

4/02286/18/MFA	CONSTRUCTION OF 268 FLATS AND 1404.5 SQUARE METRES OF OFFICE SPACE SPLIT ACROSS SIX BLOCKS, WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND AMENITY SPACE.
Site Address	PLOTS 2 & 3 KIER PARK, MAYLANDS AVENUE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP2 4FQ
Applicant	Kier Property
Case Officer	Rachel Marber
Referral to Committee	Large scale major which is linked to a proposed obligation under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990).

1. Recommendation

1 That planning permission be **DELEGATED TO THE GROUP MANAGER WITH A VIEW TO APPROVAL** subject to 21-day notification with the Secretary of State and a S.106 agreement for the following Heads of Terms:

- £26,000 for the bus stop improvements
- £2,000 travel plan review
- £30,000 car club parking space
- 35% affordable homes (94 affordable units) comprising a mix of 75% affordable rented and 25% shared ownership

1.2 The application, if granted, is subject to a call-in from Secretary of State as the development constitutes a departure from the Borough's Development Plan.

2. Summary

2.1 The proposal seeks permission for 268 flats and 1404.5 sq.m of office space.

2.2 The application site is located within an Employment Area.

2.3 Relevant economic reports demonstrate that there is currently limited demand for B1 office use, with the proposal maximising the amount of B1 use currently viable in the present market. Therefore, a flexible approach to the mix in use of site for residential and commercial is considered acceptable.

2.4 The proposed development would make a significant contribution to the Borough's housing target and would prevent further Green Belt land from being released for development as a result. The development would also include a large contribution to affordable housing, which weighs further in favour of development. On balance, the principle of development is considered acceptable.

2.5 The proposed development would range up to 6 – 12 storeys in height. The proposal design is not considered to be of particularly high architectural quality however, it is noted that it would appear an enhancement on the adjacent travel lodge

building and would provide a landmark commercial face to Maylands Business Park. The development is considered acceptable to the character and appearance of the street scene.

2.6 A daylight and sunlight assessment demonstrates that no significant loss of daylight or sunlight to neighbouring residents would result from the proposed development. Due to the degree of separation of the development from neighbouring properties no significant loss of privacy would result.

2.7 The development would fail to secure sufficient BRE sunlight and daylight standards for future residents of some units. However, para 123 of the NPPF (2019) states that a flexible approach should be taken in applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight, where the development makes efficient use of a site.

2.8 Noise and air quality concerns generated from the development have been mitigated by way of conditions and subject to consultation with the Environmental Health team.

2.9 The development would require 340.75 parking spaces in accordance with maximum standard. 334 parking spaces would be provided comprising 268 spaces for residential units and 66 spaces for the office element. Given the push for more sustainable forms of transport, flexible parking arrangements within the site and no objection from Hertfordshire County Council Highway Authority, the development is not considered to result in severe detriment to Highway safety or operation.

2.10 Contributions for highway improvements, travel plan monitoring and a car club scheme would also be secured as part of the development in addition to the CIL charge.

2.11 On balance, the proposal is considered policy compliant.

3. Site Description

3.1 The application site is situated on the western side of Maylands Avenue within the Maylands Gateway Regeneration area, as defined within the Maylands Masterplan. The site comprises plots 2 and 3 of the Kier Park site, which covers approximately 1 hectare of land on a corner plot adjacent to the St Albans Road/Breakspear way round-a-bout. Site land levels fall by approximately 3 metres from north to south. Plot 1 comprises the hotel and associated uses granted within app ref: 4/02124/08/MOA. Plot 3 of the application site is currently vacant. The site falls within a General Employment Area. Bounding the site to the west are large residential areas comprising the New Town extension completed in the 1980s, and to the north of the site comprises a self-storage unit.

4. Proposal

4.1 The application seeks permission for the construction of 268 flats comprising 1 and 2 bed units and 1404.5 sq.m of B1 office space with associated parking and landscape works.

5. Relevant History

Address: FORMER BREAKSPEAR HOUSE, MAYLANDS AVENUE, HEMEL
HEMPSTEAD, HP2 4TD

Land Parcel 74448

Ref:

Related Site History

4/00504/18/SCE SCREENING OPINION

15/03/2018

Prior to determining this current application a request for an Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion under Regulation 5(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 was submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Following consultation with the relevant parties, it was concluded that whilst the proposals constituted Schedule 2 development and exceeded the threshold for Screening, it was considered that they would not adversely affect any 'sensitive areas' or result in significant effects on the environment with reference to the selection criteria provided within Schedule 3. As such, it was considered that an Environmental Statement was not required.

The proposals which are being considered under this planning application are largely consistent with the information which accompanied the Screening Opinion request. Therefore, whilst the current proposals have not been formally screened, the Regulations have not changed since the previous Screening Opinion was issued and as such, the opinion remains relevant and valid in respect of this planning application.

4/01031/15/MFA DEVELOPMENT OF A BUILDING TO COMPRISE A LIDL FOODSTORE WITH
B1(A) OFFICE FLOORSPACE AT FIRST FLOOR LEVEL, WITH ASSOCIATED
CAR PARKING.
Refused
30/10/2015

4/00239/11/FUL EXTENSION TO APPROVED ACCESS ROAD, HARD STANDING AND
RELOCATION OF ELECTRICITY SUBSTATION
Granted
07/06/2011

4/002 SUBMISSION OF RESERVED MATTERS
35/11 (HOTEL DESIGN, LANDSCAPING,
/RES LAYOUT AND SCALE) PURSUANT TO
OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION
4/00333/11/ROC (VARIATION OF
CONDITION 12 (DETAILS OF PUBLIC
ART) OF PLANNING PERMISSION
4/02124/08 (HOTEL AND OFFICES))
Granted
18/05/2011

4/021 HOTEL AND OFFICES
24/08
/MOA
Granted
18/06/2010

6. Policies

National Policy Guidance (2019)

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

Adopted Core Strategy (2013)

Hemel Hempstead Place Strategy
NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS2 - Selection of Development Sites
CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages
CS8 - Sustainable Transport
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS14 - Economic Development
CS15 - Offices, Research, Industry, Storage and Distribution
CS17 - New Housing
CS18 - Mix of Housing
CS19 - Affordable Housing
CS26 - Green Infrastructure
CS28 - Carbon Emission Reductions
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction
CS31 - Water Management
CS32 - Air, Soil and Water Quality
CS34 - Maylands Business Park
CS35 - Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004)

Policy 10 - Optimising the Use of Urban Land
Policy 13 - Planning Conditions and Planning Obligations
Policy 18 - The Size of New Dwellings
Policy 21 - Density of Residential Development
Policy 31 - General Employment Areas
Policy 51 - Development and Transport Impacts
Policy 57 – Provision and Management of Parking
Policy 58 - Private Parking Provision
Policy 76 - Leisure Space in New Residential Developments
Policy 99 - Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands
Policy 100 - Tree and Woodland Planting
Policy 111 - Height of Buildings
Policy 118 - Important Archaeological Remains
Policy 129 - Storage and Recycling of Waste on Development Sites
Appendix 3 - Gardens and Amenity Space
Appendix 5 - Parking Provision
Appendix 6 – Open Space and Play Provision

Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (July 2002)
Planning Obligations (April 2011)
Affordable Housing (Jan 2013)
Hemel Hempstead Urban Design Assessment (2010)
Maylands Gateway Development Brief (2013)
Maylands Master Plan (2007)
Maylands Business Park Design Strategy (2013)
Maylands Business Park Improvements Specification
Refuse Storage Guidance Note (2015)
Dacorum Regulation 123 List

7. Constraints

Maylands Business Park
General Employment Area

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

9.1 The main planning issues to consider are:

- Principle of Development
- Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Impact to Street Scene

- Impact on Residential Amenity

- Impact on Highway Safety and Parking Provision

- Impact on Trees and Landscaping
- Dwelling Mix
- Sustainability
- Protected species
- Flood Risk and Site Drainage
- Contaminated Land and Air Quality
- Archaeology
- Refuse Collection
- Secure by Design
- Planning Obligations & Legal Agreement
- Consultation Response

Principle of Development

Employment Use

9.2 The application site is located within an employment area where the following national and local policies apply:

9.3 Paragraph 8 of the updated National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) (2019) outlines an economic objective of planning to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity. Paragraph 80 states that planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.

9.4 Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy (2013) outlines that Hemel Hempstead will be the

focus for homes, jobs and strategic services in order to retain the separate identity of the town and to maintain a balanced distribution of employment growth, with growth and rejuvenation in the Maylands Business Park. Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy (2013) states that in general employment areas appropriate employment generating development is encouraged.

9.5 Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy (2013) supports this outlining that sufficient land will be allocated to accommodate growth in the economy of approximately 10,000 jobs between 2006 and 2031. Most employment generating development will be located within town, local centres and General Employment Areas. Hemel Hempstead will be the main focus for new economic development uses, which will be used to support the regeneration of the Maylands Business Park and Hemel Hempstead town centre.

9.6 Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy (2013) designates a minimum area of land to be identified and retained for B class uses, comprising a General Employment Area. This area will be managed so that a target of around 131,000 sq.m of additional office space can be met between 2006 and 2031. Development proposals that include provision for small businesses will be encouraged. General Employment Areas will be protected for B-class uses.

9.7 Policy CS34 of the Core Strategy (2013) sets out the principles guiding development in the Maylands Area. The application site falls within the Maylands Gateway which is specifically designated for securing HQ offices and other complementary uses. The vision for the Gateway is set out in the Maylands Master Plan (2007) and Maylands Gateway Development Brief (2013) which sees the Gateway as a key part of Maylands becoming a 'green' business park. This brief gives increased flexibility over the type of jobs to be provided (classes B1, B2 and B8), but does not support residential development, except adjacent to Hales Park.

9.8 Saved Local Plan (2004) Policy 31 also requires the retention and promotion of existing and new office uses within employment areas. Saved Policy 31 of the Local Plan (2004) notes the application site is designated as a Core Office location within the General Employment Area and therefore seeks a focus of B1, B2 and B8 development within this area.

9.9 The Hemel Hempstead place strategy within the Core Strategy (2013) sets out the vision for Maylands is to rejuvenate and grow the business area and promote the use of green energy. Maylands Business Park in East Hemel Hempstead will be the home to a vibrant, dynamic and premier business-led community. It is envisioned as the first choice investment location for offices and industrial development, capitalising on its strength as a sub-regional economic hub. Maylands Gateway offers around 29.7ha of developable land. This will deliver a large proportion of the Borough's employment needs over the plan period.

9.10 However, the Council's economic reports: The South West Hertfordshire

Economic Study (2016) and the Dacorum Employment Land Availability Assessment (2017) and paragraph 60 NPPF reason that where employment generated land uses are unviable in accordance with market signals and future demographic trends, alternative uses and subsequent benefits should be considered.

9.11 The South West Hertfordshire Economic Study (2016) outlines that while the economy has grown, this does not appear to have been reflected in commensurate increases in the supply of offices and other types of industrial development. The Economic Study estimated a need for an additional 13 hectares of land for office development in Dacorum by 2036. Although demand for office space at Maylands has not been as strong as other locations in recent years, over the longer term Maylands Business Park is considered to represent as an attractive office location which could address a significant proportion of the demand for office floorspace identified for Dacorum. It could also potentially address a proportion of the displaced demand from investors who have been unable to find space in other locations. The South West Hertfordshire Economic Study (2016) concludes that an exclusively office led development could potentially result in an oversupply of office space in this location, and a development with a greater proportion of B8 space would be expected to attract greater market interest.

9.12 The Dacorum Employment Land Availability Assessment (2017) sees limited demand for new office development, at least in the short term in Dacorum. This is because Maylands suffers from poor public transport access which renders it less attractive than competing office locations elsewhere in the sub-region, including Watford and St Albans. As such, during the time of this report the Maylands Gateway had an office vacancy rate of 7,576 sq.m. The report continues to advise that significant public sector intervention would be required to turn the fortunes around of Maylands. This *could* be achieved by the Enviro-tech Enterprise Zone which was set up in 2017 to implement a package of improvements, including the upgrading of Junction 8 to improve access from the M1, which would boost the desirability of the area for employment land uses in the future. This *may* improve the potential for intensification of Maylands Gateway as an industrial location, with some potential for office development at the end of the plan period.

