only seem concerned with fulfilling their housing quotas.

(1/06/18)

97 Highfield Lane - As far as I can see nothing much has changed and with regards to reducing the car parking this surely is going to result in more cars being parked in the

lane on an already dangerous bend.

The whole idea is still out of keeping with the area and I fully support all those that are directly affected by it. It is not just the odd person, but half a close that back onto it and all those residents surrounding this property.

Sadly, if this were to get the go ahead it is just setting a precedence for any future property speculators to spoil what up until now, having lived here for nearly 40 years, has always been a very pleasant area.

Please, do consider the residents of Highfield Lane and the Apple Orchard, when making your decision.

(1/06/18)

25 Georgewood Road - I have noted the amendments to this application and still feel that it affects my parents right to the enjoyment of their property . The development extends too far back on the plot making it overbearing to the property next door. The property next door and it's topography makes the height of the proposed development overbearing. Since the application was submitted my parents have been subjected to power washers going throughout the day to an area of the property that if successful in their application will be demolished. This amounts to harassment and unneighbourly . They have stripped out all the shrubbery that borders my parents home . This house was purchased with deceit in mind no mention to the estate agent was made at the time of purchase of their hidden agenda. They said a family was moving in to live . This application is out of character in a street of .houses . Hemel Hempstead needs more houses not flats .

(31/05/18)

95 Highfield Lane - We have seen the revised plans for Fairview and they are still overdeveloped for the size of the plot. Making the car park smaller will only worsen the parked traffic in the Lane and make for a very dangerous narrow bend onto Queensway.

We still strongly object to these plans, which are completely out of character in Highfield Lane and totally support our friends and neighbours living in the Apple Orchard and hope you take all our comments into consideration.

(31/05/18)

4 The Apple Orchard - As the owners and residents of 4 The Apple Orchard, we write to object to the Planning Application Ref: 4/00147/18/FUL.

The specific grounds for objection to the amended plans are set out below:

Unsympathetic to the character of the Area

Whilst we fully appreciate there is a need for new housing within Dacorum, we feel that the proposed building on the site of Fairview, specifically relating to the size, mass and relocation within the plot is totally out of character with the other houses in the roads surrounding the property. Although it would be sad to lose such a historic house, we

feel a proposal of one or two 2-storeys houses of proportionate mass to the surrounding houses would be instead a better option. Such a development would then follow the building line, the density would meet the acceptable criteria and the mass would be of a reasonable size.

Overshadowing / Loss of Privacy

The amended plans show that Number 2 The Apple Orchard will now be partially looking at a brick wall that impacts the light to the property. However they will also now suffer a loss of privacy due to the stepped back position of the first and second floors on the amended plans.

Numbers 3 & 4 The Apple Orchard (our property) will have the rear gardens overlooked. There would also be a loss of privacy from the first and second floor windows to all adjoining properties - with five flats with occupants on upper floors, we will be constantly overlooked.

Listed on the Dacorum Borough Council Planning Policies, Adopted Core Strategy, Policy CS11, we feel the amended proposal still hasn't fully considered points a, b and f. And especially on Policy CS12 point c – '*avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties.*'

Also we feel that the amended plans have not taken into consideration CS12 Appendix 3, A3.6 More detailed aspects of layout and design should be treated as follows:

(i) Privacy - *Residential development should be designed and laid out so that the privacy of existing and new residents is achieved.*

Highway Safety – Increase in local traffic, obstruction to the footway and parking pressure

The amended plans show that the new building would still be set back in the plot which as we brought up in our previous objection letter, is out-of-character in the area.

Although the proposals do include foliage to be planted at the front of the building to minimise the impact of the car park, this would need to be kept at a specific height to maintain good visibility. Due to the fact of where the car park entrance is situated, we have concerns that this foliage maybe eventually be removed to enable easier access and increase visibility. The entrance is situated on a narrow lane with a blind bend. Any foliage that is allowed to grow too high and block visibility would increase the chances of an accident. If the foliage is reduced or removed for safety reasons, the street scene would be then dominated by hard surfacing car park.

The scale and dominance of hard surfacing and car parking is excessive and detrimental to the amenity of the local area and not in keeping with other properties. This is noted in CS12 Appendix 5, A5.17 states that *Large unbroken expanses of parking or excessive hard surfacing areas at building frontages are undesirable.*

With the increased occupation density on the site and level of parking provision (8 spaces) this will give rise to an increase in local traffic levels. It is likely that visitors to the flats or the inhabitants overspill vehicles will be parked in Highfield Lane. The road just down from Fairview is a dangerous bend with poor sightlines and parking would lead to further loss of visibility. On occasions when vehicles have parked on the pavement outside of Fairview our neighbours have had to push prams/steer mobility scooters into the road to get around the cars, which lead to concerns over pedestrian safety.

Although soakaways have been indicated on the plans, will they be sufficient to cover the runoff from the hard surfacing at the front of the property? With chalk streams being predominant in the area our concerns are that excess water will run down the hill.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we feel that the amended plans for the proposal of 4 flats and one duplex apartment have not addressed the majority of our concerns. Some of the outstanding points remain:

- The
- - The proposed building is grossly oversized for the plot of land.
 - It would be out of character with the surrounding buildings in its height mass and design. Consequently this would have a negative impact to the street scene.
 - The property would be overbearing to immediately adjoining properties.
 - It would severely compromise the sense of openness that the site currently provides to the street scene.

We would ask that our detailed objections are taken into account in the council's consideration of planning application Ref: 4/00147/18/FUL and for the reasons set out we are of the strong view that it should be refused.

(31/05/18)

Kinsale, HL - We write in connection with the above revised planning application. We live two doors down Highfield Lane from Fairview and feel if this development went ahead, it would set a precedent for future developers for the demolition of other houses with big gardens to make way for more blocks of flats. Eventually spoiling the country feel and character of the lane.

