

4/02338/18/FUL	TWO 1-BED UNITS AND 2 2-BED UNITS FROM THE CONVERSION AND PART DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING BUILDINGS (AMENDED SCHEME)
Site Address	NISSEL HOUSE, FENSOMES CLOSE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 5DH
Applicant	Avon Services, Rose Barn
Case Officer	Jason Seed
Referral to Committee	Application called-in by Cllr Wyatt-Lowe on the grounds of overdevelopment, lack of adequate parking and loss of residential amenity for adjacent properties.

1. Recommendation

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions detailed within this report.

2. Summary

2.1 The proposal is considered to provide a modest yet valuable contribution towards the Council's housing stock within an existing residential area. Sufficient parking is proposed and the site is located within close proximity to publically-available open spaces. It is considered that on the balance of the evidence contained within the submission, the development is acceptable.

3. Site Description

3.1 The site is located on the Eastern side of Fensomes Close, Hemel Hempstead, and comprises three single-storey vehicle garages and a two-storey commercial building. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in terms of both use and character.

3.2 The site is subject to the following relevant designation: CIL3.

4. Proposal

4.1 The application proposes 2 x one bedroom units and 2 x three bedroom units through part demolition and conversion of the existing structures which are on site.

4.2 The proposals have been amended during the determination of the application and 1 one bedroom unit was removed to minimise the impact of the proposals on adjoining properties.

5. Relevant Planning History

4/01707/18/FUL PART DEMOLITION AND CONVERSION OF THE EXISTING BUILDING TO CREATE THREE 1 BED UNITS AND TWO 2 BED UNITS.
 Withdrawn
 10/09/2018

6. Policies

6.1 National Policy Guidance

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

6.2 Adopted Core Strategy –

NP1, CS1, CS4, CS8, CS11, CS12, CS17, CS31, CS32.

6.3 Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policies 10, 12, 18, 19, 21, 51, 100.

Saved Appendix 3 - Layout and Design of Residential Areas
Saved appendix 5 - Parking Standards

7. Constraints

- 45.7M AIR DIR LIMIT
- CIL3

8. Representations

Consultation responses

8.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix 1

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

8.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix 2

9. Considerations

Main issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Policy and principle
- Impact of the Development on the Street Scene
- Trees and Landscaping
- Site Access and Impact on Highway Safety
- Parking
- Impact upon Neighbours
- Refuse Storage
- Sustainability

Policy and Principle

9.2 Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy states that Hemel Hempstead will be the focus for homes, jobs and strategic services. Policy CS2 encourages development within defined settlements on previously developed land and buildings and areas of high accessibility. Policy CS4 states that in residential areas appropriate residential development is encouraged. National policy guidance (NPPF) focusses on the objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing and the efficient use of brownfield land.

9.3 It is therefore considered that the principle of the development is acceptable, subject to the satisfactory addressing of other material planning considerations.

Impact of the Development on the Street Scene

9.4 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy states that on each site development should integrate with the streetscape character.

9.5 The existing structures are utilitarian in appearance and occupy the eastern side of the street scene in addition to the westernmost elevations of the residential properties which are situated adjacent to the site's northern and southern boundaries.

9.6 The street scene on the western side of the close is set by a short terrace of two storey dwellinghouses. The properties are provided with front amenity areas and garaging projecting from the front elevations.

9.6 The proposals would result in the demolition of the southernmost part of the site to create a shared external amenity area for the proposed dwellings.

9.7 2 x two storey dwellinghouses would be constructed on the central part of the site, whilst the commercial property would undergo some minor aesthetic alterations to facilitate the residential conversion of this building.

9.8 The proposals are considered to be modest in scale and would not result in incongruous additions within the street scene in respect of scale, mass and height. Whilst front dormers are not evident within the immediate existing street scene, a number are present within East Street to the south and Broad Street to the south-west.

9.9 The removal / conversion of the current buildings which are of limited aesthetic merit and their replacement with newer, well-proportioned dwellings is considered to have an acceptable impact upon the street scene and with the use of appropriate materials, will integrate within the prevailing streetscape character.

Trees and Landscaping

9.10 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy states that on each site, development should retain important trees or replace them with suitable species if their loss is justified.

9.11 The site does not benefit from a substantial degree of existing tree coverage or landscaping. However, it is noted that the southern section of the site is proposed to be used as amenity space for the occupant of the new unit. As such, it is considered appropriate to secure further details of proposed landscaping through condition to ensure a satisfactory finish to the development is achieved.

Site Access and Impact on Highway Safety

9.12 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy states that on each site development should provide a safe and satisfactory means of access for all users.

9.13 Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy states that the traffic generated from new development must be compatible with the location, design and capacity of the current and future operation of the road hierarchy, taking into account any planned improvements and cumulative effects of incremental developments.

9.14 Furthermore, Saved Policy 51 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (DBLP) states that development must be compatible in locational and general highway planning, design and capacity terms with the current and future operation of the defined road hierarchy and road improvement strategy.

9.15 The site is accessed via an existing access from Broad Street, which is to remain unaltered. This access leads to Fensomes Close, which is used to access the existing workshop/garages and three other residential dwellings.

9.16 The Highway Authority has been consulted on the application and does not wish to restrict the granting of planning permission, subject to conditions and informatives.

9.17 As such, it is considered that the proposals do not conflict with the relevant planning policies as detailed above.

Parking

9.18 Policy CS12 states that on each site, development should provide sufficient parking.

9.19 The site is identified within the Council's Accessibility Zones for the Application of Parking Standards SPG as being situated within Zone 3.

9.20 Saved Appendix 5 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan provides the Council's maximum parking standards. The development comprises the following schedule of units:

- 2 x one bed: max standard. 1.25 spaces per dwelling = 2.5 spaces
- 2 x two beds: max standard. 1.5 spaces per dwelling = 3 spaces
- Total maximum parking requirement = 5.5 spaces

9.21 The proposal plans illustrate that 5 parking spaces currently exist, and that 5 are to be retained. With a shortfall of 0.5 spaces below maximum, it is considered that the proposals are acceptable, particularly given the site's Zone 3 status and proximity to the town centre.

9.22 The Highway Authority have recommended the imposition of a condition in respect of layout and dimensions of parking spaces and their arrangements to keep an area free of parked vehicles to ensure the permanent availability of a turning area. It is considered that there is sufficient spaces within the red line boundary for such matters to be appropriately accommodated and as such, the condition is reasonable and will assist with securing a suitable arrangement post- development.

Impact upon Neighbours

9.23 Policy CS12 states that on each site, development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties.

Visual Intrusion

9.24 It is considered that the visual intrusiveness of the proposals needs to be assessed in relation to the following: properties to the west (1-3 Fensomes Close) and those to the south (11 – 15 Broad Street).

9.25 With regards to the former, it is noted that the views from these properties will change from a row of single-storey garages to that of 2 x two storey dwellinghouses. However, it is not considered that such a change would result in visual intrusion due to the relatively modest scale of the proposals and the separation distance of approximately 20 metres between the front elevation of these properties and those which are proposed.

9.26 With regards to the properties to the south in Broad Street, No. 15 is situated to the south of the proposal site. The southernmost elevation of the proposed dwellings is proposed to be located approximately 11m from the rear elevation of No. 15. It is noted that the Council does not have a policy on rear-to-side relationships and as such, a judgement needs to be made as to the extent to which this would result in unacceptable visual intrusion / overbearingness.

9.27 The application originally proposed an additional two-storey dwelling where the amenity area is now proposed. This was removed following discussions with the Case Officer due to concerns arising in respect of the relationship between this property and the rearmost elevation of No. 15.