9.13 A Brasier Freeth's Planning Report has been submitted alongside the planning application. This report highlights a four year oversupply in office floorspace and under demand of grade A office buildings in Hemel Hempstead. This report also states that office rents are too low in Hemel Hempstead for an office-base scheme to be viable. This report outlines that the poor access of the application site reduces further the demand for office provision in this location. The site is also shown to have been extensively marketed for office space with offers for several planning uses, although none of these have been secured. Given the above, the report emphasises that 9,000sq.ft -11,000sq.ft is the most appropriate offer for this site and that the 15117.9 sq.ft of office space proposed is in excesses of this recommended level. The proposal would also allocate this office space for smaller businesses, which there is greater

demand for within this area.

9.14 Page 16 of the report highlights that Kier was approached and provided offers from several other companies after the planning application was submitted which would have provided employment provision on site, (although not necessary B1 use) or a wholly affordable residential scheme. The reason these offers were not secured further by Kier appear to consist of reasons such as: 'the buildings would not be a landmark building, the site would have been split, the planning application had already been submitted, did not provide the Kier Property Board with sufficient certainty', etc. These are not considered good enough reasons to justify refusal of these offers which the LPA consider may have been a preferred option to the current proposal.

9.15 It is also acknowledged that within the immediate area of the application site there has been a great change to the built environment, with a move away from office base employment, to more B2 and B8 uses for warehouse and storage use. Nevertheless, employment uses are retained. The LPA are also aware of the significant depletion in the Borough's employment land supply due to office to residential permitted development conversions.

Summary

9.16 The proposed residential use of this site would result in the loss of employment land, in the Gateway location serving the Maylands Business Park. The site is therefore an important site strategically both in terms of its visual contribution to the employment environment, and for providing increased jobs within the Maylands Business Park. The proposed use of the site for only 5% employment floor space with 91% residential use, would therefore be contrary to the policies identified above which seeks to protect the application area for employment use.

9.17 The economic reports demonstrate that there is currently limited demand for B1 office use within this area with the proposal maximising the amount of B1 use currently viable in the present market. However, there is investment being made to improve the desirability of the area and therefore the Council consider that the long-term potential for office demand in the Maylands Gateway will have increased by the end of the planned period and will provide an important role in meeting the Borough's employment figures.

9.18 In short, the Council have mind to the wider economic situation in the current office market and would allow for some degree of flexibility over the mix of commercial and residential uses on the site provided that the proposal offers significant benefits to the Borough which would justify this departure from the Development Plan.

Residential use

9.19 Balanced against the need to retain employment allocated land within the

Borough, Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS1 states that Hemel Hempstead will be the focus for homes. Furthermore, para 117 the NPPF (2019) encourages the provision of more housing within towns and other specified settlements and the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed. Para 121 of the NPPF (2019) also states that Local Planning Authorities should also take a positive approach to applications for alternative uses on land which is currently developed but not allocated for a specific purpose in plans, where this would help to meet identified development needs. In particular, they should support proposals to use retail and employment land for homes in areas of high housing demand, provided this would not undermine key economic sectors or sites or the vitality and viability of town centres, and would be compatible with other policies in this Framework.

9.20 Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan (2004) also seeks to optimise the use of available land within urban areas. The application site is situated within an urban area in close proximity to Hemel Hempstead town centre. As such, the infrastructure in the immediate area has been developed to provide good transport links for existing land uses. There are also services and facilities available within close proximity of the site.

9.21 Taking all of the above into account, the proposal could make a valuable contribution to the Borough's existing housing stock (in accordance with Policy CS17), which would greatly assist in meeting housing targets and prevent larger green belt releases in the future.

Balancing Exercise

9.22 Paragraph 8 of the NPPF (2019) identifies three aspects of sustainable development: social, economic and environmental. Due to the fact that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, paragraph 11 of the NPPF (2019) is engaged. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that decisions should apply a tilted presumption in favour of sustainable development unless policies in protected areas of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; these policies of protected/restricted areas are clarified within footnote 6.

9.23 Paragraph 11 and footnote 7 clarifies that in the context of decision-taking "the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date" when the LPA cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.

9.24 It must therefore be considered whether the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, as outlined in paragraph 11 of the NPPF (referred to as 'the tilted balance' in favour of sustainable development).

Environmental

9.25 The application site is situated within the urban area of Maylands Business Park, in close proximity to the town centre. As such, the infrastructure in the immediate area has been developed to provide reasonably good transport links for existing residents. There are also services and facilities available within close proximity of the site. Taking this into account, the proposal would be environmentally sustainable. The proposal would be located on a brownfield site and would develop a site which has been left vacant since 2007, when Kier purchased the land. The proposal also incorporates green initiatives such as solar panels, green roofs and green walls, which would result in some small Environmental gains from the development.

Social

9.26 The proposal would make a valuable contribution to the Borough's housing supply providing 268 new homes, thereby facilitating the Government's aim of boosting the supply of housing. The proposal would also meet the Council's affordable housing policy criteria of 35% affordable units (94 units) at a tenure split of 75% social rented and 25% shared ownership. Further public realm contributions would also be secured for bus stop improvement works. Therefore, there would be social benefit from the proposal.

Economic

9.27 The proposal would result in the loss of employment land, for predominately residential use thereby resulting in the loss of employment infrastructure to the immediate area and increased deficit in Dacorum's employment target, to which Maylands Business Park, and Maylands Gateway specifically makes an important contribution. Although, a small element of employment provision would be provided, the scheme would not deliver the amount of economic gains expected for this location. Although, small increase in local expenditure would result from the residential habitation of the site. Overall, proposal would result in the loss of long term employment provision, which would weigh against the proposal.

Conclusion

9.28 Taking into consideration all of the above, the Council are aware of the current economic clement and lack of demand for B1 office space. The proposal seeks the optimum amount of B1 floorspace which is currently viable and therefore would deliver small economic gains. Further, the proposal would secure a substantial number of required homes, including a large contribution to affordable housing, on a brownfield site. The scheme would also result in a landmark development on a plot which has been vacant for over 10 years. It is therefore considered that the negative impact which would result from the loss of this strategic employment site in the long term, would be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal. Therefore, on balance, the proposed development is considered acceptable in principle in accordance with the provisions of

the NPPF (2019), Policies CS1, CS14, CS15, CS17 and CS34 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013), Hemel Hempstead Place Strategy (2013), Saved Policies 10 and 31 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004) and guidance within the Maylands Master Plan (2007) and the Maylands Gateway Development Brief (2013).

Impact to Street Scene

9.29 Paragraph 124 of the revised NPPF (2019) states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

9.30 Paragraph 120 of the NPPF (2019) states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents.

9.31 Core Strategy (2013), Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 highlight the importance of high quality sustainable design in improving the character and quality of an area; seeking to ensure that developments are in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of size, mass, height and appearance. This guidance is reiterated in the Saved Local Plan (2004) Policies 10, 18, 21 and Appendix 3.

9.32 The Core Strategy policies are supplemented by advice contained within the Maylands Masterplan, where the site falls within the “Maylands Gateway” which is identified as a first rate business park where very high quality, individually designed buildings, set within a landscaped setting and utilising high quality materials is a defining principle. Buildings should create an active frontage, company signage should be integrated into the building design and car parking should be avoided on the frontages with the potential for undercroft provision explored.

9.33 The application site currently comprises an area of cleared land adjacent to Maylands and Breakspear Way. Nearby are the relatively tall buildings of the Travel Lodge hotel and a self-storage business. Opposite is the Aviva regeneration site. To the rear of the site is a housing development dating from the construction of the new town. Due to the height of the propose development it is considered that the development would also be visible from longer distance views on St Albans Road, Breakspear Way, Leverstock Green Road, Leverstock Green Way and from the M1.

9.34 The proposed development comprises two main sites of built form divided by a spine road running through the middle of the scheme, providing access into the site. Three separate modulated blocks are apparent within each site. These building heights range from 12 to 6 storeys in height in order to break up mass and bulk of built form. Given the surrounding site context, and location in Hemel Hempstead, no objections

are raised in regards to the proposed height of the development, in accordance with Saved Policy 111 of the Local Plan (2004). The development would accommodate undercroft parking in the ground and first floor with commercial surrounding this at street scene level. The remaining floors would be utilised for residential accommodation.

9.35 Plot 2 would contain Buildings A, B and C. Building A would be 12 storeys in height to create a 'marker' building into the entrance of the business park. Plot 3 would contain Buildings D, E and F. Building E would also be a marker building when viewed from within Maylands Business Park. The landmark buildings would have a vertical emphasis with the connected secondary blocks of horizontal design, in order to create a distinction between the two. The Marker Buildings are also to be clad in wire cut facebrick to create a further distinction from the remainder of the proposed buildings which are predominantly to be clad in a sand faced brick. However, the LPA are concerned these blocks are not distinctive enough from the main 'marker' towers. As there would be a lack of breaks, shadow lines or change in materials and detailing (with only two brick bond types proposed) the proposal could appear somewhat monolithic and overpowering to the streetscape. Having said this, given the quality of development within the immediate environment it is not considered that the design of the scheme would be significantly harmful in order to warrant a refusal.

9.36 The design of the buildings would have a commercial frontage to Maylands Avenue comprising glass curtain walling. However, sections of this active frontage would be false as a result of the car parking external ventilation required. It is considered that while not optimising the entire ground floor of the development with commercial use is not ideal, a fake screen would give some illusion of this. The proposals will incorporate a plinth to separate the commercial element from the residential units above. Full height windows to the apartments coupled within a large opening within would also assist in giving the development less of a domestic appearance. It is therefore considered that the proposal would contribute to the visual appearance of the commercial environment of the Maylands Business Park; providing a successful 'face' to the Maylands Gateway.

9.37 The development would follow the build line of adjacent development. This close proximity (approximately 2-4 metres) to the Maylands Avenue in combination with the scale of the proposal would provide a strong presence within the street scene which would help increase the sense of urbanisation and activity within the employment area.

9.38 The development would address corners of the site with chamfered edges, although this would be more successful with deeper chamfering. The proposal also uses chamfered edges and an open plaza, accessible to the public, to relate to the travel lodge development (plot 1). The commercial element of the scheme within building A would also be accessible adjacent to plot 1 and therefore create a visual link and continuity between both development phases. This in turn would also assist in providing high quality, public realm improvements to the area.

9.39 Similar concern is raised regarding the cycle route running north of the site, connecting Maylands Avenue to The Flags. This cycle path will become enveloped between two buildings of significant height and mass. Block D would be located only 4 metres away from the northern boundary of the site. This would result in the development enclosing the cycleway and public footpath between two developments; the application site and adjacent self-storage unit. This has the potential to create quite an oppressive and dark environment for users of this cycle/foot path. Nevertheless, the cycle path is relatively wide, at 5.6 metres, and the residential units of blocks D and E would provide natural surveillance for users of this footpath. Furthermore, the development has been designed with a 13 metre gap between blocks D and E at second floor level in order to provide visual relief for users of this public right of way.

9.40 The development would also use green walls and landscaping to soften the appearance of the development from within the application site itself.

9.41 The proposed scheme would have a density of 268 units per hectare. It is therefore considered that the proposals make the most efficient use of urban land in accordance with the NPPF (2019) and Saved Policies 10 and 21 and will assist the Council in meeting its future housing target.

9.42 Overall, the proposal design is not considered to be of particularly high architectural quality however, it is noted that it would appear an enhancement on the adjacent travel lodge building and would provide a landmark commercial face to Maylands Business Park. The proposed visual appearance of the development is considered in accordance with the NPPF (2019), Policies CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS34 of the Core strategy (2013), Saved Policies 10, 18, 21 and Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004), the Maylands Master Plan (2007) and the Maylands Gateway Development Brief (2013).

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.43 The NPPF (2019) outlines the importance of planning in securing high standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact to neighbouring properties and their amenity space. Thus, the proposed should be designed to reduce any impact on neighbouring properties by way of visual intrusion, loss of light and privacy.

9.44 The application site sits on Maylands Avenue which comprises predominately employment, retail and warehouse uses. The only residential properties within the immediate vicinity on the proposal reside within Adeyfield South residential character area, which sits to the immediate rear of the application site.

9.45 Blocks A and B of the proposed development would be located approximately 51

metres away from the side elevation of the closest property No. 8 Greenway, this separation distance is considered sufficient and raises no significant concern in regards to loss of outlook or privacy serving these properties.

9.46 Block D would be located 32 metres approximately away from the flank elevations of the closest properties Nos. 26, 26a and 27 The Flags. This block would be 5 storeys high at this boundary, at a height of 19 metres. DBC have no side to rear separation distance standards and given the 15 metre high boundary trees at this location this relationship is considered to be acceptable in outlook and privacy terms.