We wish to object strongly to the development of these flats in this location. We think the proposal is contrary to the Dacorum Core Strategy September 2013 policies CS11 (a) (b) (f) and CS12 (c) (f) (g) in regards to the following:

- Three storey dwelling out of scale in this narrow lane.
- The proposed development is out of character with existing adjoining properties.
- The proposed development doesn't integrate with the streetscape character.
- There is a loss of garden land due to the large size of the revised development, the re-siting of the living area (encroaching into the back garden) plus the hard standing for eight cars (completely swallowing the front garden – albeit that a few more bushes are to be planted). Not only will this have a negative visual impact, but it will increase pollution and result in a loss of habitat for wildlife.

POLICY CS11: Quality of Neighbourhood Design

Within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should:

- (a) respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and general character;
- (b) preserve attractive streetscapes and enhance any positive linkages between character areas;

(f) avoid large areas dominated by car parking.

POLICY CS12: Quality of Site Design

On each site development should:

- c) avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties;
- f) integrate with the streetscape character; and
- g) respect adjoining properties in terms of:
 - i. layout;
 - iii. site coverage;
 - iv. scale;
 - v. height;
 - vi. bulk;
 - viii. landscaping and amenity space.

In addition, we have concerns with regard to the increase of traffic in a narrow lane with the property exit near a bend. On street parking will be increased as the number of parking spaces on the property has been reduced on the revised plan. Visitors and service vehicles to the property will have to park on the road outside, thereby narrowing the lane further or restricting pavement access for pedestrians (Please see photo below taken outside Fairview today illustrating the point). In the DBC Local Plan 1991-2011 it states:

POLICY 51 DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT IMPACTS

The acceptability of all development proposals will always be assessed specifically in highway and traffic terms and should have no significant impact upon:

- (e) the environmental and safety implications of the traffic generated by the development.

Historically, Highfield Lane is mentioned as early as 1890 in Hemel Hempstead, long before the new town was developed. It has a “country lane” character consisting of mainly detached family dwellings with front and back gardens of a picturesque and traditional nature. As far as we know, this is the first application for a three story apartments in this lane according to the planning records.

(30/05/18)

2 The Apple Orchard - We wish to make you aware of our most strong objections to the proposed development of FLATS at the rear of Fairview.

As an immediate neighbour to the development we are of the view that the proposal will have a serious impact on our lives and should not be passed.

VISUAL INTRUSION / IMPACT ON AMENITY

The Apple Orchard, Highfield Lane and Tannfield Drive consist of detached low-density houses and bungalows.

The house Fairview sits with a green space to the front, side and rear that affords a pleasant green space enjoyable to all nine homes that adjoin the property.

The Flats would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity.
This will be replaced by a mass of brick and car park.

The proposed FLATS and CAR PARK are :

Totally out of character

Over-bearing to immediately adjoining properties

Crammed into the site

1.5M from our boundary and 14M from our property

Out of scale of Commercial proportions, almost twice the size and higher (450mm) than the existing property.

The mass, bulk and proximity of the Flats would appear overbearing and intrusive on our property.

Dacorum Borough Council Planning Policies Adapted core Strategy
Policy CS 11 Quality of Neighbourhood Design

Within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should:

- respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and general character;
- g preserve attractive streetscapes and enhance any positive linkages between character areas;
- h co-ordinate streetscape design between character areas;
- i protect or enhance significant views within character areas;
- j incorporate natural surveillance to deter crime and the fear of crime; and
- k avoid large areas dominated by car parking.

We believe the proposal has not fully considered points a,b,d, and f

LOSS OF LIGHT / OVERSHADOWING

The proposed development along 50% of our joint boundary will be predominantly a three story brick wall 13M from our house.

The bulk and proximity of the FLATS will cast a shadow over our house and garden.

Dacorum Borough Council Planning Policies Adapted core Strategy
Policy CS 12 Quality of Site Design

On each site development should:

- c. Avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties
- e. plant trees and shrubs to softly screen development and settlement edges;
- f. integrate with the streetscape character; and
- respect adjoining properties in terms of: (i) layout; (ii) security; (iii) site coverage; (iv) scale; (v) height; (vi) bulk; materials; and (vii) landscaping and amenity space.

We believe the proposal has not fully considered point's c,e and f

OVERLOOKING/LOSS OF PRIVACY

Our property is open plan and has eight floor to ceiling windows on the ground floor. The rear bedrooms have a continuous wall of windows seven in total. Therefore being over looked and privacy from the upper floors would be a major issue.

NOISE AND DISTURBANCE RESULTING FROM USE

Noise from 10 cars
Increased noise from communal garden,
Over occupancy up to 20 residents

ADEQUACY OF PARKING/TURNING

5 flats means probably 10 cars parking for only 8
There is no additional parking for visitors
Parking in the lane is a hazard

Parking bays not future proof
The minimum recognized width of parking bays 2.4M has remained the same since 1994 while car dimensions have continued to grow as extra safety features have been fitted.

DESIGN APPEARANCE AND TYPE OF MATERIALS

National Planning Policy Framework
Guidance Design
Paragraph: 025 ref ID: 26-025-020140306

CONSIDER SCALE

This relates both to the overall size and mass of individual buildings and spaces in relation to their surroundings, and to the scale of their parts.
Decisions on building size and mass, and the scale of open spaces around and between them, will influence the character, functioning and efficiency of an area.
In general terms too much building mass compared with open space may feel overly cramped and oppressive, with access and amenity spaces being asked to do more than they feasibly can. Too little and neither land as a resource or monetary investment will be put to best use.
The size of individual buildings and their elements should be carefully considered, as their design will affect the: overshadowing and overlooking of others; local character; skylines; and vistas and views. The scale of building elements should be both attractive and functional when viewed and used from neighbouring streets, gardens and parks.

The design of the Flats is to maximize the occupancy of the site.
Extremely large/awkward over developed.
Front/rear gardens are mainly buildings/hardstanding.
Most of the existing trees and shrubs removed.

I cannot see how the development meets the planning guidance.

Aitchison Raffety Design Access Statement

2.2 Heritage

Although the house Fairview has not met Heritage criteria it is a local landmark House that fits well within the street scene.