9.28 Whilst it is acknowledged that a change of outlook will result from the rear windows of No.

15 if the proposals were to be approved, it is not considered that this would result in an unacceptable level of visual intrusion due to the aforementioned separation distances.

9.29 It is considered that given the proposals location in relation to the remainder of the properties within Broad Street (i.e. situated to the north-east) the new dwellings would not create an unacceptable level of visual intrusion.

Loss of Sunlight and Daylight

9.30 The proposal site is located to the north / north-east of the closest residential properties. The separation distances between the new dwellings and these properties, combined with the sun rising in the east, will ensure that no unacceptable loss of sunlight / daylight would result.

9.31 The properties to the north of the site are situated a substantial distance from the proposal site. Furthermore, the roofs of the new dwellings will not exceed the height of the commercial building which is to be converted and which is situated closer to the properties to the north than those which are proposed to be created. The separation distances notwithstanding, this would minimise any loss of sunlight / daylight which may otherwise have resulted.

Loss of Privacy

9.32 As the proposal plans illustrate, limited fenestration is proposed to be incorporated within the new dwellings.

9.33 Dormer windows and windows within the ground floor front elevation are to be created within the new dwellings which will replace the garages. A separation distance of approximately 20m will exist between the front elevation of these properties and the front elevations of the properties to the west which is considered sufficient to ensure that mutual privacy is provided.

9.34 The rear (westernmost) elevation will require the retention of an existing window at first floor level and the creation of a new window at ground floor level, both serving each of the 2 bedroom units located to the north of the site. It is not considered that the introduction of an additional window to this elevation would not result in a significant degree of privacy impact to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

Disturbance

9.35 The introduction of small-scale residential accommodation into a residential area is not considered to result in such a significant uplift in movement, noise or other associated impacts which would result in an unacceptable level of disturbance.

9.36 For the reasons detailed above, it is considered that the proposals will not conflict with the requirements of Policy CS12 in respect of visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance.

Amenity Space

9.37 Saved Appendix 3 of the DBLP states that all residential development is required to provide private open space for use by residents whether the development be houses or flats. The appendix does however state that a reduced rear garden depth may be acceptable for small starter homes, homes for the elderly and development backing onto or in close proximity, to open land, public open space or other amenity land.

9.38 It is noted that only a limited amount of amenity space is to be provided as part of the proposals (the floor area of approximately the footprint of one of the new dwellings). However, it is further noted that the site is located within close proximity to numerous public open spaces and the amenities of Hemel Hempstead town centre.

9.39 The properties would provide good quality 'entry-level' properties for people seeking to enter the housing market. Taking all of these matters into consideration, it is considered that the benefits of the addition of 4 residential units to the Council's housing stock outweighs the disbenefits of the lack of on-site amenity provision in this instance.

Refuse Storage

9.40 It is noted from the submitted proposal plans that the existing open bin store area is to become an enclosed, single storey structure. The floorspace will be divided between secure cycle storage and refuse storage.

9.41 Whilst this area appears sufficiently spacious to accommodate both of these areas, it is considered appropriate to condition further information in these respects to ensure that they provide sufficiently for both requirements and to obtain an enforceable position in respect of refuse storage.

Sustainability

9.42 Policy CS29 of the Core Strategy states that new development will comply with the highest standards of sustainable design and construction possible and provides a number of principles which should normally be complied with. Limited detail has been provided in this respect, but given the scale of the proposals it is considered that further appropriate consideration of this matter will be undertaken during the Building Control process.

Conclusions

10.1 The proposal is considered to provide a modest yet valuable contribution towards the Council's housing stock within an existing residential area. The proposal will provide effective use of a brownfield site. Sufficient parking is proposed and the site is located within close proximity to publically available open spaces. It is considered that on the balance of the evidence contained within the submission, the development is acceptable.

11. RECOMMENDATION – That planning permission be **GRANTED** for the reasons referred to above and subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

No	Condition
1	The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2	The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents: A 100 001 P3 A 110 001 P3 A 000 001 P3 A 110 002 P3 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3	No development (excluding demolition and internal conversion works) shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Please do not send materials to the council offices. Materials

	<p>should be kept on site and arrangements made with the planning officer for inspection.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.</p>
4	<p>No development (excluding demolition and internal conversion works) 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; means of enclosure; soft landscape works which shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; trees to be retained and measures for their protection during construction works; proposed finished levels or contours; car parking layouts and other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc, indicating lines, manholes, supports etc); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.</p> <p>The approved landscape works shall be carried out prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.</p>
5	<p>Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, details of cycle and bin storage (to include dimensions and provision) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, both the cycle and bin storage will be provided and retained for the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that adequate facilities are provided in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS29 or the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 5 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan.</p>
6	<p>No development (excluding demolition and internal conversion works) shall commence until full details (in the form of scaled plans and/or written specifications) shall be submitted to illustrate the following: Layout and dimensions of parking spaces, parking spaces would need to be wider than 2.4m (recommended 3m) in width due to the narrow width of the carriageway adjacent to the parking spaces. Arrangements to keep an area free of parked vehicles to ensure the permanent availability of a turning area.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of highway safety and traffic movement in accordance with Policy CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 51 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan.</p>
7	<p>The development (excluding internal conversion works) shall not begin until full details of all proposed construction vehicle access, movements, parking arrangements and wheel washing facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The relevant details should be submitted in the form of a Construction Management Plan and the approved details are to be implemented</p>

<p>throughout the construction programme.</p> <p>Reason: To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway in accordance with Policy CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 51 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan.</p> <p>ARTICLE 35 STATEMENT</p> <p>Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.</p> <p>INFORMATIVES</p> <p>Highway Authority</p> <p>The Public Right of Way should remain unobstructed by vehicles, machinery, materials, tools and any other aspects of the construction during works. The safety of the public using the route and any other routes to be used by construction traffic should be a paramount concern during works, safe passage past the site should be maintained at all times. The condition of the route should not deteriorate as a result of these works. Any adverse effects to the surface from traffic, machinery or materials (especially overspills of cement & concrete) should be made good by the applicant to the satisfaction of this Authority. All materials should be removed at the end of the construction and not left on the Highway or Highway verges. If the above conditions cannot reasonably be achieved then a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order would be required to close the affected route and divert users for any periods necessary to allow works to proceed. A fee would be payable to Hertfordshire County Council for such an order. Further information on the rights of way network is available via the website. Please contact Rights of Way, Hertfordshire County Council on 0300 123 4047 for further information in relation to the works that are required along the route including any permissions that may be needed to carry out the works. https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/recycling-waste-and-environment/countryside-access/rights-of-way/rights-of-way.aspx#DynamicJumpMenuManager_1_Anchor_8</p>

Approve, subject to conditions.

Appendix 1

Consultation responses

NATS LTD	No Objection
HERTS PROPERTY SERVICES	No Objection
DBC - LEAD OFFICER - HOUSING DEVELOPMENT	No Objection

Highway Authority

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:

1. No development shall commence until full details (in the form of scaled plans and/or written specifications) shall be submitted to illustrate the following: • Layout and dimensions of parking spaces, parking spaces would need to be wider than 2.4m (recommended 3m) in width due to the narrow width of the carriageway adjacent to the parking spaces. • Arrangements to keep an area free of parked vehicles to ensure the permanent availability of a turning area. Reason: In the interest of highway safety and traffic movement.
2. Construction Management The development shall not begin until full details of all proposed construction vehicle access, movements, parking arrangements and wheel washing facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The relevant details should be submitted in the form of a Construction Management Plan and the approved details are to be implemented throughout the construction programme. Reason: To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway.