9.47 It is considered that the development would be visible from properties at The Flags, Greenway, New Park Mews and Maddox Road due to the proposed scale of the development. However, the proposal would retain a sufficient separation distance from these neighbouring residents so as not to result in significant detriment to their residential amenity.

9.48 A daylight and sunlight assessment was carried out on the closest surrounding residential properties and was submitted with the full planning application, this demonstrates that no significant loss of daylight or sunlight to the surrounding residential properties habitable rooms or garden space would result from the proposed development.

9.49 Turning to the living conditions the proposal would afford future residents, a Daylight Sunlight Assessment was also carried out and submitted for selected flats within the proposed development. This assessment shows that not all proposed units would receive a sufficient level of daylight and sunlight in accordance with BRE standards; only 64 rooms from the assessed 93 (69%) would meet the average daylight factor BRE target values. Of the 93 rooms assessed for daylight distribution only 77 (83%) would meet the BRE target values. Of the 30 external amenity areas tested, 28 (93%) would meet the BRE overshadowing target criteria on the spring equinox (21 March). Although the report justifies this by stating that the *majority* of the rooms not meeting BRE criteria are bedrooms and therefore not primary living space, it is noted that the studio apartments also do not meet this criteria. Nevertheless, regard also has to be given to para 123 of the NPPF (2019) which states that local planning authorities when considering applications for housing, authorities should take a flexible approach in applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight, where they would otherwise inhibit making efficient use of a site.

9.50 Concerns are also raised regarding the quality of environment within the northern enclosed gallery access serving as access to flats within block D in terms of natural light serving this corridor and potential anti-social behaviour which may result.

9.51 Within plot 2 the relationship between flats would be located 21 -30 metres approximately away from opposite rear primary windows (albeit at a slightly obtuse angle), around the internal podium. This is considered to secure a sufficient level of

amenity provision to prevent overlooking between apartments. Within plot 3 block E would be located 13 metres approximately away from the flank elevation of block D. Nevertheless, as this is a side to rear relationship, which DBC have no minimum standard for, it is considered acceptable. Block F would be located 29- 30 metres approximately from Block D, which is also considered to secure an acceptable degree of overlooking and privacy between departments. Plots 2 and 3 would also be located 20 metres away from each other, which is considered acceptable.

9.52 The east facing units within Block D would be located 10.5 metres approximately away from the adjacent 15 metre high tree bank. This distance is considered sufficient to secure a reasonable outlook from the primary living rooms within these flats. The north facing flats within Blocks D would be located 13 metres approximately away from the adjacent self-storage unit, which although not an ideal relationship due to close proximity, is not considered sufficiently harmful to future residents' outlook to warrant refusal of the application. Minor concerns are also raised regarding the relationship of balconies within the scheme, and resulting overlooking and loss of privacy between units. This mainly relates to the relationship of concern units within Block D and Block B with Block C at third and fourth floor.

9.53 Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) states that for a multiple occupancy residential development an amenity area at least equal to the footprint of the building should be provided. External amenity provision has been allocated to the development by way of central podium (which has been designed to mitigate noise and disturbance), private roof terraces within each plot and private balconies. This level of external amenity provision is considered acceptable, with other external amenity space (such as Coppinsfield sports ground, High Street Green and Leverstock Village Green) located within a 1 kilometre radius of the site.

Noise

9.54 A noise assessment was submitted alongside the planning application to demonstrate that a sufficient level of amenity for future occupiers would be maintained given the surrounding land uses within the employment area and road traffic. Dacorum Borough's Environmental Health team were consulted on this assessment and consider that provided windows remain closed within front facing flats an acceptable acoustic level would be achieved. This requires a sufficient level of comfort to be achieved in the flats in order to ensure that residents are not required to open windows for climate control. Therefore, the installation of mechanical ventilation has been conditioned which provides for thermal comfort, not just background noise. Windows serving these front facing flats will remain openable however, this would be the future occupiers choice if they want them opened. Further concerns regarding external noise levels for private balconies were also raised from the Environmental Health's noise officer. Para 6.2.2 of the submitted noise assessment highlights this by stating, 'the measured daytime ambient noise levels exceed the BS 8233 guidance noise levels for balconies (50 to 55 dB LAeq); as such any balconies should ideally be designed

accordingly in order to achieve the guidance levels.’ In response to this a statement has been submitted demonstrating the development has been engineered to best reduce noise levels and that any further alteration to balcony design would not improve noise levels. It is noted that the removal of the balconies from the scheme would overcome this concern however, the LPA are of the view that balconies are an added luxury of the scheme and their removal would not be providential for future residents. Instead, it is considered that balconies are retained with the option for future occupiers to use them at their discretion and therefore the scheme will not be recommended for refusal on these grounds. In short, the balconies are not considered intrinsic to the design of the development. The remaining finding of the noise report shows that the proposed development (including construction stage) would not generate significant noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents, subject to the appropriate mitigation measures set out.

9.55 On balance, the proposed development is not considered to result in a significant loss of outlook or daylight and sunlight to surrounding residential properties and it is considered that the standard of amenity provision which would be secured for future residents is not significantly low so as to warrant a refusal of the application. The proposal is therefore considered in accordance with the NPPF (2019) Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004).

Highway Safety and Parking Provision

9.56 Policy CS34 of the Core Strategy (2013) requires developments in Maylands Avenue to support more sustainable forms of transport. Saved Policy 51 of the Local Plan (2004) outlines that development should have no significant impact upon the nature, capacity and use of the highway network, the provision of routes and facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and passenger transport users or on-street parking. Development proposal should take into consideration transport measures which would reduce the dependency on cars.

9.57 Paragraph 109 of the NPPF (2019) states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. This severe impact would need to be demonstrated by evidence.

9.58 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF (2019) states that if setting local parking standards authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport; local car ownership levels and adequate provision of spaces for ultra-low emission vehicles. Policies CS8 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policies 57, 58 and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004) promote an assessment based upon maximum parking standards.

Parking

9.59 The application site falls within Zone 4 where parking provision between 75 - 100% of maximum standard should be taken for non-residential development. The proposal seeks to provide 268 flats and 1404.5sq.m of office space. This would require 340.75 parking spaces for the residential element, at maximum standard (this figure incorporates visitor parking spaces). 268 parking spaces have been provided for the residential element of this space which would fall 72 spaces short of this standard. 41 parking spaces would be required at 100% of maximum standard for the commercial element of the scheme. 66 car spaces have been provided to support the B1 office space which exceeds maximum standard; totally 334 car parking spaces overall. The 72 commercial spaces can be used by the residential units during weekends and evenings. In addition, there would also be a club car space, secured by way of S.106 agreement, to off-set the short fall in residential spaces further. A further 11 motorcycle spaces would be available to further off-set the shortfall in spaces. Lay-by spaces would also be provided with capacity for a further 6 cars.

9.60 Some commercial spaces are tandem designed, although not ideal the commercial units would derive a system to manage this.

9.61 More sustainable forms of transportation would also be available with provision for 288 cycle spaces allocated within the scheme, 268 for residents and 20 for employees of the commercial units. This meets maximum standard of 1 cycle space, per residential unit and 19.8 cycle spaces require for B1 office use (1 cycle space per 500 sq.m of office space and 1 per 10 full time staff). Clear glass would be allocated to cycle areas on street level with Maylands Avenue, which would advertise the use of bicycles over cars. Hemel Hempstead is serviced by the National Cycle Network with a traffic-free route entering from the north to south Hemel Hempstead. The shared cycleway on the north western boundary of the site is part of this National Cycle Route and allows for easy access to cyclists. Five bus routes also serve the area of the application site which operates a reasonable service (four per hour) on the weekdays.

Travel Plan

9.62 Paragraph 111 of the NPPF (2019) states that all developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan and transport statement/assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.

9.63 A travel plan has been submitted alongside the planning application to further support a shift away from car use. The Travel plan seeks for a reduction in car usage, traffic speed and road safety and more environmentally friendly delivery and freight movements. Initiatives include home delivery services, a welcome pack for new residents highlighting local public transportation and a care share database which matches those who live and work in the same locality. As this is not a full travel plan

(with a full package of measures and targets outlined), two conditions have been attached to the permission requesting further travel plans for both the residential and commercial elements of the scheme. Monitoring of these travel plans has also been secured by way of S.106 agreement. This will monitor the success of the travel plan at encouraging more sustainable forms of transport and suggest, if necessary, measures which would be most effective at achieving these aims and objectives if not realised within the first few years of development occupation.

Transport Assessment

9.64 A Transport Assessment was also submitted alongside the planning application. This assessment demonstrates that the vehicular movements generated from the proposed development would be less than the vehicular movements generated from the previously approved office scheme (app ref: 4/02124/08/MOA). This office use would generate 1166 daylight movements, which comparatively the current proposal would generate a total of 902 daily trips a day (weekly).

9.65 The office scheme has been implemented and therefore forms a fall-back position in consideration of the highway impacts of the current proposal. Moreover, the growth in traffic since this scheme was granted in 2007 to June 2017 is 16% (1.6% per annum). When calculating the additional vehicular volumes the following adjacent newly granted developments were also factored using TEMPRO to determine forecast growth rates for the years 2023: Heart of Maylands (4/00676/14/MFA), Maylands Avenue (4/03157/16/MFA), Maylands Gateway (4/00064/17/MFA), KFC and Hotel (4/02981/17/MFA), Diamond Point (4/03421/15/MFA), Wood House (4/03252/15/MFA) and Spring Park (4/03054/17/MFA).

9.66 Taken the above into consideration, the proposed development would increase traffic movements on the road by 0.8%-1.7%, with no further queues on the public highway generated from the proposed development.

9.68 Servicing (including refuse collection) and delivery would take place on the spine road serving the development, where vehicles can pull into the lay-by when required. Full details of the servicing and delivery plan has been requested by condition.

9.69 A construction management plan has also been recommended as a condition to ensure construction vehicles would not have a detrimental impact on the vicinity of the site to prevent on-street conflict and impacts to the highway safety.

Highways Comments

9.70 Hertfordshire County Council were consulted on the submitted Transport Assessment, Travel Plan and plan drawings and provided the following comments:

- Walking and cycling are viable travel options for potential future residents of the

- development and the locality is conducive to both.
- Given the accessibility of the site by sustainable transport modes, the level of parking provision provided is considered acceptable.
 - Full travel plans for both residential and commercial uses should be requested by condition.
 - TRICs database has determined that the total vehicle trip generation for the proposed development is: AM Peak: total of 109 two-way trips, PM Peak: total of 101 two way trips.
 - The permitted development for this site generated more traffic.
 - Over the study period, there were a total of 17 collisions, with thirteen classified as slight and four classified as serious, with no fatalities.
 - Swept path analysis has been carried out by the applicant showing refuse and delivery vehicles entering / exiting the site in a forward gear

Fire Safety

9.71 Hertfordshire fire and Rescue have been consulted on the application and has stated that based on the information provided to date they would seek the provision of fire hydrant(s) as all developments must be adequately served by fire hydrants in the event of fire. This has been recommended as condition.

Summary

9.72 Given this push for more sustainable forms of transport and initiatives to encourage this, flexible parking arrangements within the site and no objection from Hertfordshire County Council Highway Authority ; it is considered that the parking level proposed within the site is considered acceptable and that the development would not generate significant increase in traffic so as to result in severe impact to the operation and safety of the adjacent highway network.

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.73 Saved Policies 99 and 100 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seek to ensure that retained trees are protected during development and that new planting is a suitable replacement for any removed trees.

9.74 An Arboricultural report has been submitted with the application which identifies the existing tree constraints on site. Overall, no category A (high quality trees) were recorded on site, with two individual trees and one group identified as Category B (moderate quality) and one individual tree and five groups classes as category C (low quality). Thus, the constraints to development arising from trees growing on both plots are minimal as neither area has significant trees present. Only smaller landscaped trees will be removed as a result of the proposal with tree protection measures recommended for the three retained trees marked as T1, T2 and G6 (lime and silver birch) in the report. Trees and Woodlands have no objection in relation to the proposed

tree removals and consider the planting scheme outlined in the submitted landscape statement an appropriate mitigation measure to support tree losses.

9.75 The proposed scheme has the potential to provide soft and hard landscaping on site, in addition to public open space. A comprehensive landscaping plan for the new development have been provided in the Landscape Masterplan ref: 782-MP-04 Rev E.