5.29 The proposed dwellings would not have any unacceptable impact on the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

This statement is hard to comprehend how a 3 story block of flats disguised to look like a large house with a large extension on the side have no impact on the neighbouring properties Is beyond belief.

Given these objections we believe the development should not go ahead

I request that you visit our property to view the potential impact of the proposed development.

(30/05/18)

12 The Apple Orchard - (29/05/18)

11 The Apple Orchard - Please feel free to use the objection and comments we have made against the planning permission to demolish the existing property and proposed plan to build flats and a duplex dwelling at Fairview Highfield Lane.

We are totally against the proposed plan and feel it will really detract from the ambience, look feel and character of the area, our original comments on the proposed plan I have copied below for your reference.

Please feel free to contact us directly if you require any further comments or support on this matter.

(29/05/18)

9 The Apple Orchard - I have seen the revised plans dated 18th May 2018 on Dacorum website and accompanying document from Aitchison Rafferty, regarding the proposed demolition of the 2-storey 4 bedroomed house known as 'Fairview' in Highfield Lane, and construction of a 3 storey block of 5 double bedoomed 'luxury' flats on the plot. The changes do not address adequately any of my original objections and increase my concern regarding traffic. I write to express my continued objection to this development as revised. This is on the following grounds:

- 1. Completely out of character for the area
- 6. Highways concern regarding increased traffic
- 7. Impact on my property

1. Character.

Highfield Lane and satellite streets are comprised entirely of houses, none smaller than three bedrooms and some substantially more. This end is large, spaciously detached properties. The houses in The Apple Orchard also appear to be spaciously separated, despite actually touching at opposing corners. The houses in the nearby streets Nicholas Way, The Grazings and Tannsfield Drive are also large, two storey detached properties.

Nowhere in the area are there any blocks of flats or any three storey structures. The

revised plans are still for a three storey construction with a foot print nearly twice as big as the existing dwelling (245 m² v. 127 m²)

In addition, this revised proposal continues to violate several of the Council's own development policies:

CS11 Quality of Neighbourhood Design

Within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should:

8. respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and general character – This proposal reduces space between existing dwellings as it is substantially closer to next door Rosebank bungalow and nos 2-5 The Apple Orchard
- (m) avoid large areas dominated by car parking, large unbroken expanses of parking or excessive hard surfacing at building frontages are undesirable – This proposal still has a large area of car parking at the front

CS12 Quality of Site Design

On each site development should:

- (f) avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties; - The proposal reduces sunlight and daylight to properties adjoining in The Apple Orchard, overlooks the adjoining properties in Highfield Lane, Tannsfield Drive and The Apple Orchard, aligns the headlights of manoeuvring vehicles directly into the bedroom of Rosebank, and moves the property much closer to Rosebank
- c) integrate with the streetscape character; - there are no blocks of flats in the area, and no three storey buildings
- f) respect adjoining properties in terms of: iv) scale; v) height – this proposal is taller and larger than the existing Fairview house, which is already of maximum size within the neighbourhood

Local development plan for area HCA23, as per Area Based Policies 185 Supplementary Planning Guidance, May 2004.

This states policy as 'Maintain existing layout and building form characteristics whilst allowing certain opportunities for new development.' Namely:

- g) Should pay respect to the type, style, size and mass of nearby and adjoining development
 - Should not normally exceed two storeys
 - New development should follow the building line where this is clearly present.Spacing should respect that of nearby and adjacent development

The proposal does not pay respect to size and style of nearby and adjoining properties, exceeds two storeys despite trying to disguise this with roof apartments, and does not respect existing spacing.

This document also mentions that there are 'Notable designs at The Apple Orchard...' and these would be overshadowed by the block of flats.

In their statement, Aitchison Rafferty believe "The proposed dwellings would not have any unacceptable impact on the occupiers of neighbouring properties.", however, those living in neighbouring properties feel that having a towering brick wall and fully occupied upper stories overlooking their gardens instead of an open garden is adverse and unacceptable.

Aitchison Rafferty also point out that the original dwelling has been considerably

extended. This is irrelevant. The extensions that make up the existing property have not made it out of character with some of the larger dwellings on Highfield Lane, unlike this application for three storeys of flats.

Other applications for flats in the area have been refused, e.g.:

24 Tannsfield Drive 4/03915/15/FUL – refused because it was out of keeping with the established character of detached dwellings in the area, highway safety, the scale of the car parking, and contrary to policies CS12 and CS13

The Stores, St Paul's Road APP/A1910/W/17/318402 – refused, appealed, refusal upheld because of the effect on character and appearance of the area, effect on highway and pedestrian safety, living conditions of future occupiers; conflicts with policies CS11, CS12, CS13, development principles of St. Paul's character

2. Highways Concern

There is a sharp, steep blind bend at this end of Highfield Lane. Traffic to and from this development is most likely to use this end of Highfield Lane as it is only a few yards from Queensway, rather than travel up Highfield Lane. Increased traffic will increase the danger of accidents on this bend.

In 2017 a vehicle failed to negotiate this bend, colliding with and destroying the illuminated 40mph sign at the junction with Queensway (which still has not been replaced). Had the vehicle avoided the sign it would have collided with the three BT junction boxes, thus removing telephone and internet services for the area.

The revisions reducing parking spaces to eight without reducing the number of dwellings increases my concern regarding overspill parking. It will now create an even greater additional vehicular and pedestrian hazard. On pushing my child in his pram down the pavement from The Apple Orchard I have had to walk in the road due to existing parked cars. The aforementioned blind bend makes this extremely hazardous, and overspill parking will only exacerbate this risk. It will also increase the risk of collisions as vehicles travelling along the lane avoid parked cars and stray into the path of those coming around the bend.

3. Impact on my property

Whilst not suffering the light restrictions, loss of privacy and close proximity of my neighbours adjoining the site, from the front of my property I look directly between a gap in the houses opposite to the rear corner of Fairview. This blends in nicely and there are no direct windows looking towards me. The proposed new three storey building will be visible over the roofs of the houses opposite me, I will have sight of a multi-windowed modern structure with brick colour 'to be agreed', and the windows will be able to look directly into my house unlike the offset of the Apple Orchard houses.