HIGHWAY INFORMATIVE: Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) recommends inclusion of the following highway informative / advisory note (AN) to ensure that any works within the public highway are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980:

AN) The Public Right of Way should remain unobstructed by vehicles, machinery, materials, tools and any other aspects of the construction during works. The safety of the public using the route and any other routes to be used by construction traffic should be a paramount concern during works, safe passage past the site should be maintained at all times. The condition of the route should not deteriorate as a result of these works. Any adverse effects to the surface from traffic, machinery or materials (especially overspills of cement & concrete) should be made good by the applicant to the satisfaction of this Authority. All materials should be removed at the end of the construction and not left on the Highway or Highway verges. If the above conditions cannot reasonably be achieved then a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order would be required to close the affected route and divert users for any periods necessary to allow works to proceed. A fee would be payable to Hertfordshire County Council for such an order. Further information on the rights of way network is available via the website. Please contact Rights of Way, Hertfordshire County Council on 0300 123 4047 for further information in relation to the works that are required along the route including any permissions that may be needed to carry out the works. https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/recycling-waste-and-environment/countryside-access/rights-of-way/rights-of-way.aspx#DynamicJumpMenuManager_1_Anchor_8

COMMENTS / ANALYSIS: The proposal comprises of the erection of three one-bed and two two-bed dwellings through the conversion / part demolition of the existing buildings at Nissel House, Fensomes Close, Hemel Hempstead. Fensomes Close is a private road and not highway maintainable at public expense. The nearest highway maintainable at public expense is Broad Street approximately 20/30m south of the site. Public footpath Hemel Hempstead 044 runs along the route of the close.

ACCESS & PARKING: The site is accessed via an existing access from Broad Street, which is to remain unaltered. This access leads to Felsomes Close, which is used to access the existing workshop/garages and three other residential dwellings. Following consideration of the size of

the proposals, the access arrangement from Broad Street is considered to be acceptable by HCC as Highway Authority.

The proposal includes the provision of 5 car parking spaces (the same as existing). The general provision and layout (as shown on submitted plan no. A100 001 P2) is considered to be acceptable by HCC as Highway Authority. Nevertheless HCC would recommend that a turning area is provided (and kept free of any parking) for any service or other visiting vehicles to be able to turn around and egress to Broad Street in forward gear. Furthermore a scaled plan (with dimensions) would need to be submitted illustrating parking spaces that are wider than the standard 2.4m width (recommended 3m). This is in the interest of safety and to ensure that vehicles can safely manoeuvre in and out of the parking area and to be in accordance with Manual for Streets (MfS) due to the relatively narrow width of the carriageway adjacent to the parking spaces on Fensomes Close.

Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) is the parking authority for the district and therefore should ultimately be satisfied with the level of parking.

ACCESSIBILITY & SUSTAINABILITY: The site lies close to the town centre of Hemel Hempstead and therefore in close proximity to its main amenities and facilities (which are within 300m and 1km from the site) and within easy walking and cycling distance. Hemel Hempstead railway station is approximately 1.85 miles (2.9km) and therefore within reasonable cycling distance. The proposals include the provision of an on-site cycle store with the capacity for five cycles, which is acceptable to promote cycling as a sustainable form of travel. **TRIP GENERATION & DISTRIBUTION:** HCC as Highway Authority considers that the generation of vehicles would not have a significant or detrimental impact on the local highway network particularly when taking into consideration the replacement of an existing use.

REFUSE / WASTE COLLECTION: Provision has been made for on-site refuse stores within 30m of each dwelling (through a communal bin storage area), which is acceptable. The collection method must be confirmed as acceptable by DBC as the waste collection authority.

EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS: The access arrangements would enable emergency vehicle access to within 45 metres from all dwellings. This adheres to guidelines as recommended in MfS, Roads in Hertfordshire; A Design Guide and Building Regulations 2010: Fire Safety Approved Document B Vol 1 – Dwellinghouses.

CONCLUSION: HCC as Highway Authority has considered that the proposal would not have an unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the surrounding highway. Therefore HCC has no objections on highway grounds to the application, subject to the inclusion of the above planning conditions and informative.

Strategic Housing

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

NATS

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

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

consulted.

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

Appendix 2

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

Objections

Comments Following Re-Consultation

3 FENSOMES CLOSE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 5DH (Objects)

I object to the latest incarnation of this planning application. Too many properties are proposed.

As the latest plans show four properties should not the application description reflect this?

The developer has not addressed the real access and parking issues the development would cause. My neighbour has already provided photographs that show restricted access to my and their properties by road.

I see from the amended drawings the developer has submitted that they were drawn up many months ago. Cut to the chase and submit plans (which have no doubt already been drawn up) for one house with garden! These constant tweaks of the plans only serve to alienate the existing residents and are likely to cause ill will towards the developer should any planning permission be issued.

The planning application does not take into account where it is situated, the surrounding properties and access. This inappropriate development appears to be based on nothing more than greed!

- The existing plan submitted for current parking arrangements is not a true depiction of how parking in front of these garages actually works. The vehicles do not park head on with a gap between the garage doors and the front of the vehicles. There is no room to turn to move in or out due to the narrow road with the cars parked opposite in the existing houses. Therefore, vehicles for Nissell House park right up against the existing garage doors on an angle, this is the only way the vehicles can manoeuvre in and out of the road due to the tight turning point with the parked cars opposite.
- The proposed plan for parking depicts head on with a space between the entrance of the units and the front of the vehicles. This will simply not work. The existing residents will get trapped on their drive unable to manoeuvre. There is a legally binding right of way for the existing dwellings on Fensome's Close, this proposed parking scheme would flout this property law.
- The revised scheme to lose one of the units to be utilised as communal outside space for all remaining units is inadequate and does not in the true sense provide ample access to outside space for the whole scheme.
- East Street is the only road for vehicle access to Fensome's Close. East Street is permit parking only which does not extend to the residents of Fensome's Close this leaves no alternative parking for any Fensome's Close residents. Where will the existing residents park if they cannot get into their own road and onto their driveways?

- Despite the developers attempt to shoe horn in as many units as possible for maximum return is unrealistic on such a small site surrounded by existing buildings on all sides with such a narrow access point. Their architect should be devising a realistic scheme proposal of 1 or 2 dwelling houses both with gardens and off road parking. This fits with the current local street scene, provides family homes and would not impede the access to the existing residents to their properties. This change of use scheme for this many residential units is more suited to sites on Maylands where all the new flats are being erected on land previously used for commercial use.

The revised proposal to lose 1 of the garage units for access to outdoor space for the others is simply not fit for purpose. It is far too small and a pathetic attempt to address no access to outdoor space.

The revised proposal still fails to address vehicle access and exit for the existing dwellings.

Access to the proposed site from East Street is very narrow

The road is also a public footpath via Fensomes Alley

There is simply not enough turn space for the existing dwellings to get onto or off their driveways if the proposal is approved as the scheme brings the parking spaces far forward of the current arrangement for the existing commercial use of the site.

East Street is a residents parking permit zone therefore no opportunity for alternative parking.

The 3 existing residential dwellings Fensome's Close have legal right of way for vehicular and pedestrian access. This legal right of way would be breached if the scheme is approved.

1 FENSOMES CLOSE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 5DH (Objects)

We are disappointed that our objections haven't been addressed in the last amended application.

Our objections include overcrowding, lack of planning for upgraded sewage to support the new proposed development, and potential danger to life in making access difficult for emergency vehicles (fire engines, ambulances), refuse collection, due to additional parking for so many flats.