9.76 The frontage to Maylands Avenue will encompass low level planting which would soften the frontage of the development and assist with its integration onto the street scene and ground level. A combination of native tree, hedge and shrub planting (Hornbeam hedges and rows of advanced nurse stock, fastigiated and flowering Liriodendron trees) will feature on each side of the spine road leading into the site. This will emphasise the linearity of the area and help soften the appearance of the development.

9.77 Green walls would also be incorporated on the elevations of both plots 2 and 3, facing the spine road. This would further create and enhance the perception of a green corridor leading into the site. In addition to this, a retaining wall including soft landscaping elements would be introduced onto the northern boundary and the tree belt on the western boundary would be retained. Climber planting would be introduced onto the western elevation of plot 2 facing the Travelodge car park. Overall, the development would maintain and enhance a green external appearance.

9.78 A southern entrance court combining cherry tree planting and self-binding gravel would be available to all residents and provide a soft entrance from the Travelodge site. This would create a public realm within the site but also allow for a cohesive link between the three phases of development. This area also provides external amenity for the commercial units, in line with Saved Appendix 6 of the Local Plan (2004).

9.79 Residents of each block would have access to communal amenity spaces located at podium level above the car parking areas. Apartments directly facing these podiums would have access to a private terrace which would be defined by raised planters.

9.80 A biodiverse roof will be incorporated onto the roof of block D and sedum roofs will be located on blocks C and F. These would enhance the local biodiversity of the site and provide visual interest to the residents residing at a higher level in blocks A and E.

9.81 Maintenance details for the proposed landscaping has also been provided and compliance would be conditioned as part of the landscaping strategy. Landscaping maintenance will take place once monthly between October and March and twice monthly between April and September.

9.82 Details of hard surfacing materials and landscaping planting have been submitted and these are considered acceptable. Details of boundary treatment both within the

site and bordering the proposal has been requested by condition.

9.83 Overall, details submitted regarding the landscaping for the scheme and maintenance measure for this are considered to provide to a high level quality, verdant finish to the scheme.

Open Space Contribution

9.84 Saved Policy 76 of the Local Plan (2004) states that permission cannot be granted for new residential developments over 25 dwellings or 1 hectare in area unless public leisure space is provided. This leisure space contribution should meet a standard of at least 1.2 hectares (3 acres) per 1,000 population, or 5% of the development area, whichever is greater. This play space provision should be local need with specification of contribution detailed in Saved Appendix 6 of the Local Plan (2004).

9.85 This open space and leisure contribution is now secured through CIL as highlighted on the Council's Regulation 123 List and therefore a duplicate contribution of this would not be sought from the developers.

Maylands Improvement Specification

9.86 Public realm improvements are sought in the Maylands Area through the Maylands Business Park Improvement Specification SPG. Of this, the strategic planning team are seeking the following contributions: 1/5th of the cost of sheets 6, 7 and 8 Index linked to 13.02.19, with a total contribution sought of £155,026.07. A viability statement has been submitted with the planning application which demonstrates that the scheme cannot absorb further costs. Further to this, the LPA's preference is for affordable housing to be secured over this S106 contribution. The reason for this is that the Maylands Improvement contribution sought is considered unreasonable to the extent that the amount asked for has not been supported with any rationale and the sheets ask for are not within the immediate area of the application site, as the development area has already been completed.

Dwelling Mix

9.87 Policy CS18 of the Core Strategy (2013) states that new development should provide a range of housing types, sizes and tenures with unit mix determined by market intelligence. The unit mix would comprise 21 studio apartments, 119x 1 bedroom apartments and 128x 2 bed units for a maximum of 3/4 people. The Council's most recent Strategic Housing Market Land Assessment (2016) (SHMA) outlined that smaller (1 and 2 bed) units for affordable housing is most desirable and market demand is highest for 2 and 3 bedroom units. The 1 and 2 bed mix put forward as part of the current application was negotiated with the Strategic Housing team, who advised that in this specific location smaller units are in high demand. Of this housing offer 35%

has been allocated for affordable housing, with a mix of 75% affordable units for rent and 25% shared ownership. This affordable housing mix is compliant with Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy (2013). It is therefore considered that the housing mix put forward would contribute towards the Council's housing need.

Sustainable Construction

9.88 Policy CS29 of the Core Strategy (2013) states that new development should comply with the highest standards of sustainable design and construction possible. A sustainability statement checklist has been included within the submitted Design and Access Statement and includes measures such as; use of PV cells, BREEAM Very Good Ratings under New Construction 2014 for the commercial elements of the scheme, a maximum residential indoor water use rate of 105 litres per person per day achieved through the use of efficient bathroom fittings and use of sustainable build materials. This detailing would ensure that the development is of sustainable build and occupation.

Protected Species

9.89 The presence of protected species is a material consideration, in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 175), Natural Environment & Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (section 40), Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 as well as Circular 06/05. Furthermore, Policy CS26 of the Core Strategy (2013) states that proposals should contribute to the conservation of habitats and species.

9.90 A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been submitted along with the planning application which shows that the site has limited potential to support a range of protected species.

9.91 Although, there was no evidence of badgers existing on the site at the time of surveys, a condition would need to be attached requesting a walkover study prior to commencement of any works to ensure that badgers have not begun to use the site while it has remained vacant. Nesting birds are also not considered likely to be present on site due to the limited number of existing trees and scrubs.

9.92 The proposals would provide a level of biodiversity offering through the provision of greenery, green walls and biodiverse roofs.

Flood Risk and Site Drainage

9.93 Policy CS31 of the Core Strategy (2013) outlines that water will be retained in the natural environment as far as possible. Developments are required to avoid Flood Zones 2 and 3, minimise water runoff and secure opportunities to reduce the cause and impact of flooding. Para 148 of the NPPF (2019) states that the planning system

should take full account of flood risk, with para 155 of the NPPF (2019) stating that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk. Developments should be used as an opportunity to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding. Para 165 of the NPPF (2019) states that major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate.

9.94 The application site falls within Flood Zone 1, which has the lowest risk of flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy was submitted alongside the planning application. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy outlines that the site would be drained using a SUDS system with attenuation and flow limiting Hydrobreak in order to limit surface water flow and that the development would not result in further flooding elsewhere in the surrounding area.

9.95 The Lead Local Flood Authority were consulted on this information and have raised no objection to the development on flood risk grounds and consider that the proposed development site can be adequately drained and mitigate any potential existing surface water flood risk, if carried out in accordance with the overall drainage strategy. Three conditions have been recommended to be attached to the permission to ensure that appropriate drainage and site attenuation is carried out.

9.96 Thames Water have also requested that a condition for four water network be attached to the planning permission prior to occupation.

Contaminated Land and Air Quality

9.97 Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy (2013) seeks to improve road safety and air quality.

9.98 Policy CS32 of the Core Strategy (2013) seeks to maintain soil, water and air quality standards and ensure any contaminated land is appropriately remediated.

9.98 Para. 181 of the NPPF (2019) requires planning policies and decisions to sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas. Para. 189 of the NPPF (2019) ensures that a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination.

Air Quality

9.99 Policy CS28 of the Core Strategy (2013) states that carbon emission reductions will be sought in the generation and use of energy, building design and construction, and the use of transport as far as possible. In accordance with Policy CS32 of the Core

Strategy (2013) development should maintain existing Air Quality standards. Any development proposals which would cause harm from a significant increase in pollution (into the air, soil or any water body) by virtue of the emissions of fumes, particles, effluent, radiation, smell, heat, light, noise or noxious substances, will not be permitted.

9.100 Paragraph 170 of the NPPF (2019) reflects this local guidance by stating that new and existing development should not contribute to unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality.

9.101 The application site does not fall within immediate proximity of an Air Quality Management zone however, due to the scale of the proposed development and nature of surrounding uses the air quality of the air needs to be carefully considered. The original Air Quality Assessment submitted alongside the planning application shows the impact of the proposed development on local air quality (pollutants to adjacent road network on Maylands Avenue and St Albans Road and air quality of adjacent residents) to be negligible. The Environmental Health team were consulted on this document and considered this to be based on a historic (2017) air quality baseline. The air quality assessment was subsequently revised with a slight adverse impact to air quality as a result of the development identified. The Environmental Health Team confirmed that the revised report shows the development to be very close to an exceedance of the national objective for nitrogen dioxide. In this regard Air Quality mitigation conditions for a travel plan and electric vehicle charging points have been recommended to ensure that the proposed development does not breach national or local air quality standards.

Contaminated Land

9.102 No Contamination documents were submitted alongside the planning application. Nevertheless, the DBC Contaminated Land team were consulted on the proposed development and considered that as the application site falls within a radon affected area where 1-3% of homes are above the action level and due to historic contaminated land use on the site the standard contamination conditions should be attached to the permission.

Archaeology

9.103 Saved Policy 118 of the Local Plan (2004) states that on archaeological sites or monuments of more local importance their settings, physical preservation in situ will be the preferred option and applications may be refused. The County Archaeological Group will be consulted on all planning applications affecting areas of archaeological significance and archaeological potential. Hertfordshire Archaeology were therefore consulted on the planning application, and as the site is adjacent to an Area of Archaeological Significance they consider the proposal likely to have an impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest. Two archaeological conditions have therefore been requested for archaeological excavation and recording to mitigate the

impact of the development on any historic remains which may be present on the site.

Refuse Collection

9.104 Saved Policy 129 of the Local Plan (2004) seeks to ensure that developments have adequate storage for refuse and recycling

9.105 Refuse provision would be stored in the undercroft parking area of both blocks of the development. Separate refuse facilities would be provided for each block and commercial area, a total of six refuse storage areas are proposed on site. The majority of these refuse stores would be graded for external access. For the bins stores which do not have external access, the management company would be responsible for bringing the bins to the roadside collection points ahead of collection day. Further details of refuse collection arrangement has been requested by condition.

9.106 The residential refuse stores would have sufficient provision to accommodate the bin number required in-line with the Refuse Storage Guidance Note (2015).

9.107 Hertfordshire minerals and waste were consulted in relation to the commercial waste refuse storage facilities and have requested a smart waste management plan to be submitted; this has been conditioned as part of the recommendation for approval.

9.108 Refuse collection would be from the spine road which runs through the development, where the refuse collection vehicle would wait in a bay whilst the bins are collected. A TRACK swept path analysis has been submitted to show that the site is suitable to accommodate a refuse vehicle with an over-run edge island.

9.109 Refuse arrangements for the development are considered to be acceptable.

Secure by Design

9.110 The proposed development has been designed with mind to crime prevention. With the following measures (as well as others) incorporated:

- The security to the communal gardens would be controlled so that residents have access to these spaces from their own building; residents would not have access to other building cores which access the same amenity space.
- The under croft parking area would be access controlled.
- Communal entrance doors to all blocks of flats would have access control systems installed with an audio visual link to each apartment.
- Communal post boxes would be installed to entrance halls and covered by CCTV; the local postal officer would have fob access to the entrance halls only.

9.111 The Crime Prevention Officer at Herts Constituency was consulted on the proposed development and confirmed that the entire development would be built to a

Police minimum security standard.

Equalities Act 2010

9.112 The proposed development has been designated to cater for different types of users with 10% of market and affordable units designed for disability. This is reflected by 10% of parking spaces being allocated for wheelchair users.

9.113 All external amenity area and internal areas of the flats would also be wheelchair accessible.

Planning Obligations & Legal Agreement

9.114 Policy CS35 requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure which is required to support the proposal. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on the 1st July 2015. The application would be CIL Liable.

9.115 In accordance with Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policy 13 of the Local Plan (2004) planning obligations under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991) will be required to deliver the affordable housing, adoption and maintenance of on-site open spaces and financial contributions towards the physical and social infrastructure requirements generated by the development.

9.116 A S106 agreement to secure the following obligations has been agreed and is currently being processed by DBC and County. This application is recommended for approval subject to the competition of this S106 agreement.

- £26,000 for the bus stop improvements
- £2,000 travel plan review
- £30,000 car club parking space

Affordable units

9.117 The Council's planning policies indicate that a housing scheme of this scale at this site should include at least 35% affordable housing, in accordance with Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the recently adopted Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document. The mix of affordable housing should comprise a 75/25% tenure split between rented and intermediate tenures. For this site the affordable housing requirement would therefore be for: 94 affordable units with 70 socially rented units and 24 shared ownership.