Further concerns

- There is also the matter of what will actually be built. As a resident of The Apple Orchard, our street has been adversely impacted by the concrete monstrosity at no. 17 Tannsfield Drive that now overlooks my garden and faces down the street. Although planning permission was granted to this property, that development has not followed the plans that were approved. Since no effective enforcement has taken place to correct this, I fear this will encourage the development of Fairview to be even more intrusive than those plans in front of you today.

Since my original letter, these concerns have been increased by the felling of nearly all trees on the site, as if preparing to begin construction before the application has been considered.

1. I am aware of the acute shortage of housing throughout Dacorum and the urgent need to build new homes. However, 'luxury' flats are not going to help alleviate the housing crisis or assist first-time buyers. In order to return a reasonable profit to the developers for purchasing the plot, demolition and new construction these will be sold at a price that will attract 'buy-to-let' investors, thus exacerbating the shortage of housing available to buy. Additionally, there are not many houses of this size in this area of Hemel Hempstead. They are usually to be found in more expensive areas, e.g. Boxmoor and Fields End. Demolishing this property means one less home at a more affordable price being available for a larger family in Dacorum.

(29/05/18)

1 The Apple Orchard - We object to the above planning proposal for the reasons shown below..

Amended plans.

Overlooking /Loss of Privacy

The revised plans have moved the building forward which has improved the situation slightly, however the front windows on storeys 2 and 3 will still overlook our property resulting in a loss of privacy.

Size of Building

Even with the modest size reduction the building is still an extremely large/bulky development which is out of character with the area .

Highway Safety / Parking

The proposed entry/ exit to the new property is a few yards away from a virtual blind bend in the road in both directions. The road is also quite narrow at this point , it can just take 1 vehicle parked on the blind bend to create a potential problem.

The number of new properties will attract more visitors, deliveries etc , who have nowhere to park except for the road. You really have to know the road to understand what I am saying ! It has to be driven with extra care. The revised plans have reduced on site parking by 2 vehicles

(29/05/18)

Rosebank - As the owners and residents of Rosebank, Highfield Lane, HP2 5JE we write to OBJECT to planning application ref: 4/00147/18/FUL. Demolition of detached dwelling and construction of 4 flats and one duplex at Fairview, Highfield Lane HP2 5JE.

When affected residents became aware of the situation, a meeting was arranged of about 20 to discuss how we felt about it, and it was felt that their privacy and loss of light and intrusion was compromised, also a block of flats was out of character with the surrounding area.

ROSEBANK! BUNGALOW

All hedging from Fairview has been removed, plus mature trees except for three trees at the rear of the communal amenity. How will the proposed planting be managed from intruding into my garden?

Headlights and noise will still be intrusive to our bedroom at the front, all hedges indicated will take many years to grow to be effective, and these will not cut out conversations and door slamming at night.

SIZE

Size should respect type, size and mass of existing nearby developments. The proposed flats respect none of these. The footprint of the flat is two times larger and three times higher than Rosebank. Two flats each of 107.6 m.sq are each larger than Rosebank. The angles used on the roof design have been used to minimise the appearance of bulk.

THE AREA POLICY FOR ADEYFIELD, HCA23, notes that any new proposals should pay respect to the style and house type close by. This proposal will give rise to an over developed form that would not be in keeping with the established character of dwellings in the lane.

HIGHWAY DANGER FROM STREET PARKING

With traffic leaving Queensway at 40m.p.h. confronted immediately by a blind bend and facing oncoming cars on the wrong side of the road due to parked cars in the lane.

There has been many accidents and near misses as a result of the blind bend. The last one I know about happened in 2017, the car lost control and crashed into the 40m.p.h sign. Fortunately the sign stopped the car careering into Queensway, the bent sign can still be seen. Two oak trees have also been damaged due to cars losing control therefore, let us not increase the danger with additional street parking.

With reference to Aitchison Rafferty's statement that the provision of housing on this site would also reflect the Council's hierachal approach to development, I would respond by saying that there are a large number of flats already under construction within the area, I am sure the Council would like to see more family homes with a garden available, which would be more suitable to the site.

I would like to bring to your attention aspects of the proposed development which significantly affects Rosebank. The height of the building will be bigger than the existing one. Rosebank is on land that drops down which exaggerates the difference in scale.

LOSS OF PRIVACY. The side entrance of the flats carry people and goods to and from the car park also to the rear of the property patio area and communal amenities, also cycle path to cycle shed, therefore a busy access route with no privacy.

IN conclusion may I say that our objections are genuine and are the result of over development which will cause intrusion, loss of light, failure to respect adjoining properties and parking problems, and for these reasons we believe that Planning Application 4/00147/18/FUL should be refused.

(28/05/18)

85 Highfield Lane - As a resident of Highfield Lane I would say that these plans show a huge over-development of this site and are not in keeping with any of the properties in Highfield Lane or The Apple Orchard and surrounding area. Visitors to the flats will almost certainly park their cars on Highfield Lane adding more congestion to the road and making driving up and down the lane even more hazardous. The site is very near a sharp bend in the road which is an even bigger worry - an accident waiting to happen.

No consideration has been given to the current owners of the properties in this area some of whom will have a huge three storey building sitting right at the end of their back gardens, taking away their privacy and blocking some light. The whole thing needs to be reconsidered.

(27/05/18)

9 Tannsfield Drive - I have looked at the revised plan for Fairview. To be honest I see very little change and continue to see it as a case of, as long as the property owners, the property developers and architects can make lots of money from the project "SCREW THE NEIGHBOURS". I hope you are aware all the apple trees, save one, have now been cut down. So just one apple tree and a very large conifer left. It leaves the Tannsfield Drive properties more exposed to the development and I still think the adjacent property in Highfield Road and those in the Apple Orchard will have their properties blighted by a large brick wall at the end of their gardens. Sorry Andrew, whilst I have no particular problem with the demolition of Fairview, I am still opposed to the development proposals as they now stand. Why can't they settle for a couple of semi's or detached houses on the site? Much more in keeping with surrounding properties. But I think we all know the answer to that one.