Details for the afore-mentioned (and other legitimate concerns) have been posted twice, now three times, to planning@dacorum.gov.uk, without seeing any visible traction.

It is our belief that the size of the plot and its location with restricted access would more suit a family dwelling house with a garden and off-road parking.

OBJECTIONS OVER DEVELOPMENT

- The amended scheme falls short to address our previous objections listed below
- The proposed development scheme is too large for the plot site which is a small cul de sac that also serves as a pedestrian right of way via Fensomes Alley impacting the 2 houses immediately adjoining Fensomes Close on East Street as well as the properties at 1, 2, and 3 Fensomes Close.
- The proposed development scheme is in stark contrast with the majority of existing detached, semi and terraced family dwellings with off-road parking in the immediate locale of Fensomes Close and East Street.

OBJECTIONS OVER ACCESS AND PARKING

- The proposed development site has very narrow access via a corner of East Street. It is not sufficient to facilitate 24/7 access for 5 additional dwellings, leading to excessive noise, traffic, and disturbance. It will also hinder emergency vehicle access in the area (fire services, ambulances), in case of a fire incident at 1,2, 3 Fensomes Close and restricted access for fire

services due to parked car density, all afore-mentioned terraced houses will be affected. The residents will be interested to see the consultee response from the Fire Safety assessment (which already has been raised in objections to the original application 4/01707/18). The proposal further hinder delivery van and truck access due to parked car density.

- The existing site is in use 9am-5pm week days only (excluding bank holidays). The existing garage doors are not used. The current workforce park up against the garage doors as there is not sufficient manoeuvre turn/space to drive into or out without doing so, also for pedestrian safety accessing the site via Fensomes Alley.

The new development plan shows 5 parking spaces further away from the existing build line to accommodate front door access to the proposed new dwellings, therefore making access of cars in and out more difficult for the proposed development and existing properties nearby.

- The amended refuse chute placement would hinder weekly refuse waste truck access on collection day (they struggle currently, the increase parked car density would make matters worse). Potentially, the garbage bins would need to be dragged individually over the entire length of Fensomes Close to the truck on East Street boundary, with potential for garbage overflows. The residents will be interested to see the consultee response comments from Waste Management on this matter (which already has been raised in objections to the original application 4/01707/18).

- The site is accessed via East Street which is in parking permit holders Zone H 8am-8pm Monday to Saturday. Potentially the proposed units will be 2 person occupancy and therefore potentially 2 cars per unit. As there is no parking for Fensomes Close residents on East Street there is potential for the development to result in extra cars being parked on the pavement (particularly 1 East Street as this is the nearest property to the site boundary that is outside of parking zone restriction) blocking access to existing residents and pedestrians via Fensomes Alley.

- There is no provision for outside space for the proposed dwellings, and the amended document fails to address it. The only exit from the new dwellings is the front door, there is concern that during times when the weather is favourable the residents will use the space outside the front door to sit outside on the road overlooking the existing properties. This is not conducive to the safe quiet space the cul de sac currently offers to the existing residents with young children. It could result in anti-social behaviour. The fact that the amended document suggests its ineligibility for families and the alleged proximity of Gadebridge Park as a mitigation factor, seems to emphasize the new housing unit is not fit for its purpose.

- The existing residents at numbers 1, 2, and 3 Fensomes Close have covenants in their deeds to the legal right to vehicular and pedestrian access. This access would be compromised if there are five (and potentially more) cars on the site.

OBJECTIONS OVER WATER/SEWAGE/CONTAMINATED LAND

- The existing mains and sewer supply to this site has a history of problems due to the way the original services were installed. Properties 1, 2, and 3 Fensomes Close are situated on a slope however, the sewage system has been laid the wrong way and not in line with downward slope of the houses. Frequent blockages occur due to this fault and Thames Water have attended issues on many occasions. The residents are concerned that the existing services will not support 5 new dwellings and cause further issues. This The residents will be interested in the consultee response from both building control and Thames Water on this matter (which already has been raised in objections to the original application 4/01707/18).

- The existing site has been used for manufacturing. Residents are aware chemicals have been used and stored on the premises by the existing factory. Residents are unaware of the disposal arrangements for these chemicals and would like to know if the planning case officer will consult the councils contaminated land officer on this matter (which already has been raised in objections to the original application 4/01707/18).

In summary, the entire amended proposal falls short addressing a number of legitimate previous concerns and seeks to overcrowd too many units into an inadequately sized plot. The motivation

for developers to achieve maximum return and overdevelop in this manner is not in line with what Hemel Hempstead needs in terms of housing. The size of the plot and where it is located with restricted access would more suit a family dwelling house with a garden and off-road parking. This would be in keeping with the existing area and provide a new family home.

15 BROAD STREET, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 5BW (Objects)

We are concerned that the changes proposed in the last application have not dealt with any of the issues raised on previous objections.

The access concerns have not been addressed and I have attached some pictures on this letter to demonstrate this.

We have concerns about the demands on the current utilities drainage, water and electricity supplies, which would become completely overburdened. Any upgrade required for the utilities services should be addressed and resolved solely by the proposed occupier to accommodate the development of new properties.

The proposal does not honour the rights of access for the properties of 1, 2 & 3 Fensomes Close. The current site boundary runs along the centre of Fensomes close roadway, not beside it, as indicated in previous diagrams sent in by several of the residents. This means that there will be insufficient width for engines, ambulances, refuse collection vehicles, delivery vans (and in today's world of online shopping and home delivery services this will be a greater challenge) to enter into Fensomes Close, with inadequate room for manoeuvre. This causes considerable concern, and impacts the health and safety of the many parents and children who regularly walk along Fensomes Close on the way to and from school.

The proposed scheme is still far too large for the existing plot, and is far too bulky, aggravated by the roadside parking, and not keeping with the surrounding developments. One or two houses maximum, with some better allocated garden amenity space, off road parking and some planting, would be more acceptable.

We are also concerned about the flat roof proposals, as these can easily become impromptu roof terraces, with obvious overlooking and loss of privacy for current residents.

We are not completely averse to the change of use, as housing is in such demand.... but we feel the proposals are still too dense, certainly opportunistic, and more accurately, greedy. Any proposal should be more respectful of its surroundings.

It is unclear how this private road will function properly, under the current proposals, unless it was to be adopted by the council, and receive suitable no-parking yellow lines and adequate parking enforcement.

If the proposed owner would take some responsibility for establishing the roadway to become adopted under sections 205 to 218 Operation of private street works code, and part section 228, Adoption after execution of street works with adequate provision of required utilities, the issues of uncertain parking and vehicle access would be removed, along with the main objections of the adjacent residents. Some gesture towards creating a more considerate, well-meaning approach to the development would be beneficial in the long term.

My first concern is that it appears from the documentation on the planning page of the Dacorum website and your letter dated 12th November 2018 that the revised application is for now for four dwellings however the title still remains as five dwellings. I would be grateful if you could advise why the title has not been amended? My concern is that there is a plan for the fifth property to be added at a later date?

Whilst I appreciate that this new plan does remove part of the 5.9 metre wall from the nearest point to my property, the new 'amenity space' does now open many questions and concerns:

The revised 5.9 metres wall would still cause issues as detailed below:

1. Loss of light and overshadowing (Dacorum Core Strategy Policy CS12)

The proposal is to increase the height of the existing wall from 3.3 metres to 5.9 metres high along the length of the right-hand side of my garden. At present the office section of the wall has a pitched roof which peaks at 5.9 metres, this is not affecting the light or overshadowing my property as it is located at the bottom of my garden.