9.118 A viability assessment was submitted alongside the planning application which

originally demonstrated that the proposed development would be unviable to make a full affordable housing contribution. Instead 20% affordable homes were put forward with 100% of this being shared ownership. Through negotiations with the developer and appraisal of this viability assessment from an independent consultant acting on behalf of the Council this figure was amended. The scheme now meets the policy compliant affordable housing amount and tenure mix. An amended viability assessment was resubmitted to reflect this proposed changed and the independent consultant verified the costings as being achievable with a 12% developer profit.

9.119 The proposal is considered policy compliant in regards to affordable housing and S.106 contributions.

Consultation Response

9.120 The main concerns received as a result of the proposed development are addressed below:

Parking- The parking provision assessment has been made within the 'Highway Safety and Parking Provision' section above. The policy guidance for parking numbers outlined within Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004) includes visitor provision and is a maximum standard. It is acknowledged that public transport in the immediate vicinity is not great, with no close access to a train station. However, the bus, cycle and pedestrian routes serving the immediate area are considered adequate to off-set the shortfall in parking provision.

Traffic Impact has been underestimated- The traffic impacts of the proposed development highlight within the Transport Assessment have been generated through professional trip-generating software and verified by Hertfordshire Highways who analysed the relevant documents.

Height - It is acknowledged that the height of the development would exceed that of adjacent properties however, the policy guidance for this area seeks a landmark development in this location. It is further considered that a 12 storey high building (maximum 37 metres high) in this location would be out of character, or harmful to the visual amenity of the area.

Loss of privacy- the proposed separation distance of the development to neighbouring residents at the Flags, and other adjacent roads, far exceeds the 23 metre minimum guideline outlined in Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004). The separation distances to neighbouring residents are considered acceptable, with the height of the proposed development factored.

Loss of daylight and sunlight to properties - A daylight and sunlight report was submitted for immediately adjacent residents of the development site. This shows a negligible loss to daylight and sunlight serving these properties as a result of the development.

Lack of infrastructure - The development will make a contribution towards improving local infrastructure. The development is liable for a CIL payment which will be put towards primary and secondary education facilities, health facilities (such a GP

practices and hospital facilities), social and community facilities, open space, waste services and strategic transport projections. The development will also make a direct highway improvement contribution to the immediate area and affordable housing contribution. Please see 'Planning Obligations & Legal Agreement' section.

Further noise and air pollution - this has been assessed within the 'noise' and 'air quality' sections.

Light pollution- A condition requesting external lighting details has been attached to the recommendation so that the LPA can control the level of light pollution omitted from the development.

Impact on bats and ecology- This has been addressed within the 'Protected Species' section above.

Anti-social behaviour in cycle/footpath path - The proposed development has been designed with mind to crime prevention measures, please see 'Secure by Design' section. The proposed development would provide an active residential frontage to the northern cycle/footpath which would help to control/deter anti-social behaviour in this location.

No demand for office space – this has been acknowledged and assessed within the 'principle of development section'. As the site is located within an employment area, the Council are seeking to maximum the amount of office space viable.

9.121 A MP objection to scheme has also been received which supports neighbours' concerns.

10. Conclusion

10.1 The proposed residential use of this site would result in the loss of designated employment land in The Gateway location, serving the Maylands Business Park, which is a departure from Dacorum's Development Plan policies. Factors such as, the current market demand of office use has been taken into consideration in the planning balance. It is considered that the negative impact which would result from the loss of this strategic employment site, would be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal; securing additional new homes on a brownfield site and providing 35% of these homes as affordable housing. The development is therefore considered acceptable in principle in accordance with the NPPF (2019), Policies CS1, CS2, CS4, CS14, CS15, CS17, CS19, CS34 and CS35 of the Dacorum Core Strategy (2013), Hemel Hempstead Place Strategy (2013), Saved Policies 10 and 31 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004) and guidance within the Maylands Master Plan (2007) and the Maylands Gateway Development Brief (2013).

10.2 The scheme is also considered acceptable in terms of visual impact to the street scene, securing a reasonable standard of amenity for future residents, impact on highway safety and operation and other relevant matters; in accordance with the NPPF (2019) Policies CS8, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS18, CS26, CS28, CS29, CS31 and CS32 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policies 18, 21, 51, 58, 76, 99, 100, 111, 118, 129,

Appendices 3, 5 and 6 of the Local Plan (2004), Hemel Hempstead Urban Design Assessment (2010) and Refuse Storage Guidance Note (2015).

11. RECOMMENDATION

1. That the application be DELEGATED to the Group Manager, Development Management with a view to approval subject to the completion of a planning obligation under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. That the following Heads of Terms for the planning obligation, or such other terms as the Committee may determine, be agreed:

- £26,000 for the bus stop improvements
- £2,000 travel plan review
- £30,000 car club parking space
- 35% Affordable units (75/25% tenure split between rented and intermediate tenures)

3. That the following conditions, or such other terms as the Committee may determine, be agreed:

- 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:**

Additional Noise Assessment Letter Ref: 60566365 23rd April 2019

Affordable Housing Note 4th April 2019

Revisions to Air Quality Assessment 28th February 2019

Response to Highway comments ADL/LRJ/lS/1981 31 January 2019

Response to Residents Ref: 3094CPL 05 February 2019

16960-02-SC-(10)-01 Rev 6

Air Quality Technical Note 14th December 2018

16960-03-SC-(10)-01 Rev 6

Response to comments on the Air Quality Assessment for Maylands Avenue 30th October 2018

Traffic Note ADL/LRJ/Is/1981 31 October 2018

16960-SW-TP-(10)-38 Rev 1

16960-SW-TP-(10)-32 Rev 1

16960-SW-TP-(10)-33 Rev 1

16960-SW-TP-(10)-35 Rev 1

16960-SW-TP-(10)-36 Rev 1

16960-SW-TP-(10)-34 Rev 1

16960-SW-TP-(10)-37 Rev 1

Parking Note 1981 September 2018

60215703/CL(5)/001 Rev C6

60215703/CL(5)/002 Rev C6

16960-03-TP-(10)-01 Rev 10

Maylands Air Quality Assessment August 2018

Planning Report 14th December 2018

Revised Submission covering letter 14th December 2018

Daylight and Sunlight Report for Plots 2 & 3 Kier Park, Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead 31st October 2018 66275/16/EB/SM

16960-SW-TP-(10)-20 Rev 7

16960-02-TP-(10)-20 Rev 7

16960-03-TP-(10)-02 Rev 8

16960-03-TP-(10)-00 Rev 10

16960-03-TP-(11)-03 Rev 7

16960-02-TP-(10)-06 Rev 8

16960-02-TP-(10)-02 Rev 8

16960-SW-TP-(11)-02 Rev 6

16960-03-TP-(10)-11 Rev 7

782-MP-05 Rev C

16960-02-TP-(11)-04 Rev 5

16960-03-TP-(10)-10 Rev 7

16960-03-TP-(10)-03 Rev 8

16960-SW-TP-(12)-06 Rev 7

782-MP-04 Rev E

16960-02-TP-(10)-04 Rev 8

16960-02-TP-(10)-10 Rev 8

782-MP-06 Rev B

16960-03-TP-(10)-08 Rev 8

16960-SW-TP-(12)-05 Rev 7

16960-02-TP-(10)-03 Rev 8

16960-SW-TP-(12)-04 Rev 7

16960-02-TP-(10)-09 Rev 8

16960-02-TP-(10)-01 Rev 10

16960-SW-TP-(12)-03 Rev 7

16960-02-TP-(10)-08 Rev 8

16960-02-TP-(10)-05 Rev 8

16960-02-TP-(10)-07 Rev 8

16960-03-TP-(10)-05 Rev 8

16960-03-TP-(11)-05 Rev 7

16960-03-TP-(10)-06 Rev 8

16960-03-TP-(10)-07 Rev 8

16960-SW-TP-(12)-02 Rev 7

16960-03-TP-(11)-02 Rev 7

16960-SW-TP-(11)-01 Rev 6

16960-03-TP-(10)-04 Rev 8

16960-02-TP-(11)-01 Rev 5

16960-02-TP-(10)-00 Rev 10

16960-03-TP-(11)-01 Rev 7

16960-02-TP-(11)-02 Rev 5

16960-03-TP-(10)-09 Rev 8

782-MP-07 Rev A

16960-03-TP-(11)-04 Rev 7

16960-02-TP-(10)-11 Rev 8

**Landscape Statement December 2018 Ref: 782 Landscape Statement
Rev. A 2018-12-14**

16960-02-TP-(11)-03 Rev 5

16960-SW-TP-(12)-01 Rev 7

Statement of Community Involvement August 2018

BS5837 Arboricultural Report Ref: 18024 28th August 2018

Design and Access Statement 13 December 2018 Rev 07

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal August 2018

16960-SW-TP-(00)-02 Rev 4

**Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Issue 2 Revision A 18th
April 2018**

782-IM-01 - Hard Materials Palette August 2018

782-IM-02 - Planting Palette August 2018

16960-SW-TP-(00)-01 Rev 4

Noise Survey and Assessment August 2018

Planning Statement 31 August 2018

**Daylight and Sunlight Report for Plots 2 & 3 Kier Park, Maylands
Avenue, Hemel Hempstead 28 August 2018 66275/16/EB/SM**

Topographical Survey 10985.dwg Rev 2

Transport Assessment December 2018 ADL/LRJ/1981/14A

Notwithstanding the following Affordable Housing details:

Design and Access Statement pages 7, 96 and 105;

Planning Statement pages 24 and 25; and

Parking Note page 1

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

- 3 **No development 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.**

This detail shall include:

- **Joinery details and finish**
- **Rainwater goods**
- **Eaves details**
- **Brickwork**
- **Brickwork bond**
- **Mortar**
- **Fenestration and glazing**

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Due to the nature of this condition it necessary to be pre-commencement as materials will be used in construction. This material condition is to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development; in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS34 of the Core Strategy (2013), Maylands Gateway Development Brief (2013) and Maylands Master Plan (2007).The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been agreed by the applicant.

Materials Informative

Please do not send materials to the council offices. Materials should be kept on site and arrangements made with the planning officer for inspection.

- 4 **Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted details for the**

undercroft parking shutters to be installed within plots 2 and 3 shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Prior to occupation of the relevant plot of the development permitted, works shall be carried out for that plot in accordance with these approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory commercial appearance to the proposed development in accordance with Policies CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

- 5 Prior to occupation of plot 2 of the development hereby permitted details for the appearance of the false commercial screen to be installed on the South-East elevation of plot 2, block C, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Prior to occupation of plot 2 of the development permitted, works shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory commercial appearance to the proposed development in accordance with Policies CS12, CS14, CS15, CS34 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policy 31 of the Local Plan (2004), Maylands Gateway Development Brief (2013) and Maylands Master Plan (2007).

- 6 Prior to occupation 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:**

- **plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected;**
- **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; and**
- **trees to be retained and measures for their protection during construction works;**

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

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area; in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policies 99 and 100 of the Local Plan (2004).

- 7 All planting, seeding or turfing and soil preparation comprised in the approved details in condition 6 shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following one year post implementation of the**

development hereby approved; and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from this date die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written approval to any variation. All landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the guidance contained in British Standards unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure proper implementation of the agreed landscape details in the interest of the amenity value of the development; in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policies 99 and 100 of the Local Plan (2004).

- 8 Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted a long term Landscaping Work, Biodiverse Green Roof and Green Wall Maintenance Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall detail the long-term maintenance and specification of the Landscaping Works, Biodiverse Roof Green Roofs and Walls hereby permitted on the development. Details shall include cleaning and general maintenance works/checks which shall commence throughout the lifetime of scheme.**

Maintenance and up-keep of the green roofs shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details for the life-time of the development.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area in the long-term; in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy (2013).

- 9 Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted an exterior lighting plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include:**

- Specifications of lighting including: luminaire and lamp type, beam control, wattage, the use of reflectors, baffles, louvres, cowling (including colouring), lux contours/distribution diagrams and column type/colour;**
- Site plan showing location of lighting within development;**
- A lighting statement clarifying the precise lighting impact (both internal and external) in relation to bats and other nocturnal wildlife, nearby housing and cycle path and how the installation minimises light pollution in relation to the control criteria specified by the Institution of Lighting Engineers' 'Guidance Notes for the Reduction**

of Light Pollution’;

- A maintenance programme (after-care); and
- Hours of use;

Exterior lighting works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To safeguard and mitigate light pollution and illumination levels from the scheme; in accordance with Saved Appendix 8 and Policy 113 of the Local Plan (2004).