(22/05/18)

Neighbour reps on initial plans

25 Georgewood Road - My Elderly parents live next door to this proposed development .The architect has not considered the neighbouring properties and the impact this will have on their right to a quiet life and their enjoyment of their home. One of Hemel Hempstead oldest lanes with some of the highest priced homes in Hemel Hempstead. There will be the impact of cars being started early hours of the morning when people are leaving for work and night time arrivals when coming home from nights out . The foot print of this proposed development will leave my parents garden having an overbearing wall directly facing into their garden . The owners have currently stripped out all planted shrubs and trees from the site . Hemel Hempstead does not need any more flats it needs to retain houses for families who want to enjoy their gardens and live in harmony with the environment . I would ask the planning dept to reject this application on the grounds of over development and overbearing for the neighbouring properties

(26/04/18)

80 Highfield Lane - I would like to lodge an objection to the above mentioned planning application.

I have checked through the application and relevant documents on the Dacorum

website and comment as follows

2. I view the demolition of a single detached dwelling and the replacement by four flats and a duplex apartment as over development and out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood. All present dwellings in the lower half of Highfield Lane are single detached properties and this gives character to this particular residential road of Hemel Hempstead. I feel strongly that the proposed development would be detrimental to this.
- The proposed 'car park' with ten spaces to the front of the dwelling is crammed and would be detrimental to the local street scene

(22/02/18)

9 The Apple Orchard - I write to express my objection and concerns regarding the proposed demolition of the 2-storey 4 bedroomed house known as 'Fairview' in Highfield Lane, and construction of a 3 storey block of 5 double bedrooomed 'luxury' flats on the plot. This is on the following grounds:

- Completely out of character for the area
- 3. Highways concern regarding increased traffic
- 4. Impact on my property

1. Character.

Highfield Lane and satellite streets are comprised entirely of houses, none smaller than three bedrooms and some substantially more. This end is large, spaciously detached properties. The houses in The Apple Orchard also appear to be spaciously separated, despite actually touching at opposing corners. The houses in the nearby streets Nicholas Way, The Grazings and Tannsfield Drive are also large, two storey detached properties.

Nowhere in the area are there any blocks of flats or any three storey structures.

In addition, this proposal violates several of the Council's own development policies:

CS11 Quality of Neighbourhood Design

Within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should:

5. respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and general character – This proposal reduces space between existing dwellings as it is substantially closer to next door Rosebank bungalow and nos 2-5 The Apple Orchard
- (h) avoid large areas dominated by car parking, large unbroken expanses of parking or excessive hard surfacing at building frontages are undesirable – This proposal has a large area of car parking at the front

CS12 Quality of Site Design

On each site development should:

- (f) avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties; - The proposal reduces sunlight and daylight to properties adjoining in The Apple Orchard, overlooks the adjoining properties in Highfield Lane, Tannsfield Drive and The Apple Orchard, aligns the headlights of manoeuvring vehicles directly into the bedroom of Rosebank, and moves the property much closer to Rosebank
- c) integrate with the streetscape character; - there are no blocks of flats in the

- area, and no three storey buildings
- f) respect adjoining properties in terms of: iv) scale; v) height – this proposal is taller and larger than the existing Fairview house, which is already of dominant size within the neighbourhood

Local development plan for area HCA23, as per Area Based Policies 185 Supplementary Planning Guidance, May 2004.

This states policy as 'Maintain existing layout and building form characteristics whilst allowing certain opportunities for new development.' Namely:

- f) Should pay respect to the type, style, size and mass of nearby and adjoining development
- g) Should not normally exceed two storeys
 - New development should follow the building line where this is clearly present. Spacing should respect that of nearby and adjacent development

The proposal does not pay respect to size and style of nearby and adjoining properties, exceeds two storeys despite trying to disguise this with roof apartments, and does not respect existing spacing.

This document also mentions that there are 'Notable designs at The Apple Orchard...' and these would be overshadowed by the block of flats.

Other applications for flats in the area have been refused, e.g.:

24 Tannsfield Drive 4/03915/15/FUL – refused because it was out of keeping with the established character of detached dwellings in the area, highway safety, the scale of the car parking, and contrary to policies CS12 and CS13

The Stores, St Paul's Road APP/A1910/W/17/318402 – refused, appealed, refusal upheld because of the effect on character and appearance of the area, effect on highway and pedestrian safety, living conditions of future occupiers; conflicts with policies CS11, CS12, CS13, development principles of St. Paul's character

2. Highways Concern

There is a sharp, steep blind bend at this end of Highfield Lane. Traffic to and from this development is most likely to use this end of Highfield Lane as it is only a few yards from Queensway, rather than travel up Highfield Lane. Increased traffic will increase the danger of accidents on this bend.

In 2017 a vehicle failed to negotiate this bend, colliding with and destroying the illuminated 40mph sign at the junction with Queensway (which still has not been replaced). Had the vehicle avoided the sign it would have collided with the three BT junction boxes, thus removing telephone and internet services for the area.

Overspill parking from the flats will create additional vehicular and pedestrian hazard. On pushing my child in his pram down the pavement from The Apple Orchard I have had to walk in the road due to existing parked cars. The aforementioned blind bend makes this extremely hazardous, and overspill parking will only exacerbate this risk. It will also increase the risk of collisions as vehicles travelling along the lane avoid parked cars and stray into the path of those coming around the bend.

3. Impact on my property

Whilst not suffering the light restrictions, loss of privacy and close proximity of my neighbours adjoining the site, from the front of my property I look directly between a gap in the houses opposite to the rear corner of Fairview. This blends in nicely and there are no direct windows looking towards me. The proposed new three storey building will be visible over the roofs of the houses opposite me, I will have sight of a multi-windowed modern structure with brick colour 'to be agreed', and the windows will

be able to look directly into my house unlike the offset of the Apple Orchard houses.