2. Overlooking/loss of privacy (Dacorum Core Strategy Policy CS12)

There is a window on the existing office wall, I have already had a situation where I came home from work one day to find a gentleman with a ladder coming from the window standing in my garden which is a privacy and security breach. There is also a further window which looks directly towards number 15. Both of these windows are often open meaning that I am already overlooked. There is an additional window on the plans at a lower level which I strongly object to.

3. Visual intrusion (Dacorum Core Strategy Policy CS12)

A wall of this height is visually intrusive even more so as it is running directly along the side of my property with no space in-between. The wall will block out light and be overpowering to my garden.

The height of the wall will give my garden a hemmed in feeling down the right-hand side.

4. Adequacy of parking/turning. (Dacorum Core Strategy Policy CS8 H)

The new development will consist of four or five dwellings with potentially two people per dwelling, a total of ten people. This will mean ten additional cars to provide parking for. The current plans only show five parking spaces, so I would like clarification on where the balance five cars will park. The parking in Broad Street and East Street is already challenged with cars from Christchurch Road using these roads as there is insufficient parking for them in their road.

Fensomes close is a narrow cul-de-sac which already has cars from the other side of the road turning in it, the additional cars will cause a public safety issue especially as the alleyway is frequently used to cut through from Fensomes close to Christchurch Road. It is used by school children every day on their way to and from school.

The additional traffic will cause a road safety issue as the corner of Broad street and East Street is already a hazard with cars coming too fast around the corner and having to stop suddenly. The additional traffic will exacerbate this.

5. Overdevelopment of the area/ noise and disturbance resulting from use

The new development is an overdevelopment of a very small area. The proposed properties have windows in the roof which I assume will open. The noise from the properties will be heard in the adjoining gardens (no 12 and No 15) and also on the street.

Currently the building is a commercial property so is only occupied during working hours, this new development will be occupied for much longer hours as a residential property which will mean additional noise, traffic and disturbance to the current residents.

Comments following Original Consultation

Sir Mike Penning MP

Sought confirmation that objections would be taken into account.

11 BROAD STREET, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 5BW (Objects)

Dear Jason

Thank you for declining the last application.

There isn't a huge difference to this new application compared with the previous one as far as I can see.

Therefore my previous comments and points made in the letter I sent you are still relevant.

Therefore do I need to resubmit these or are you happy to accept my comments from before for this application?

1 EAST STREET, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 5BN (Objects)

12 BROAD STREET, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 5BW (Objects)

I would like to thank you for taking the time to do the site visit and for your understanding of the impact of this development to me and my neighbours particularly those at no 15.

I have reviewed the revised plans and am still objecting based on my original points. The small amendment to the roof still means that the height of the proposed development is 5.9 metres. All other points below still apply.

1. Loss of light and overshadowing (Dacorum Core Strategy Policy CS12)

The proposal is to increase the height of the existing wall from 3.3 metres to 5.9 metres high along the length of the right-hand side of my garden. At present the office section of the wall has a pitched roof which peaks at 5.9 metres, this is not affecting the light or overshadowing my property as it is located at the bottom of my garden.

Please see photo 1 and 2 on the attached PDF for clarification. I would like to point out that the angle that the photo was taken from does not truly show the impact that the additional section of the wall will have, so would ask for a site visit.

Photo 3 shows the shadow created by the existing wall at 10.00am on 21st July, the new wall would mean most of my garden would be in shadow all morning.

Photo 4 shows the proximity of the new wall at its nearest point to my house as this will affect the light and overshadow the windows to bedroom 2 and 3, the utility room, dining room and kitchen.

2. Overlooking/loss of privacy (Dacorum Core Strategy Policy CS12)

There is a window on the existing office wall, I have already had a situation where I came home from work one day to find a gentleman with a ladder coming from the window standing in my garden which is a privacy and security breach. There is also a further window which looks directly towards number 15. Both of these windows are often open meaning that I am already overlooked. There is an additional window on the plans at a lower level which I strongly object to.

3. Visual intrusion (Dacorum Core Strategy Policy CS12)

A wall of this height is visually intrusive even more so as it is running directly along the side of my property with no space in-between. The wall will block out light and be overpowering to my garden.

The height of the wall will give my garden a hemmed in feeling down the right-hand side.

3. Adequacy of parking/turning. (Dacorum Core Strategy Policy CS8 H)

The new development will consist of 5 dwellings with potentially 2 people per dwelling, a total of 10 people. This will mean 10 additional cars to provide parking for. The current plans only show 5 parking spaces so I would like clarification on where the balance 5 cars will park. The parking in Broad Street and East Street is already challenged with cars from Christchurch Road using these roads as there is insufficient parking for them in their road.

Fensomes close is a narrow cul-de-sac which already has cars from the other side of the road turning in it, the additional cars will cause a public safety issue especially as the alleyway is frequently used to cut through from Fensomes close to Christchurch Road. It is used by school children every day on their way to and from school.

The additional traffic will cause a road safety issue as the corner of Broad street and East Street is already a hazard with cars coming too fast around the corner and having to stop suddenly. The additional traffic will exacerbate this.

5. Overdevelopment of the area/ noise and disturbance resulting from use

The new development is an overdevelopment of a very small area. The proposed properties have windows in the roof which I assume will open. The noise from the properties will be heard in the adjoining gardens (no 12 and No 15) and also on the street. There is no outside space provided for the inhabitants so will they be permitted to sit outside of their properties in their car parking spaces?

Currently the building is a commercial property so is only occupied during working hours, this new development will be occupied for much longer hours as a residential property which will mean additional noise, traffic and disturbance to the current residents.

3 FENSOMES CLOSE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 5BN (Objects)

1. OVER DEVELOPMENT

The current amended proposed scheme does not reduce the overdevelopment of his site. The site is too small to shoe horn this amount of residential properties on such a small plot. The current proposal is overbearing and not in keeping with the rest of the local. The developer/owner should explore a more fitting scheme of x 2 residential properties with access to outside space and off road parking.

2. ACCESS/PARKING

The site has narrow access at the junction of East Street and Broad Street, also serving pedestrian access to Fensomes Alley. The available space for vehicle manoeuvre on this site is currently tight and unsuitable for increased restrictions of more cars parked head on further out into the road. The current use of the site is 9-5 Mon-Fri excluding bank holidays. The current parking arrangements for staff is on an angle right up against the unused garage doors. The proposed scheme plans indicate head on parking in front of the property front doors and landscaping. This will bring the cars even further out onto the road which will make it impossible for 1 2 and 3 Fensomes Close to manoeuvre onto and off their existing driveways (see attached graphics). The junction roads are resident parking only, Fensomes

Close residents do not qualify for parking vouchers or permits on East Street or Broad Street. The proposed studio properties potentially could house x 2 adults. If they both have a car there would be no room for parking on Fensomes Close and no potential to park on any surrounding roads with permit parking restrictions. Refuse and emergency services already have access issues during weekdays on this site, proposing 5 additional residential units 24/7 will only exacerbate the problem.

The residents would welcome the planning case officer making a site visit to appreciate the limitations of the site and how it does not facilitate the revised proposal.

3. WATER/SEWAGE/CONTAMINATED LAND

The proposal concerns all the residents of Fensomes Close as well as ourselves on East Street due to the history of sewage problems on this sloping site. The strain of 5 additional dwellings would severely impact the current problems. All the residents would welcome Building Control comments on this issue and hope that they will be consulted on this revised application as well as Thames Water Sewage.