- 10 **Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted a noise assessment and mitigation / control scheme for the proposed plant shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This noise assessment shall specify and rate sources of noise associated with the proposed plant and detail mitigation measures to be made for its control. Sources of noise include, but are not restricted to general building services plant and emergency generators.**

This noise assessment shall be compiled by appropriately experienced and competent persons.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved noise assessment and mitigation/control scheme prior to first occupation and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory level of amenity for future occupiers; in accordance with the NPPF (2019), Policies CS12 and CS32 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004).

- 11 **Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted a scheme of façade protection and alternative ventilation measures for the protection of future residential occupiers from noise shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

This scheme shall be compiled by appropriately experienced and competent persons.

Prior to first occupation of the development the scheme of façade protection and alternative ventilation measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory level of amenity for future occupiers; in accordance with the NPPF (2019), Policies CS12 and CS32 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004).

Construction Hours of Working – (Plant & Machinery) Informative

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: 0730hrs to 1830hrs on Monday to Saturdays, no works are permitted at any time on Sundays or bank holidays.

Construction Dust Informative

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.

Noise on Construction/Demolition Sites Informative

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.

- 12 **Notwithstanding the details submitted prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted 20 Electric Vehicle (EV) ready domestic charging points shall be installed within the undercroft parking area.**

Reason: To contribute to the objective of providing a sustainable transport network and to provide the necessary infrastructure to help off-set the adverse impact of the operational phase of the development on local air quality; in accordance with the NPPF (2019) and Policy CS32of the Core Strategy (2013).

EV Charging Point Specification Informative

- Each charging point shall be installed by an appropriately certified

electrician/electrical contractor in accordance with the following specification. The necessary certification of electrical installation should be submitted as evidence of appropriate installation to meet the requirements of Part P of the most current Building Regulations.

- Cable and circuitry ratings should be of adequate size to ensure a minimum continuous current demand for the vehicle of 16A and a maximum demand of 32A (which is recommended for Eco developments).

- A separate dedicated circuit protected by an RBCO should be provided from the main distribution board, to a suitably enclosed termination point within a garage or an accessible enclosed termination point for future connection to an external charge point.

- The electrical circuit shall comply with the Electrical requirements of BS7671: 2008 as well as conform to the IET code of practice on Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment installation 2012 ISBN 978-1-84919-515-7 (PDF). This includes requirements such as ensuring the Charging Equipment integral protective device shall be at least Type A RCD (required to comply with BS EN 61851 Mode 3 charging).

- If installed in a garage all conductive surfaces should be protected by supplementary protective equipotential bonding. For vehicle connecting points installed such that the vehicle can only be charged within the building, e.g. in a garage with a (non-extended) tethered lead, the PME earth may be used. For external installations the risk assessment outlined in the IET code of practice must be adopted, and may require additional earth stake or mat for the EV charging circuit. This should be installed as part of the EV ready installation to avoid significant on cost later.

- A list of authorised installers (for the Government's Electric Vehicle Homecharge Scheme) can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/office-for-low-emission-vehicles>

- 13 **Prior to residential occupation of the development hereby permitted a Residential Travel Plan shall be submitted in accordance with Hertfordshire's Travel Plan Guidance and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable and targets contained therein and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied subject to approved modifications agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority as part of the annual review.**

Reason: To promote sustainable transport measures to the development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy (2013).

- 14 **Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted a Business Travel Plan shall be submitted in accordance with Hertfordshire's Travel Plan Guidance and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable and targets contained therein and shall continue to be**

implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied subject to approved modifications agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority as part of the annual review.

Reason: To promote sustainable transport measures to the development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy (2013).

- 15 **Prior to commencement of development hereby permitted a Smart Waste Management Plan should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This Smart Waste Management Plan should provide details for both the site preparation and construction phases. Good practice templates for producing SWMPs can be found at:**

<http://www.smartwaste.co.uk/> or

http://www.wrap.org.uk/construction/tools_and_guidance/site_waste_management_planning/index.html

Works should be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Due to the nature of this condition it necessary to be pre-commencement as details to minimise waste during construction need to be outlined. This condition is to ensure the build is sustainable and waste in minimised; in accordance with Policy CS29 of the Core Strategy (2013). The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been agreed by the applicant.

- 16 **No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan. The Construction Management Plan / Statement shall include details of:**

- a. Construction vehicle numbers, type, routing;
- b. Access arrangements to the site;
- c. Traffic management requirements
- d. Construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking, loading / unloading and turning areas);
- e. Siting and details of wheel washing facilities;
- f. Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway;
- g. Timing of construction activities (including delivery times and removal of waste) and to avoid school pick up/drop off times;
- h. Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities;
- i. Post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and

- temporary access to the public highway;
- j. where works cannot be contained wholly within the site a plan should be submitted showing the site layout on the highway including extent of hoarding, pedestrian routes and remaining road width for vehicle movements;
- k. Construction or Demolition Hours of Operation;
- l. Dust and Noise control measure; and
- m. Asbestos survey and control measure where applicable.

Reason: Due to the nature of this condition it necessary to be pre-commencement as details as construction details are required. The construction management plan is required in order to protect highway safety, the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way; in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy. The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been agreed by the applicant.

- 17 **Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, a Servicing and Delivery Plan shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Servicing and Delivery Plan shall contain the delivery and servicing requirements (including refuse collection) for the proposed uses, a scheme for coordinating deliveries and servicing for the proposed development, areas within the development site that would be used for loading and manoeuvring of delivery and servicing vehicles, and access to / from the site for delivery and servicing vehicles.**

The servicing and delivery of the development shall be carried out in accordance with these details.

Reason: In the interests of maintaining highway efficiency and safety; in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

- 18 **Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a Car Parking Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The car parking management plan shall include the information prescribed in the Transport Assessment and the following:**

- Details of car parking allocation and distribution;
- Methods to minimise on-street car parking;
- A scheme for the provision and parking of cycles; and,
- Monitoring required of the Car Parking Management Plan to be submitted to and approved in accordance with a timeframe to be agreed by the local planning authority.

The Car Parking Management Plan shall be fully implemented before the

development is first occupied, in accordance with a timeframe agreed by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained for this purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure sufficient available on-site car parking and the provision of adequate cycle parking that meets the needs of occupiers of the proposed development and in the interests of encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport; in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Highways Informatives

Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 123 4047.

Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 123 4047.

Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 123 4047.

Construction standards for works within the highway: All works to be undertaken on the adjoining highway shall be constructed to the satisfaction and specification of the Highway Authority, by an approved contractor, and in accordance with Hertfordshire County Council's publication "Roads in Hertfordshire - Highway Design Guide (2011)". Before works commence the applicant would need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 123 4047.

4047.

- 19 **Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted a housing and infrastructure phasing plan for the developments use of the wastewater network shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Development shall be carried out in accordance with this housing and infrastructure phasing plan prior to occupation and maintained therefore.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional flows anticipated from the new development; in accordance with Policy CS31 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Thames Water Informative

A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 02035779483 or by emailing wwriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality."

- 20 **No development shall take place/commence until a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:**

- 1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording**
- 2. The programme for post investigation assessment**
- 3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording**
- 4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation**
- 5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation**
- 6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.**

Reason: Due to the nature of this condition it necessary to be pre-commencement in order to provide properly for the likely archaeological

implications of this development proposal; in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Saved Policy 118 of the Local Plan (2004) and the guidance contained in the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide. The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been agreed by the applicant.

- 21 **Development shall take place in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 18.**

The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation has been completed and the provision made for analysis in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 18 and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: In order to provide properly for the likely archaeological implications of this development proposal; in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Saved Policy 118 of the Local Plan (2004) and the guidance contained in the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide.

- 22 **No development, shall take place until a Phase I Report to assess the actual or potential contamination at the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. If actual or potential contamination and/or ground gas risks are identified, further investigation shall be carried out and a Phase II report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. If the Phase II report establishes that remediation or protection measures are necessary, a Remediation Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

For the purposes of this condition:

- **A Phase I Report consists of a desk study, site walkover, conceptual model and a preliminary risk assessment. The desk study comprises a search of available information and historical maps which can be used to identify the likelihood of contamination. A simple walkover survey of the site is conducted to identify pollution linkages not obvious from desk studies. Using the information gathered, a 'conceptual model' of the site is constructed and a preliminary risk assessment is carried out.**
- **A Phase II Report consists of an intrusive site investigation and risk assessment. The report should make recommendations for further investigation and assessment where required.**

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

Reason: Due to the nature of this condition it necessary to be pre-commencement in order to ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed before building works begin; in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32. The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been agreed by the applicant.

- 23 **All remediation or protection measures identified in the Remediation Statement referred to in Condition 22 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 that part of the development hereby permitted.**

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

Reason: To ensure that the issue of contamination is adequately addressed and to ensure a satisfactory development, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS32 and the NPPF (2019).

Contamination Informatives:

Paragraph 178 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

Un-expected Contaminated Land Informative: 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.

- 24 **Prior to the commencement of development, a Construction Ecological Management Plan shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for approval. The Ecological Management Plan shall detail planned mitigation for ecological impacts on the adjacent woodland. Works shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.**

Reason: Due to the nature of this condition it necessary to be pre-commencement in order to protect the presence of protected species before construction of the development commences, in line with the NPPF (2019) and Policy CS26 of the Core Strategy (2013).The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been agreed by the applicant.

- 25 **Prior to commencement of the development permitted, a Badger survey of the bund shall be carried out and details including an assessment of the impact of the proposed development and any appropriate mitigation measures to alleviate such impacts shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Works shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.**

Reason: Due to the nature of this condition it necessary to be pre-commencement in order to protect the presence of protected species before construction of the development commences, in line with the NPPF (2019) and Policy CS26 of the Core Strategy (2013).The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been agreed by the applicant.

Ecology Informative

Any significant tree/shrub works or removal should be undertaken outside the nesting bird season (March to August inclusive) to protect breeding birds, their nests, eggs and young. If this is not practicable, a search of the area should be made no more than 2 days in advance of vegetation clearance by a competent Ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest.

- 26 **The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy carried out by PCS Consulting Engineers Ltd Issue 2 Revision A dated 18 April 2018. The surface water drainage scheme should include;**

- 1. Providing attenuation to ensure no increase in surface water run-off volumes for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.**
- 2. Limiting surface water run-off to a maximum of 40l/s for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change even**

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site; in accordance with Policy CS31 of the Core Strategy (2013).

- 27 **No development shall take place until the final design of the drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage system will be based on the submitted approved Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy carried out by PCS Consulting Engineers Ltd Issue 2 Revision A dated 18 April 2018. The scheme shall also include:**

- 1. Demonstrate an appropriate SuDS management and treatment train and inclusion of above ground features reducing the requirement for any underground storage.**
- 2. Full detailed engineering drawings including cross and long sections, location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features. This should be supported by a clearly labelled drainage layout plan showing pipe networks. The plan should show any pipe 'node numbers' that have been referred to in network calculations and it should also show invert and cover levels of manholes.**
- 3. Details regarding any areas of informal flooding (events those exceeding 1 in 30 year rainfall event), this should be shown on a plan with estimated extents and depths and details of final exceedance routes.**

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

Reason: Due to the nature of this condition it necessary to be pre-commencement in order to prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site and to prevent the increased risk of flooding, both on and off site; in accordance with Policy CS31 of the Core Strategy (2013). The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been agreed by the applicant.

- 28 **Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted a management and maintenance plan for the SuDS features and drainage network must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:**

- 1. Provision of complete set of as built drawings for site drainage with maintenance and operational activities.**
- 2. Arrangements for adoption and any other measures to secure the**

operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

Works shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In order to prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site; in accordance with Policy CS31 of the Core Strategy (2013).

- 29 **Prior to commencement of any built development hereby permitted information on the number and position of fire hydrants shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The relevant details shall include information on how the hydrants will be incorporated into the mains water services whether by means of existing water services or new mains or extension to or diversion of existing services or apparatus. The fire hydrants shall be implemented prior to occupation of the dwellings hereby approved.**

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

Article 35 Statement

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.