Further concerns

- There is also the matter of what will actually be built. As a resident of The Apple Orchard, our street has been adversely impacted by the concrete monstrosity at no. 17 Tannsfield Drive that now overlooks my garden and faces down the street. Although planning permission was granted to this property, that development has not followed the plans that were approved. Since no effective enforcement has taken place to correct this, I fear this will encourage the development of Fairview to be even more intrusive than those plans in front of you today.
- I am aware of the acute shortage of housing throughout Dacorum and the urgent need to build new homes. However, 'luxury' flats are not going to help alleviate the housing crisis or assist first-time buyers. In order to return a reasonable profit to the developers for purchasing the plot, demolition and new construction these will be sold at a price that will attract 'buy-to-let' investors, thus exacerbating the shortage of housing available to buy. Additionally, there are not many houses of this size in this area of Hemel Hempstead. They are usually to be found in more expensive areas, e.g. Boxmoor and Fields End. Demolishing this property means one less home at a more affordable price being available for a larger family in Dacorum.

(22/02/18)

81 Highfield Lane - I would like to OBJECT to the proposal to build flats over the site of Fairview House.

The proposed flats are not in keeping with the houses on Highfield Lane. The lower portion of the lane is made up of detached houses as is The Apple Orchard, The Grazings, Nicholas Close and Tannsfield Drive which are all close by. The proposed size of the building, which is at least double that of Fairview is far too large for this area. The area at the front, which will be dominated by car parking, is also totally out of keeping. Although foliage at the front has been proposed to minimise impact, who is going to maintain this and how can this be assured?

The proposed entrance to the flats will be opposite my driveway. With so many extra vehicles coming in and out of the car park at night, car headlights will shine through our windows. There would also be extra noise from cars 'revving' in the morning.

The bend on Highfield Lane outside of Fairview is already known to be dangerous by the local residents as there have been several accidents in recent years, which have been caused by drivers going too quickly around it. With so many extra vehicles entering and leaving the car park I believe this will cause a highway safety issue.

Whilst there are 10 parking spaces proposed I am concerned that they are so tightly packed in and there is not enough space for the drivers to be able to do a 3 point turn to leave the property facing forward – this would result in residents backing out onto Highfield Lane which I believe is another highway safety concern. Visitors to the property or the new home owners who own vans will more than likely park in Highfield Lane, again causing safety issues.

I am also very concerned that any extra vehicles parked in the road would either block

my driveway or impede my exit onto Highfield Lane.

Although I appreciate you do not take into consideration our personal views on the matter I would like to let you know how this proposal would affect my family and myself.

My mother who lives with me has dementia and needs several naps throughout the day. The building works would be right on our doorstep, with noise going on for up to 8 hours a day. As my mother's registered carer I believe this would severely affect her health further. With all of the extra noise that comes with the extra occupants of flats, again this could also lead to further deterioration of her health. My sister who is a regular visitor to our house (and who helps with the caring of our mother) would not be able to come around throughout the building works (could this last up to 2 years?) as she suffers from tinnitus in her ears.

On regular occasions I have to take my mother to hospital appointments, on some occasions we have had to call out an ambulance for her. Further to the point of the highly likely possibility of my driveway being blocked by the extra inhabitants of the flats – this could cause a lot of problems.

I chose to buy and live in this house that I considered to be my 'one for life' because I didn't want to live in a high-density area made up of flats. All of the properties as I mentioned previously are detached.

Fairview House is one of the oldest in the area and surely has some historic merit.

(21/02/18)

11 Tannsfield Drive - we wish to record our objections to the above development of one house into four flats and one duplex apartment on the following grounds:

1. We will be directly overlooked by 13 windows with the new property being moved further towards our own property.
 2. We will completely lose any privacy we have at present.
 3. When we look out of the back at our property at present we can see a partial view of Fairview House and the immediate surrounding properties. If this development goes ahead we will be looking at a block of flats at the bottom of our garden. Their windows will be looking down/into our house and garden.
This is not the view we want. At the moment we have no problems with overlooking/loss of privacy etc but can see this coming with this development.
- There will undoubtedly be noise from the communal garden/amenity area proposed behind these flats which backs directly on to our garden.
 - The proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding area. There are no flats/apartments in the adjacent roads, only houses and bungalows.

At present there is a large tree at the bottom of Fairview House which gives us some privacy. We would imagine that the developers would probably remove this tree for the communal garden/amenity area whereby we would be overlooked by the entire redevelopment.

Fairview House must be one of the oldest houses in Hemel Hempstead and to replace it with four flats and a duplex apartment would be a great loss to the area.

(21/02/18)

92 Highfield Lane - It's a lovely big family home and should not be destroyed for the greed of other people it will make it more congested with more cars in an already busy lane.

(21/02/18)

5 The Apple Orchard - As the owners and residents of 5 The Apple Orchard, we write to STRONGLY OBJECT to Planning Application Ref: 4/00147/18/FUL.

The specific grounds for objection to the proposed housing development of five flats at Fairview, Highfield Lane, HP2 5JE are set out below.

A building of this nature and size will:

Affect Highway Safety by causing a considerable amount of congestion, increase in local and additional traffic on Highfield Lane and cause obstruction to the footway as well as increasing parking pressure.

It is likely that visitors to the proposed block will park in Highfield Lane and in The Apple Orchard (which is a very narrow road) and any additional parking is likely to block access to and from this road for residents and visitors alike. Highfield Lane accessing Queensway has a dangerous bend with poor sightlines. Additional parking from visitors to the flat's occupants, particularly in the road bend, would lead to further loss of visibility.

There has already been on many occasions obstructive parking on the pavement outside of the Fairview property from the current residents, resulting in pedestrians having to push prams/steer mobility scooters/walk into the road to get around parked vehicles. An additional concern is of the increased danger of vehicles turning in and out of the proposed construction with restricted sightlines.

Layout and density of building will be totally out of keeping with the rest of the housing along Highfield Lane and in The Apple Orchard. The proposed roof line will be considerably higher than neighbouring properties and will completely change the current street scape

Many residents in The Apple Orchard will be overlooked by the height of the proposed building and will suffer from a lack of privacy as well as a loss of light caused by the overshadowing of the proposed building.