- The amended scheme falls short to address our previous objections listed below
- The proposed development scheme is too large for the plot site which is a small cul de sac that also serves as a pedestrian right of way via Fensomes Alley impacting the 2 houses immediately adjoining Fensomes Close on East Street as well as the properties at 1, 2, and 3 Fensomes Close.
- The proposed development scheme is in stark contrast with the majority of existing detached, semi and terraced family dwellings with off-road parking in the immediate locale of Fensomes Close and East Street.

OBJECTIONS OVER ACCESS AND PARKING

- The proposed development site has very narrow access via a corner of East Street. It is not sufficient to facilitate 24/7 access for 5 additional dwellings, leading to excessive noise, traffic, and disturbance. It will also hinder emergency vehicle access in the area (fire services, ambulances), in case of a fire incident at 1,2, 3 Fensomes Close and restricted access for fire services due to parked car density, all afore-mentioned terraced houses will be affected. The residents will be interested to see the consultee response from the Fire Safety assessment (which already has been raised in objections to the original application 4/01707/18). The proposal further hinder delivery van and truck access due to parked car density.
- The existing site is in use 9am-5pm week days only (excluding bank holidays). The existing garage doors are not used. The current workforce park up against the garage doors as there is not sufficient manoeuvre turn/space to drive into or out without doing so, also for pedestrian safety accessing the site via Fensomes Alley. The new development plan shows 5 parking spaces further away from the existing build line to accommodate front door access to the proposed new dwellings, therefore making access of cars in and out more difficult for the proposed development and existing properties nearby.
- The amended refuse chute placement would hinder weekly refuse waste truck access on collection day (they struggle currently, the increase parked car density would make matters worse). Potentially, the garbage bins would need to be dragged individually over the entire length of Fensomes Close to the truck on East Street boundary, with potential for garbage over spills. The residents will be interested to see the consultee response comments from Waste Management on this matter (which already has been raised in objections to the original application 4/01707/18).
- The site is accessed via East Street which is in parking permit holders Zone H 8am-8pm Monday to Saturday. Potentially the proposed units will be 2 person occupancy and therefore

potentially 2 cars per unit. As there is no parking for Fensomes Close residents on East Street there is potential for the development to result in extra cars being parked on the pavement (particularly 1 East Street as this is the nearest property to the site boundary that is outside of parking zone restriction) blocking access to existing residents and pedestrians via Fensomes Alley.

- There is no provision for outside space for the proposed dwellings, and the amended document fails to address it. The only exit from the new dwellings is the

front door, there is concern that during times when the weather is favourable the residents will use the space outside the front door to sit outside on the road overlooking the existing properties. This is not conducive to the safe quiet space the cul de sac currently offers to the existing residents with young children. It could result in anti-social behaviour. The fact that the amended document suggests its ineligibility for families and the alleged proximity of Gadebridge Park as a mitigation factor, seems to emphasize the new housing unit is not fit for its purpose.

- The existing residents at numbers 1, 2, and 3 Fensomes Close have covenants in their deeds to the legal right to vehicular and pedestrian access. This access would be compromised if there are five (and potentially more) cars on the site.

The proposed plans show the parking spaces will be in line with the Fensomes footpath on the left side of the photo, this takes up more space. This will not leave enough space for 1, 2, and 3 Fensomes Close to reverse their vehicles and turn from their driveway.

OBJECTIONS OVER WATER/SEWAGE/CONTAMINATED LAND

- The existing mains and sewer supply to this site has a history of problems due to the way the original services were installed. Properties 1, 2, and 3 Fensomes Close are situated on a slope however, the sewage system has been laid the wrong way and not in line with downward slope of the houses. Frequent blockages occur due to this fault and Thames Water have attended issues on many occasions. The residents are concerned that the existing services will not support 5 new dwellings and cause further issues. This The residents will be interested in the consultee response from both building control and Thames Water on this matter (which already has been raised in objections to the original application 4/01707/18).

- The existing site has been used for manufacturing. Residents are aware chemicals have been used and stored on the premises by the existing factory. Residents are unaware of the disposal arrangements for these chemicals and would like to know if the planning case officer will consult the councils contaminated land officer on this matter (which already has been raised in objections to the original application 4/01707/18).

In summary, the entire amended proposal falls short addressing a number of legitimate previous concerns and seeks to overcrowd too many units into an inadequately sized plot. The motivation for developers to achieve maximum return and overdevelop in this manner is not in line with what Hemel Hempstead needs in terms of housing. The size of the plot and where it is located with restricted access would more suit a family dwelling house with a garden and off-road parking. This would be in keeping with the existing area and provide a new family home.

We are looking forward to hearing feedback from the Council on this matter.

Address	Comments
1 EAST STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5BN	Following Jason Seed's recent visit to the site of the proposed development I need to know what action to take following the minimal changes made to the original application. These do not appear to address the major , valid objections to

	the original application.
11 BROAD STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 5BW	<p>Dear Jason</p> <p>Thank you for declining the last application.</p> <p>There isn't a huge difference to this new application compared with the previous one as far as I can see.</p> <p>Therefore my previous comments and points made in the letter I sent you are still relevant.</p> <p>Therefore do I need to resubmit these or are you happy to accept my comments from before for this application?</p> <p>Many thanks</p> <p>Leigh Bagshaw</p>
18 CHRISTCHURCH ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 5BY	<p>Since the original plan for the site, minimal has been done to address the concerns raised.</p> <p>The planned development of Nissel House from a commercial property to a residential development will have a number of impacts to my property.</p> <p>1) Overlooked and loss of privacy, due to a complete change in utilisation of the site - greater use of premises 24/7 in comparison to 9 to 5 - 5 days per week. Constant use of the neighboring customer footpath particularly at weekends and evenings</p> <p>2) Lack of parking and turning space for the number of dwellings planned also turning across a public footpath.</p> <p>3) Noise and disruption - due to the new timescale of properties planned use, I would expect a quiet rear to my dwelling to be disrupted by the arrival of vehicle at any given time and the number of expected residence. With the risk of disruption to sleep, and excessive noise at weekends.</p>
3 FENSOMES CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 5DH	<p>As this is basically the same application as before do we need to submit an additional objection letter?</p> <p>I object to the proposed development.</p> <p>Five properties on such a confined site is just greed on the part of the developers.</p> <p>The new application refers to lack of garden or community space and that proposed development residents can walk 8 minutes to a local park - BS they will sit outside the front of their properties and cause disturbance to the existing residents. (Who ever wrote that in the application is either out of touch with reality or other words I can not reproduce here!) I will be most affected by the proposed development.</p> <p>The plans still show access to my property by road will be impeded by parking for any new residents.</p> <p>The site is only suitable for one house with garden not five flats without garden space.</p>