Appendix A

Consultation responses

Comments received from consultees:

Thames Water

Waste Comments

Following initial investigations, Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing foul water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development proposal. Thames Water have contacted the developer in an attempt to agree a position for foul water networks but have been unable to do so in the time available and as such Thames Water request that the following condition be added to any planning permission. No properties shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:- all wastewater network upgrades required to accommodate the

additional flows from the development have been completed; or- a housing and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to allow additional properties to be occupied. Where a housing and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed housing and infrastructure phasing plan. Reason - The development may lead to sewage flooding and network reinforcement works are anticipated to be necessary to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional flows anticipated from the new development. Any necessary reinforcement works will be necessary in order to avoid sewer flooding and/or potential pollution incidents.” The developer can request information to support the discharge of this condition by visiting the Thames Water website at thameswater.co.uk/preplanning. Should the Local Planning Authority consider the above recommendation inappropriate or are unable to include it in the decision notice, it is important that the Local Planning Authority liaises with Thames Water Development Planning Department (telephone 0203 577 9998) prior to the planning application approval.

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

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

As you are redeveloping a site, there may be public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you discover a sewer, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't reduce capacity, limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes. <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

‘We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the planning application, Thames Water would like the following informative attached to the planning permission: “A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water’s Risk Management Team by telephoning 02035779483 or by emailing wwriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality.”

Water Comments

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

Company. For your information the address to write to is - Affinity Water Company The Hub, Tamblin Way, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EZ - Tel - 0845 782 3333.

Strategic Housing

To meet the affordable housing policy requirements 35% of the dwellings should be agreed for affordable housing.

Therefore, 94 units should be provided for affordable housing. We would specify that the tenure mix of the affordable housing provision is 75% affordable rented and 25% shared ownership in line with our Affordable housing SPD.

Herts Property

Thank you for your email regarding the above mentioned planning application.

Growth & Infrastructure Unit 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.

I trust the above is of assistance if you require any further information please contact me or the planning obligations team (growth@hertfordshire.gov.uk).

Rights of Way Officer

No Public Right of Way.

Herts Fire and Rescue

I refer to the above mentioned application and am writing in respect of planning obligations sought by the County Council towards fire hydrants to minimise the impact of development on Hertfordshire County Council Services for the local community.

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

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

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

The requirements for fire hydrant provision are set out with the Toolkit at paragraph 12.33 and 12.34 (page 22). In practice, the number and location of hydrants is

determined at the time the water services for the development are planned in detail and the layout of the development is known, which is usually after planning permission is granted. If, at the water scheme design stage, adequate hydrants are already available no extra hydrants will be needed.

Section 106 planning obligation clauses can be provided on request.

Justification

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

www.hertsdirect.org/planningobligationstoolkit

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

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

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

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

All developments must be adequately served by fire hydrants in the event of fire. The County Council as the Statutory Fire Authority has a duty to ensure fire fighting facilities are provided on new developments. The requirements for fire hydrant provision are set out with the Toolkit at paragraph 12.33 and 12.34 (page 22).

(ii) Directly related to the development;

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

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

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

I would be grateful if you would keep me informed about the progress of this application so that either instructions for a planning obligation can be given promptly if your authority is minded to grant consent or, in the event of an appeal, information can be submitted in support of the requested provision.

Minerals and Waste Planning

I am writing in response to the above planning application insofar as it raises issues in connection with waste matters. Should the council be mindful of permitting this application, a number of detailed matters should be given careful consideration.

Government policy seeks to ensure that all planning authorities take responsibility for waste management. This is reflected in the county council's adopted waste planning documents. In particular, the waste planning documents seek to promote the sustainable management of waste in the county and encourage districts and boroughs to have regard to the potential for minimising waste generated by development.

Most recently, the Department for Communities and Local Government published its *National Planning Policy for Waste (October 2014)* which sets out the following:

'When determining planning applications for non-waste development, local planning authorities should, to the extent appropriate to their responsibilities, ensure that:

- the likely impact of proposed, non-waste related development on existing waste management facilities, and on sites and areas allocated for waste management, is acceptable and does not prejudice the implementation of the waste hierarchy and/or the efficient operation of such facilities;*
- new, non-waste development makes sufficient provision for waste management and promotes good design to secure the integration of waste management facilities with the rest of the development and, in less developed areas, with the local landscape. This includes providing adequate storage facilities at residential premises, for example by ensuring that there is sufficient and discrete provision for bins, to facilitate a high quality, comprehensive and frequent household collection service;*
- the handling of waste arising from the construction and operation of development maximises reuse/recovery opportunities, and minimises off-site disposal.'*

This includes encouraging re-use of unavoidable waste where possible and the use of recycled materials where appropriate to the construction. In particular, you are referred to the following policies of the adopted Hertfordshire County Council Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2012 which forms part of the Development Plan. The policies that relate to this proposal are set out below:

Policy 1: Strategy for the Provision for Waste Management Facilities. This is in regards to the penultimate paragraph of the policy;
Policy 2: Waste Prevention and Reduction: &
Policy 12: Sustainable Design, Construction and Demolition.

In determining the planning application, the council is urged to pay due regard to these policies and ensure their objectives are met.

The county council would expect detailed information to be provided separately for the demolition, site preparation and construction phases of development. The waste arisings will be of a different composition from each of these phases. Good practice templates for producing SWMPs can be found at:

<http://www.smartwaste.co.uk/> or

http://www.wrap.org.uk/construction/tools_and_guidance/site_waste_management_planning/index.html

The SWMP should be set out as early as possible so that decisions can be made relating to the management of waste arisings and so that building materials made from recycled and secondary sources can be used within the development. This will help in terms of estimating what types of containers/skips are required for the stages of the project and when segregation would be best implemented. It will also help in determining the costs of removing waste for a project.

The county council as Waste Planning Authority would be happy to assess any SWMP that is submitted and provide comments to the two councils.

British Pipeline Agency

Thank you for your correspondence enclosing details of your proposals as listed above.

We are not aware that any of BPA Pipelines apparatus, falls within the vicinity of the above noted location.

However, if the location of your work should change, please contact us immediately, on 01442 218911 or email nickifarenden@bpa.co.uk. Whilst we try to ensure the information we provide is accurate, the information is provided Without Prejudice and we accept no liability for claims arising from any inaccuracy, omissions or errors contained herein.

Lead Local Flood Authority

Thank you for consulting us on the above application for the construction of 268 flats and 1095sqm of office space split across six blocks, with associated car parking, landscaping and amenity space.

Following a review of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy carried out by PCS Consulting Engineers Ltd Issue 2 Revision A dated 18 April 2018, we can confirm that we have no objection in principle on flood risk grounds and advise the LPA that the proposed development site can be adequately drained and mitigate any potential existing surface water flood risk if carried out in accordance with the overall drainage strategy.

The proposed drainage strategy is based upon attenuation and discharge into the Thames Water surface water sewer. The drainage system has been designed to restrict run off from all events to the allowable flow agreed under the original planning approval APP/4/01442/11/ROC. This allows 75l/sec for the whole site, and 40l/sec remaining for plot 2 and 3. The hydrobrake is located in manhole SWMH 14 downstream of a large attenuation tank. The hydrobrake ensures that water is stored to help control the flow prior to discharge into the public surface water sewer surface water system.

A total of 220m³ of net storage is provided upstream of manhole S9 within the undercroft ground floor parking. We note areas of informal flooding has been identified for events above for 1 in 100 year plus climate change and will be located access route and within the ground floor parking areas.

We therefore recommend the following conditions to the LPA should planning permission be granted.

Condition 1

The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy carried out by PCS Consulting Engineers Ltd Issue 2 Revision A dated 18 April 2018. The surface water drainage scheme should include;

1. Providing attenuation to ensure no increase in surface water run-off volumes for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.
2. Limiting surface water run-off to a maximum of 40l/s for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event

Condition 2

No development shall take place until the final design of the drainage scheme has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The surface water drainage system will be based on the submitted approved Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy carried out by PCS Consulting Engineers Ltd Issue 2 Revision A dated 18 April 2018. The scheme shall also include:

1. Demonstrate an appropriate SuDS management and treatment train and inclusion of above ground features reducing the requirement for any underground storage.
2. Full detailed engineering drawings including cross and long sections, location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features. This should be supported by a clearly labelled drainage layout plan showing pipe networks. The plan should show any pipe 'node numbers' that have been referred to in network calculations and it should also show invert and cover levels of manholes.
3. Details regarding any areas of informal flooding (events those exceeding 1 in 30 year rainfall event), this should be shown on a plan with estimated extents and depths and details of final exceedance routes.

Condition 3

Upon completion of the drainage works for each phase in accordance with the timing / phasing, a management and maintenance plan for the SuDS features and drainage network must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include;

1. Provision of complete set of as built drawings for site drainage with maintenance and operational activities.
2. Arrangements for adoption and any other measures to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason

1. To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site.
2. To prevent the increased risk of flooding, both on and off site

Amended Comments

Thank you for consulting us on the above application for the construction of 268 flats and 1095sqm of office space split across six blocks, with associated car parking, landscaping and amenity space.

We note that no additional information has been submitted in relation to surface water drainage or flood risk therefore we maintain our position as stated in our letter dated 03 October 2018.

Herts Archaeology

Please note that the following advice is based on the policies contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposed development site is adjacent to Area of Archaeological Significance no. 38, as identified in the Local Plan. This denotes an area of prehistoric and Romano-British occupation that includes a substantial Romano-Celtic temple and related religious complex dating to the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D. (Scheduled Monument No. 27921), south of Wood Lane End. Excavations in advance of housing development in 1982 and 1983 identified remains including a temple or mausoleum, a bath house and several other buildings [Historic Environment Record no. 94].

Archaeological evaluation in 2016, followed by archaeological excavations c.250m to the north west of the site, in 2017, have revealed the remains of several Roman corn-driers, a tile kiln, a lime kiln, and other industrial evidence [Maylands Gateway - HER no. 31265]. It is likely that these features can be linked to the construction of the temple-mausoleum complex, and that they together comprise an archaeological site of considerable significance.

An archaeological evaluation was undertaken by Oxford Archaeology in 2007 which sampled approximately 5% of the whole of the then development site (i.e. Plots 1, 2 and 3). The results of this investigation suggest a high level of disturbance across the site, particularly where the construction of the former GPO buildings has had a considerable impact. However, despite this a number of significant, albeit truncated, archaeological features were identified. The site therefore has the potential to contain currently unknown archaeological finds and deposits.

I believe therefore that the proposed development is such that it should be regarded as likely to have an impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest and I recommend that the following provisions be made, should you be minded to grant consent:

1. the archaeological supervision of the removal of soil and overburden to the archaeological horizon, via a 'strip and record' exercise, in areas to be agreed in consultation with the NHBEAT - and the investigation and recording of any

- archaeological features or deposits thereby revealed, prior to the commencement of any groundworks associated with the development;
2. the archaeological monitoring and recording of all other remaining ground works associated with the proposed development - including foundations, service trenches, landscaping, etc. (and also including a contingency for the further investigation and recording of any remains then encountered);
 3. a contingency for the rapid archaeological investigation of any remains encountered during the monitoring programme,
 4. the analysis of the results of the archaeological work with provisions for the subsequent production of a report and an archive, the the publication of the results, as appropriate, a publication of these results, and an archive,
 5. such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the archaeological interests of the site.

I believe that these recommendations are both reasonable and necessary to provide properly for the likely archaeological implications of this development proposal. I further believe that these recommendations closely follow para. 199, etc. of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018), and the relevant guidance contained in the National Planning Practice Guidance, and in the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic England, 2015).

In this case two appropriately worded conditions on any planning consent would be sufficient to provide for the level of investigation that this proposal warrants. I suggest the following wording:

Condition A

No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme for post investigation assessment
3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

Condition B

- i) Demolition/development shall take place in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A).
- ii) Each phase of the development shall not be occupied until the site investigation has been completed and the provision made for analysis in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A). The final phase of development shall not be occupied until the site investigation has been completed and the provision made for analysis in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

If planning consent is granted, then this office will be able to provide detailed advice concerning the requirements for the investigation and to provide information on accredited archaeological contractors who may be able to carry out the work.

I hope that you will be able to accommodate the above recommendations.

Amended Comments

I have no additional comment to make on these amendments. Our advice to the Planning Authority concerning the application remains unaltered to that contained in our letter dated 3rd October 2018: i.e. we consider that the position of the proposed development is such that it should be regarded as likely to have an impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest and we recommend that provision should be made to mitigate the impact of the development via the placing of appropriately worded archaeological conditions on any planning consent, should such consent be granted.

Crime Prevention Officer

Thank you for sight of planning application 4/02286/18/MFA, construction of 268 flats and 1095 square metres of office space split across six blocks , with associated car parking, landscaping and amenity space. Plots 2 & 3 Kier Park , Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead, HP2 4FQ.