Loss of Amenity to residents in The Apple Orchard and Tannsfield Drive

The proposed building will mean that 9 & 11 Tannsfield Drive will not only be directly overlooked but the number of overlooking windows increases to 13 affecting visual privacy.

Number 1 The Apple Orchard will be directly overlooked by the front of the proposed building. There will also be loss of light to the garden.

The size, massing and positioning of the proposed property within the site area will result in loss of visual privacy, overshadowing and give rise to potential noise and disturbance to the rear gardens of The Apple Orchard.

Overshadowing of resident's property in The Apple Orchard

Number 2 The Apple Orchard will be directly looking at a brick wall. The windows in the proposed east facing elevation will give light pollution. The proposed building also impacts the light to the property.

Number 3 The Apple Orchard will suffer a partial loss of light to the garden due to the height and massing of the new development.

Number 4 The Apple Orchard will have the rear garden overlooked with a loss of visual privacy. With five flats with occupants on upper floors, we will be constantly overlooked

Unsympathetic to the character of the Area

In the Area Policy for Adeyfield, HCA23 notes that any new proposals should pay respect to the style and house type close by. It also specifically lists The Apple Orchard as 'Notable in Design.'

The houses on Highfield Lane are also very distinctive in character but the proposed new building would be entirely out of keeping with the area in terms of architectural style and materials, with its height and massing also being significantly out of proportion with the buildings in the surrounding area. The vast majority of the surrounding properties, on The Apple Orchard, Nicholas Way, The Grazings and the lower section of Highfield Lane are detached houses.

The large scale, the height exceeding two stories, and nature of the proposed development would be considerably oppressive relative to the size of the plot, exacerbated by the proposed building line being very close to the boundaries to either side of the property, consequently affecting daylight and visual privacy to the several adjoining properties (as previously mentioned).

Noise and Disturbance

We are concerned that there will be a significant increase of noise and disturbance to all residents in The Apple Orchard particularly those which will be directly adjoined by the proposed communal garden.

Dacorum Borough Council Planning Policies: Adopted Core Strategy

Policy CS11 (Quality of Neighbourhood Design), we feel the proposal hasn't fully considered points a, b and f:

'Within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should: (a) *respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and general character*; (b) *preserve attractive streetscapes and enhance any positive linkages between character areas*; (c) co-ordinate streetscape design between character areas; (d) protect or enhance significant views within character areas; (e) incorporate natural surveillance to deter crime and the fear of crime; and (f) *avoid large areas dominated by car parking*.

Policy CS12 (Quality of Site Design) the proposal again hasn't met points c, f and g

On each site development should: a) provide a safe and satisfactory means of access for all users; b) provide sufficient parking and sufficient space for servicing; c) *avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties*; d) retain important trees or replace them with suitable species if their loss is justified; e) plant trees and shrubs to help assimilate development and softly screen settlement edges; f) *integrate with the streetscape character*; and g) *respect adjoining properties in terms of: i. layout; ii. security; iii. site coverage; iv. scale; v. height; vi. bulk; vii. materials; and viii. landscaping and amenity space*.

Reference to a previous rejected application (4/03915/15/FUL – Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of two dwellings, 24 Tannsfield Drive), close by to the proposed development of Fairview.

The case officer's reason for turning down the application in summary included:

'This arrangement would not only be nearly double the intended density of the area but, as before, is considered to give rise to a cramped and over-developed form of development that would be out of keeping with the established character of detached dwellings.'

'Although, as before, the proposals do include a strip of low level planting along the frontage, either side of a shared access, this provision is considered insignificant and would fail to mitigate or break up the impact of the hard surfacing and parking within the street scene and would need to be kept below 600 mm height to enable suitable visibility to be maintained. The proposal is in this respect contrary to Policies CS12 (e and g) and CS13 (f).'

'The scale of the car parking is considered excessive and detrimental to the amenity of the local area and not in keeping with other properties.'

'A swept path analysis to ensure that vehicles can park, turn around and re-enter the highway in a forward gear.'

We feel that all of these points raised on this case are also applicable to rejecting the proposed development of Fairview.

We would ask that our detailed objections are taken into account in the council's consideration of planning application Ref: 4/00147/18/FUL and for the reasons set out we are of the strong view that it should be refused.

This planning application is completely inappropriate for this area and is not adhering to DBC's Adopted Core Strategy policies as mentioned earlier. In addition the work proposed will cause a considerable amount of traffic, disruption and noise to what is a quiet and well-kept area of Hemel Hempstead.

We are totally opposed to this proposal and wish to register our disapproval to this whole project.

(21/02/18)

Kinsale, HL - We write in connection with the above planning application. We have examined the plans and know the site well. We wish to object strongly to the development of these flats in this location. We think the proposal is contrary to the Dacorum Core Strategy September 2013 policies CS11 (a) (b) (f) and CS12 (c) (f) (g) in regards to the following:

- Three storey dwelling out of scale in this narrow lane.
- The proposed development is out of character with existing neighbouring properties.
- The proposed development doesn't integrate with the streetscape character.
- There is a loss of garden land due to the large size of the development, the re-siting of the living area (encroaching into the back garden) plus the hard standing for ten cars (completely swallowing the front garden). Not only will this have a negative visual impact, but it will increase pollution and result in a loss of habitat for wildlife.

POLICY CS11: Quality of Neighbourhood Design

Within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should:

- (a) respect the typical density intended in an area and enhance spaces between buildings and general character;
- (b) preserve attractive streetscapes and enhance any positive linkages between character areas;
- (f) avoid large areas dominated by car parking.

POLICY CS12: Quality of Site Design

On each site development should:

- c) avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties;
- f) integrate with the streetscape character; and
- g) respect adjoining properties in terms of:
 - i. layout;
 - iii. site coverage;
 - iv. scale;
 - v. height;
 - vi. bulk;
 - viii. landscaping and amenity space.