<p>2 FENSOMES CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 5DH</p>	<p>Dear Jason,</p> <p>This application still do not deal with the issues Raised in the previous Letters and Objections.!!!!</p> <p>When is someone from The Council Planning department physically going to visit the site? It is so clear that the proposed development does not fit in the plot. They are not taking into account the right of access of the existing properties</p> <p>There is not changes on the plans 12/11/18 compare with the previous plans.</p> <p>So question? What is going on? Yours Juan Bordon Rodriguez</p>
<p>15 BROAD STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 5BW</p>	<p>As the resident and owner of 15 Broad Street, I would like to register objections, on behalf of myself and my family of four adults, to the intended proposals, immediately adjacent to my property, at Nissel House, Fensomes Close, Hemel Hempstead, HP2 5DH.</p> <p>I am concerned that the current 'cramming' policy is rapidly filling any available site or garden with housing, and is creating more higher densities, with increasing demands on an already overstretched infrastructure.</p> <p>The Nissel House site was previously the garden of 15 broad street, it was infilled in the past with one office unit and some garages.It would seem that a proposal for one house and its garden, would not be unreasonable, any thing else is adding insult to injury and evidently highlighting the cramming policy.</p> <p>There are concerns that the proposals will present considerable demands on the current utilities drainage, water, and electricity supplies, which will become completely overburdened,Any upgrade required for the utilities services, should be addressed and resolved solely by the proposed occupier to accommodate the addition of the four proposed properties.</p> <p>The Loss of light and overshadowing issue affecting my property has now been addressed, by the removal of one dwelling unit, offering the minimum recommended distance between two storey dwellings.</p> <p>The current proposals do not show any other significant changes, from the previous proposal,apart from the inclusion of the amenity space, and do not address the greater concerns, held by myself and all the adjacent residents to this development.</p> <p>Adequacy of turning/parking The proposals only allow for parking within the existing roadway . the plans show 5 cars parked tight to the roadside site boundary, set back, away from the proposed frontage, with ability to include a further 3 within the same zone,</p>

However, the current site boundary runs along the centre of the Fensome close roadway, not beside it, as indicated in my previously submitted Diagram 2 which means there will be insufficient road width to allow vehicles turning onto or out of the existing residents properties, and insufficient width for fire engines, ambulances, refuse collection vehicles, delivery vans, and suchlike, to enter into Fensomes Close, with inadequate room for manoeuvre, which causes considerable concern. This would create more risk and difficulties to adjacent residents, and to the many parents and children on the school walk, used regularly along to Fensomes alley.

As I have mentioned previously the cars at present for Nissel House, park up tight to the existing garage doors as they do not utilize access into them the from outside. the cars thus do not impinge on the existing roadway. This was not indicated on the proposed block plans, which would have highlighted the proposals inadequacy.

Without the constant supervision, and monitoring carried out by the current occupiers of Nissel House, Fensomes Close (current status, private road) will become a repository for randomly parked vehicles, and will become a completely chaotic, adhoc parking area, without any parking restrictions enforced. which is the greatest concern to all adjacent owners.

The current proposals, now propose a timber boarded fence to the rear of my property, replacing the existing masonry wall. The existing walling was built up to the edge of an 8ft high brick wall that runs along the boundary to the edge of my property, between 15 and 12 Broad street. This wall will be left unsupported, and in a precarious situation, requiring further support, which is unacceptable. The fence is proposed to surround the amenity space, directly adjacent to my property, which I regard as a security risk, several recent break-ins to adjacent properties have been facilitated by easy access over timber fences. I had expected the existing masonry wall which is currently the rear focus of our garden, to be suitably retained or replaced to at least the ht of my existing wall. A six foot timber fence, will only be 4ft high on our side as our garden level is significantly higher. This seems completely inadequate as a replacement for the existing boundary wall and I regard this as a loss of privacy, I will be forced to endure the consequence of all possible activities performed in the proposed amenity area, separated by an inadequate low timber fence.

Visual intrusion- Design appearance and use of materials

The proposed scheme is still far too large for the existing plot, and is far too bulky, aggravated by the roadside parking, and not in keeping with surrounding developments, One or two max houses with some better allocated garden amenity space, with off road parking and some planting, would be more acceptable.

I would also be very concerned that all proposed materials be good quality, certainly not the recent local choice of newer fletton type brickwork, which has perished drastically, within a

	<p>couple of years through frost damage, and now looks atrocious.</p> <p>I also have concern regarding the flat roof proposals, as these can easily become impromptu roof terraces, with obvious overlooking and loss of privacy consequences.</p> <p>I am not completely averse to the change of use, as housing is in such demand ...but I feel the proposals are of still too dense, certainly opportunistic, but more accurately greedy. Any proposal, should be more respectful to its surroundings.</p> <p>It is unclear how this private road will function properly, under the current proposals, unless it was to be adopted by the council, and receive suitable no-parking yellow lines, and adequate parking enforcement.</p> <p>If the proposed owner would take some responsibility, for aiding establishing the roadway to become adopted under sections 205 to 218 Operation of private streetworks code, and part section 228, Adoption after execution of street works with adequate provision of required utilities, the issues of uncertain parking and vehicle access would be removed and with it the main objections of the adjacent residents. Some gesture towards creating a more considerate, well meaning approach to the development would be beneficial in the long term.</p>
<p>15 BROAD STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5BW</p>	<p>As the resident and owner of 15 Broad Street, I would like to register objections, on behalf of myself and my family of four adults, to the intended proposals, immediately adjacent to my property, at Nissel House, Fensomes Close, Hemel Hempstead, HP2 5DH.</p> <p>I am concerned that the current 'cramming' policy is rapidly filling any available site or garden with housing, and is creating more higher densities, with increasing demands on an already overstretched infrastructure.</p> <p>The Nissel House site was previously the garden of 15 broad street, it was infilled in the past with one office unit and some garages. It would seem that a proposal for one house and its garden, would not be unreasonable, any thing else is adding insult to injury and evidently highlighting the cramming policy. There are concerns that the proposals will present considerable demands on the current utilities drainage, water, and electricity supplies, which will become completely overburdened. Any upgrade required for the utilities services, should be addressed and resolved solely by the proposed occupier to accommodate the addition of the four proposed properties.</p> <p>The Loss of light and overshadowing issue affecting my property has now been addressed, by the removal of one dwelling unit, offering the minimum recommended distance between two storey dwellings.</p> <p>The current proposals do not show any other significant changes, from the previous proposal, apart from the inclusion</p>

of the amenity space, and do not address the greater concerns, held by myself and all the adjacent residents to this development.

Adequacy of turning/parking

The proposals only allow for parking within the existing roadway . the plans show 5 cars parked tight to the roadside site boundary, set back, away from the proposed frontage, with ability to include a further 3 within the same zone, However, the current site boundary runs along the centre of the Fensome close roadway, not beside it, as indicated in my previously submitted Diagram 2 which means there will be insufficient road width to allow vehicles turning onto or out of the existing residents properties, and insufficient width for fire engines, ambulances, refuse collection vehicles, delivery vans, and suchlike, to enter into Fensomes Close, with inadequate room for manoeuvre, which causes considerable concern. This would create more risk and difficulties to adjacent residents, and to the many parents and children on the school walk, used regularly along to Fensomes alley.

As I have mentioned previously the cars at present for Nissel House, park up tight to the existing garage doors as they do not utilize access into them the from outside. the cars thus do not impinge on the existing roadway. This was not indicated on the proposed block plans, which would have highlighted the proposals inadequacy.

Without the constant supervision, and monitoring carried out by the current occupiers of Nissel House, Fensomes Close (current status, private road) will become a repository for randomly parked vehicles, and will become a completely chaotic, adhoc parking area, without any parking restrictions enforced.which is the greatest concern to all adjacent owners.

The current proposals, now propose a timber boarded fence to the rear of my property, replacing the existing masonry wall. The existing walling was built up to the edge of an 8ft high brick wall that runs along the boundary to the edge of my property, between 15 and 12 Broad street. This wall will be left unsupported ,and in a precarious situation,requiring further support,which is unacceptable. The fence is proposed to surround the amenity space, directly adjacent to my property, which I regard as a security risk, several recent break-ins to adjacent properties have been facilitated by easy access over timber fences. I had expected the existing masonry wall which is currently the rear focus of our garden, to be suitably retained or replaced to at least the ht of my existing wall. A six foot timber fence,will only be 4ft high on our side as our garden level is significantly higher. This seems completely inadequate as a replacement for the existing boundary wall and I regard this as a loss of privacy, I will be forced to endure the consequence of all possible activities performed in the proposed amenity area, separated by an inadequate low timber fence.