In addition, we have concerns with regard to the increase of traffic in a narrow lane with the property exit near a bend. On street parking will very likely be increased by visitors and service vehicles to the property, thereby narrowing the lane further or restricting pavement access for pedestrians. In the DBC Local Plan 1991-2011 it states:

POLICY 51 DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORT IMPACTS

The acceptability of all development proposals will always be assessed specifically in highway and traffic terms and should have no significant impact upon:

- (e) the environmental and safety implications of the traffic generated by the development.

Historically, Highfield Lane is mentioned as early as 1890 in Hemel Hempstead, long before the new town was developed. It has a “country lane” character consisting of mainly detached family dwellings with front and back gardens of a picturesque and traditional nature. As far as we know, this is the first application for a three story apartments in this lane according to the planning records.

If this development went ahead, it would set a precedent for future developers for the demolition of other houses with big gardens to make way for more blocks of flats, completely spoiling the character and eventually the country feel and character of the lane.

(20/02/18)

6 The Apple Orchard - I object to the plans, as I feel it is overdevelopment for the area. I also feel that it is not within keeping of the area, as it will effect the outlook for the houses in the Apple Orchard also the light will be effected in the Apple Orchard.

So I feel that if this development is allowed to go ahead, the area around the Apple Orchard will be changed for the worse.

We have already got one overdeveloped building overlooking the Apple Orchard, the last thing we need is another one.

(19/02/18)

95 Highfeild Lane - We are writing with reference to the recent planning application for "Fairview" in Highfield Lane, to which we strongly OBJECT.

We have lived here (no. 95) happily for 24 years, appreciating the tranquility of Highfield Lane, with its distinctive houses and general

We thoroughly support our neighbours in the Apple Orchard and in "Rosebank" the bungalow, either side of "Fairview" in objecting to this application for their reasons of loss of privacy and light, we feel that there should be respect for these adjoining properties.

From our own personal point of view (we live slightly further up the Lane), we also object for the following reasons:-

- HIGHWAY SAFETY - "Fairview" is situated on a bend in Highfield Lane, with poor visibility and this would be made even more dangerous with the pressure of extra residents' vehicles in and out of a car park, not to mention visitors to the site creating on-street parking near the blind bend.
- GENERAL CHARACTER - A block of flats and a car park would be totally out of character in the Lane and is so unnecessary. Also where would this end? Would all the lovely older houses end up being demolished if planning permission was requested and given?

(18/02/18)

12 The Apple Orchard -

(16/02/18)

1 The Apple Orchard - All the houses in the area are detached, we do not want the look and feel of the area spoilt by standing up flats. The High Field lane area in Adeyfield is highly sought after and flats will detract from the natural beauty of the area and will not be aligned with the look, feel and build style that all the houses have in the vicinity.

Furthermore the bend at the bottom of High Field Lane is narrow and very sharp, if access to the Fairview plot is to be opened up then that could well become a safety hazard.

(14/02/18)

99 Highfield Lane - We do not feel flats/apartments are in keeping with this area. The lane is narrow and increased traffic would be a nuisance. The existing property has character and would be a loss to the lane.

(12/02/18)

97 Highfield Lane - Having been a resident of Highfield Lane for the past 39 years and enjoyed the pleasure of living in a little bit of a 'backwater' it is most disconcerting to think that one of the original old detached houses is to be demolished and replaced with flats, bringing with them a probable 10 extra vehicles. We already have to endure fast cars using the Lane as a cut through without encouraging unnecessary extra traffic. The bend where the proposed dwellings would be already suffers extra people parking on the road making visibility poor coming in and out of the Lane and we feel that this would only exacerbate the situation.

As all the dwellings from Larchwood Road down are detached, we feel that the construction of flats would not be in keeping with the area.

We feel for the residents of The Apple Orchard, already having to endure the 3 story monstrosity that was allowed to be built overlooking the end of a very pleasant cul de sac, without now inflicting having to look at the side of what will be a very large building from the rear of some of their back gardens.

We do not understand why planners are intent on stuffing more and more flats into any available space, in a town whose infrastructure has been drastically reduced over the years.

(12/02/18)

9 Tannsfield Drive - Fairview, Highfield Lane directly affects me as its garden is just over my garden fence. You may be aware I have already posted a comment on line regarding this matter. It does concern me that the developer has not taken into account anybody whose garden backs on to the plot of Fairview. To me the proposed development is totally out of keeping with all other local properties. A couple of 2 storey houses on the plot fronting onto Highfield Lane would, I suggest, be acceptable and more in keeping with the area.

The development hasn't been thought through in respect of the positioning of the building on the site. If the majority of the development had been on the footprint of the present house and extended along the Highfield Lane side of the site, it would have been very intrusive but perhaps tolerable, although could block light to the property opposite in Highfield Lane. However, by positioning it on the central area of the plot on the uphill border it means that properties in The Apple Orchard will have a thirty/forty feet high wall directly at the end of their gardens blocking a view to the west and more importantly blocking sun and light which I am sure you would agree would be intolerable. This also must also apply to the next property uphill in Highfield Lane.

From my point of view, I of course, have concerns about the disruption (noise and dust) that will be caused by the demolition of a lovely old house. As I have commented on the effect on the people in The Apple Orchard, I too have concerns about how much I will be overlooked by a building of such height very close to my plot. Also, it is not clear whether the present trees are to be retained or new ones planted. For sure the present trees (part of the original orchard before the area was developed) afford privacy to my plot and are a haven for birds. If new trees are to be planted, I certainly would not want the likes of leylandii at the end of my garden. One last thing, does the developer intend to replace the border fence which is now starting to disintegrate?

(4/02/18)

9 Tannsfield Drive - The greed of property owners and lack of consideration for local residents by property developers continues to amaze me. If this application had been mainly developed on the footprint of the present property it would have been intrusive but perhaps tolerable. However by moving the development to a more central position on the plot it would appear residents in The Apple Orchard and the adjacent property in Highfield Road will have a very large wall blocking the current view from their back gardens and perhaps more importantly blocking the sun and light. Surely some consideration should have been given to this aspect when the plans were being drawn up but perhaps that was too much to expect.

(4/02/18)