Visual intrusion- Design appearance and use of materials

	<p>The proposed scheme is still far too large for the existing plot, and is far too bulky, aggravated by the roadside parking, and not in keeping with surrounding developments, One or two max houses with some better allocated garden amenity space, with off road parking and some planting, would be more acceptable.</p> <p>I would also be very concerned that all proposed materials be good quality, certainly not the recent local choice of newer fletton type brickwork, which has perished drastically, within a couple of years through frost damage, and now looks atrocious.</p> <p>I also have concern regarding the flat roof proposals, as these can easily become impromptu roof terraces, with obvious overlooking and loss of privacy consequences.</p> <p>I am not completely averse to the change of use, as housing is in such demand ...but I feel the proposals are of still too dense, certainly opportunistic, but more accurately greedy. Any proposal, should be more respectful to its surroundings.</p> <p>It is unclear how this private road will function properly, under the current proposals, unless it was to be adopted by the council, and receive suitable no-parking yellow lines, and adequate parking enforcement.</p> <p>If the proposed owner would take some responsibility, for aiding establishing the roadway to become adopted under sections 205 to 218 Operation of private streetworks code, and part section 228, Adoption after execution of street works.with adequate provision of required utilities, the issues of uncertain parking and vehicle access would be removed and with it the main objections of the adjacent residents. Some gesture towards creating a more considerate, well meaning approach to the development would be beneficial in the long term.</p>
<p>1 FENSOMES CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5DH</p>	<p>We are disappointed that our objections haven't been addressed in the last amended application.</p> <p>Our objections include overcrowding, lack of planning for upgraded sewage to support the new proposed development, and potential danger to life in making access difficult for emergency vehicles (fire engines, ambulances), refuse collection, due to additional parking for so many flats.</p> <p>Details for the afore-mentioned (and other legitimate concerns) have been posted twice, now three times, to planning@dacorum.gov.uk, without seeing any visible traction.</p> <p>It is our belief that the size of the plot and its location with restricted access would more suit a family dwelling house with a garden and off-road parking.</p>
<p>15 BROAD STREET,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5BW</p>	<p>I am concerned that the current 'cramming' policy is rapidly filling any available site or garden with housing, and is creating more higher densities, with increasing demands on an already overstretched infrastructure.</p>

The Nissel House site was previously the garden of 15 broad street, it was infilled in the past with one office unit and some garages. It would seem that a proposal for one house and its garden, would not be unreasonable, any thing else is adding insult to injury and evidently highlighting the cramming policy. There are concerns that the proposals will present considerable demands on the current utilities drainage, water, and electricity supplies, which will become completely overburdened. Any upgrade required for the utilities services, should be addressed and resolved solely by the proposed occupier to accommodate the addition of the four proposed properties.

The Loss of light and overshadowing issue affecting my property has now been addressed, by the removal of one dwelling unit, offering the minimum recommended distance between two storey dwellings.

The current proposals do not show any other significant changes, from the previous proposal, apart from the inclusion of the amenity space, and do not address the greater concerns, held by myself and all the adjacent residents to this development.

Adequacy of turning/parking

The proposals only allow for parking within the existing roadway . the plans show 5 cars parked tight to the roadside site boundary, set back, away from the proposed frontage, with ability to include a further 3 within the same zone, However, the current site boundary runs along the centre of the Fensome close roadway, not beside it, as indicated in my previously submitted Diagram 2 which means there will be insufficient road width to allow vehicles turning onto or out of the existing residents properties, and insufficient width for fire engines, ambulances, refuse collection vehicles, delivery vans, and suchlike, to enter into Fensomes Close, with inadequate room for manoeuvre, which causes considerable concern. This would create more risk and difficulties to adjacent residents, and to the many parents and children on the school walk, used regularly along to Fensomes alley.

As I have mentioned previously the cars at present for Nissel House, park up tight to the existing garage doors as they do not utilize access into them the from outside. the cars thus do not impinge on the existing roadway. This was not indicated on the proposed block plans, which would have highlighted the proposals inadequacy.

Without the constant supervision, and monitoring carried out by the current occupiers of Nissel House, Fensomes Close (current status, private road) will become a repository for randomly parked vehicles, and will become a completely chaotic, adhoc parking area, without any parking restrictions enforced. which is the greatest concern to all adjacent owners.

The current proposals, now propose a timber boarded fence to the rear of my property, replacing the existing masonry wall. The existing walling was built up to the edge of an 8ft high

	<p>brick wall that runs along the boundary to the edge of my property, between 15 and 12 Broad street. This wall will be left unsupported ,and in a precarious situation,requiring further support,which is unacceptable. The fence is proposed to surround the amenity space, directly adjacent to my property, which I regard as a security risk, several recent break-ins to adjacent properties have been facilitated by easy access over timber fences. I had expected the existing masonry wall which is currently the rear focus of our garden, to be suitably retained or replaced to at least the ht of my existing wall. A six foot timber fence,will only be 4ft high on our side as our garden level is significantly higher. This seems completely inadequate as a replacement for the existing boundary wall and I regard this as a loss of privacy, I will be forced to endure the consequence of all possible activities performed in the proposed amenity area, separated by an inadequate low timber fence.</p> <p>Visual intrusion- Design appearance and use of materials The proposed scheme is still far too large for the existing plot, and is far too bulky, aggravated by the roadside parking, and not in keeping with surrounding developments, One or two max houses with some better allocated garden amenity space, with off road parking and some planting, would be more acceptable.</p> <p>I would also be very concerned that all proposed materials be good quality, certainly not the recent local choice of newer fletton type brickwork, which has perished drastically, within a couple of years through frost damage, and now looks atrocious.</p> <p>I also have concern regarding the flat roof proposals, as these can easily become impromptu roof terraces, with obvious overlooking and loss of privacy consequences.</p> <p>I am not completely averse to the change of use, as housing is in such demand ...but I feel the proposals are of still too dense, certainly opportunistic, but more accurately greedy. Any proposal, should be more respectful to its surroundings.</p> <p>It is unclear how this private road will function properly, under the current proposals, unless it was to be adopted by the council, and receive suitable no-parking yellow lines, and adequate parking enforcement.</p> <p>If the proposed owner would take some responsibility, for aiding establishing the roadway to become adopted under sections 205 to 218 Operation of private streetworks code, and part section 228, Adoption after execution of street works.with adequate provision of required utilities, the issues of uncertain parking and vehicle access would be removed and with it the main objections of the adjacent residents. Some gesture towards creating a more considerate, well meaning approach to the development would be beneficial in the long term.</p>
<p>3 FENSOMES CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5DH</p>	<p>I object to the latest incarnation of this planning application. Too many properties are proposed. As the latest plans show four properties should not the</p>

	<p>application description reflect this?</p> <p>The developer has not addressed the real access and parking issues the development would cause. My neighbour has already provided photographs that show restricted access to my and their properties by road.</p> <p>I see from the amended drawings the developer has submitted that they were drawn up many months ago. Cut to the the chase and submit plans (which have no doubt already been draw up) for one house with garden! These constant tweaks of the plans only serve to alienate the existing residents and are likely to cause ill will towards the developer should any planning permission be issued.</p> <p>The planning application does not take into account where it is situated, the surrounding properties and access. This inappropriate development appears to be based on nothing more than greed!</p>
--	---

Supporting

Address	Comments
---------	----------

Commenting

Address	Comments
---------	----------