I am pleased to see that Security is detailed in the Design and Access Statement (7.5) and it is the intention to build the entire development to the Police minimum security standard Secured by Design , which will meet the requirements of building regulations (Approved Document Q).

I am meeting with the officers who Police Maylands Avenue as we have seen an increase in crime , especially in the Travel Lodge car park (adjacent to the proposed development). It is strongly recommended that this development is built to the SBD standard.

Please contact me if you require any further information.

Amended Comments

From a crime prevention and community safety perspective it is great to see that the commercial car park spaces will increase from 27 to 65 , I have no further comments relating to this application.

Trees and Woodlands

With regard to Planning Application 4/02286/18/MFA - Plots 2 & 3 Kier Park, Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead.

According to the Arboricultural Report submitted for the application many of the existing trees will require removal to facilitate the development. These have been categorised as 'C', and therefore are not of sufficient quality to seek retention. After examining the Landscape Statement outlining the proposed planting scheme, I consider appropriate mitigation is included to support tree losses. Consequently, I have no objections

relating to tree removal.

The proposed distance of block 'D' to the western tree line is a minimum of 10m. Tree roots emanating from the adjacent tree line have the potential to reach greater distances than 10m. As a result, I require a Tree Protection Plan to be submitted that clearly identifies the extent of the root areas of trees adjacent to the building and a suitable method for their protection, where tree roots encroach into the development site.

HCC Highways

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

Decision

Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) as highway authority wish to object to the proposed development at Plots 2 and 3 Kier Park due to a lack of information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the local highway network. The following information is required for consideration:

- Inclusion of further committed development:
 - 4/00064/17/MFA
 - 4/02981/17/MFA
 - 4/03421/15/MFA
 - 4/03252/15/MFA
 - 4/03054/17/MFA
- Revised site access junction capacity assessment which includes the updated committed development.
- Further junction assessments are required, with at least St Albans Road / Maylands Avenue roundabout considered. Justifying the lack of additional assessment by comparing the proposed development to the previous application, permitted in 2010, is not considered acceptable as the previous application is out of date and the characteristics of the highway network have changed since the previous application was agreed.
- Clarification that servicing does not require the parking spaces to be free from parked cars.
- Visibility from the access should include the adjacent roundabout exit.

While not reasons for refusal on their own, the following are required for consideration and would be conditioned if the application is permitted.

- Full policy review.
- Clarification of whether the permission previously granted is extant or expired.
- Review of most recent five years of collision data.
- Full Travel Plan, including measures to reduce car usage.
- Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Description of the Proposal

The proposal consists of the erection of 268 flats and 1,095 sqm of commercial floorspace split across six blocks with associated car parking, landscaping and amenity space at Plots 2 and 3 Kier Park, Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead.

History

Plots 2 and 3 have previously had permission granted for 6,455sqm of office space with 152 car parking spaces (reference 04/02124/08/MOA). The permission was granted in 2010.

The applicant is required to clarify when the permission was granted in 2010 and whether it is extant or has since expired.

Site Description

The site comprises circa 1 hectare of vacant brownfield land. The site is located on the corner of St Albans Road and Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead.

Analysis

A Design and Access Statement (DAS) is required for all planning applications that have an impact on the highway, as outlined in Roads in Hertfordshire: Design Guide (3rd Edition), this has been provided by the applicant.

A Transport Assessment is required for a development of this scale, in line with the guidance set out in Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide (3rd Edition). A Transport Assessment has been provided as part of the application package.

Policy Review

The applicant has not provided evidence of consideration of policy documents in the application submission.

HCC typically requires that the applicant provide evidence of review of the following documents:

- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG);
- Manual for Streets (2007);
- Hertfordshire County Council Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) 2011-2031;

- HCC Active Travel Strategy (April 2013);
- HCC Rail and Bus Strategy.

Additionally, pre-application comments requested the review of Hemel Hempstead Urban Transport Plan.

Trip Generation

A trip generation profile for the proposed development (residential and office) has been provided. The applicant has also provided a comparison of the proposed and permitted development trips.

Proposed Development

The applicant used the TRICS database to determine the number of trips the

development is likely to generate.

For the residential trip rate calculation, the applicant used the following parameters:

- 03 - Residential
- C- Flats Privately Owned
- 56-135 units
- Suburban Area

The proposed total person trip rates generated by the TRICS interrogation for the residential land use were summarised in the TA, as were the vehicle trip rates. The vehicle trip generation was determined to be:

- AM Peak: 17 arrivals, 62 departures for a total of 79 two-way trips
- PM Peak: 50 arrivals, 26 departures for a total of 76 two way trips

For the office trip rate calculation, the applicant used the following parameters:

- 02 - Employment
- A - Office
- 186 to 70291 sqm
- Suburban Area

The proposed total person trip rates generated by the TRICS interrogation for the office land use were summarised in the TA, as were the vehicle trip rates. The vehicle trip generation was determined to be:

- AM Peak: 26 arrivals, 4 departures for a total of 30 two-way trips
- PM Peak: 3 arrivals, 22 departures for a total of 25 two way trips

The total vehicle trip generation for the proposed development is:

- AM Peak: 43 arrivals, 66 departures for a total of 109 two-way trips
- PM Peak: 53 arrivals, 48 departures for a total of 101 two way trips

The applicant has also provided trip generation for sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport. It is considered that the majority of trips generated by the development can be accommodated within existing infrastructure.

Trip Distribution

The applicant has provided local trip distribution and assignment diagrams as part of the TA.

The methodology for trip distribution is acceptable. However, the diagrams for '2023 base +committed + proposed development' should be updated to include further committed development (explained further below).

Impact on the Highway Network

Committed Development

As part of the TA, the applicant has considered the following as committed

developments:

- Heart of Maylands (4/00676/14/MFA)
- Land at Maylands Avenue (4/03157/16/MFA)

The following committed developments should also be considered within this assessment:

- 4/00064/17/MFA
- 4/02981/17/MFA
- 4/03421/15/MFA
- 4/03252/15/MFA
- 4/03054/17/MFA

The above committed development should be considered to provide an accurate representation of the future 2023 traffic base.

Growth Rates

The applicant states that TEMPRO has been interrogated to determine the forecast growth rates for the year 2023. For growth over the period 2017 to 2023, the factors 1.0820 and 1.0824 were determined for the morning and evening peak hours respectively.

This approach is considered acceptable.

Traffic Surveys

Traffic survey data (for 2017) was obtained for:

- Maylands Avenue (ATC)
- St Albans Road (ATC)
- Maylands Avenue / Breakspear / Leaverstock / St Albans (MCC)

Junction Assessment

The applicant has undertaken a capacity assessment of the site access only. The results indicate that the operation of the junction would exceed capacity in both peak periods; however, the impact will be contained within the site, i.e. no queuing would occur onto Maylands Avenue.

However, the junction modelling results cannot be agreed until all committed development within the area has been considered.

The applicant does not include any further junction assessments. The applicant justifies this approach by stating that the permitted development for this site generated more traffic.

This approach is not acceptable as the permitted development TA which was submitted in 2008 is no longer considered to be comparable.

The proposed development is forecast to increase traffic traveling southbound on Maylands Avenue by 4%. At a minimum, a capacity assessment of the Maylands Avenue/ St Albans Road roundabout should be completed.

Highway Safety

Personal Injury Collision (PIC) data has been sourced from Hertfordshire for a period covering the past three years, encompassing the local highway network surrounding the site.

Over the study period, there were a total of 11 collisions, with nine classified as slight and two classified as serious, with no fatalities. A serious collision occurred at the site access junction and one occurred at the roundabout junction to the south. Four of the slight collisions occurred at the roundabout, one occurred at the site access, two occurred on the signalised junction with the access to the fitness centre, one collision on the junction 120 metres north of this signalised junction, one collision occurred at the junction with Duxons Turn and two collisions occurred on the junction of Wood Lane End.

It was stated in the TA that the collision at the junction involved a cyclist, which could mean that visibility is an issue at this location. Further details are required with regards to this collision. In addition to this, HCC would like the most recent five years of data to be reviewed to ascertain whether there are any trends in collision in the area that could be exacerbated by additional trips generated by the proposed development.

Highway Layout

Access

There is an existing access to Plots 2 and 3 from Maylands Avenue constructed for the hotel development on Plot 1.

The visibility splays at the access are a minimum of 2.4 metres x 43 metres and hence, comply with current guidance for a road subject to a 30-mph speed limit. However, given the proximity of the roundabout junction with Maylands Avenue / A414 Breakspear Way / St Albans Road to the site access, visibility should be demonstrated to this junction.

Delivery, Servicing and Refuse Vehicles

Swept path analysis has been carried out by the applicant showing refuse and delivery vehicles entering / exiting the site in a forward gear. Refuse vehicles are expected to represent the largest vehicles that will be accessing the site.

It appears from the swept path analysis that the servicing vehicle requires parking bays to be empty to service the site. This should be reviewed and clarification provided.

Accessibility

Public Transport

There are bus stops located on Maylands Avenue, approximately 200m north of the site. These bus stops are provided with a shelter, seats and timetable in the northerly direction but are 'flag only' for southbound journeys. Both bus stops have easy access kerbing.

These stops provide access to 5 bus services which are summarised below:

- 758 - 21 services per day
- 301 - 6 morning services and 4 evening services
- 320 - every 30 mins, reducing to every hour after 19:00
- PB2 - every 30 mins from 16:30.

Additional bus services are available along the A414 Breakspear Way, approximately 300 metres southwest of the site which are served by the same routes as well as services 300/301 which run every hour between Stevenage and Hemel Hempstead from Monday to Sunday, and the H10 service between Hemel Hempstead and Boxmoor/Leverstock Green that run hourly Monday to Saturday.

Hemel Hempstead railway station is situated approximately 6km away in the town centre, but is accessible by bus or taxi. The main terminating destinations accessible from this station include Milton Keynes, Tring and London Euston.

HCC notes that the site is adequately served by bus which provide services to Hemel Hempstead town centre, railway station, London, and surrounding areas. Traveling by bus is deemed a viable method of travel for potential future residents and office employee of the development.

Walking and Cycling

There are footways on both sides of Maylands Avenue and the signalised junction which provides access to the Aviva site includes pedestrian crossing facilities over Maylands Avenue.

Footpaths are provided on both sides of all the roads forming the four arms of the roundabout junction at Maylands Avenue / A414 Breakspear Way / St Albans Road adjacent to the site.

A footbridge is provided across the A414 on its eastern arm. This footbridge provides access to the site for pedestrians approaching from the south and east. For those approaching from the south and west, there is a signalised pelican crossing on the A414, west of the junction.

A shared cycleway/footway runs along the northwest boundary of the site. The shared cycleway/footway provides pedestrian access to Broadfield Primary School (located approximately 1.7 kilometres west of the site), The Queens Square shopping centre (located approximately 1.3 kilometres west of the site) and Adeyfield School (located approximately 1.1 kilometres west of the site).

Hemel Hempstead is serviced by the National Cycle Network with a traffic-free route entering from the north. It runs alongside Hemel Hempstead Road and the A4147 Link Road just

To the north of Maylands Avenue a National Cycle Network route runs alongside Hemel Hempstead Road and the A4147 Link Road before heading south into Hemel Hempstead.

HCC concludes that walking and cycling are viable travel options for potential future residents of the development and that the locality is conducive to both. The accessibility of the area is deemed suitable for the proposed level of development.

Parking

Residential

It is proposed that 268 car parking spaces be provided for the 268 residential units.

The mix of units proposed is as follows:

- 119 x 1 bed units;
- 128 x 2 bed units.

The Dacorum Borough Council Parking Guidance provide the following maximum standards for residential units:

- 1 bed units - 1.25 spaces per dwelling; and,
- 2 bed units - 1.5 spaces per dwelling.

Based on the above standards a maximum provision of 366 car parking spaces can be provided. The proposals include 268 car parking spaces, this is significantly 73% of the maximum standards and represents one space per dwelling. Given the accessibility of the site by sustainable transport modes, this is considered acceptable. However, it is ultimately the decision of the LPA to agree parking.

The Dacorum Borough Council Parking Guidance provide the following minimum cycle parking standards for residential units:

- 1 bed units - 1 space per dwelling;
- 2 bed units -1 spaces per dwelling.

Based on the above standards a provision of a minimum of 268 cycle parking spaces is required. The proposals include the provision of 268 cycle parking spaces, this meets the recommended standards.

Office

It is proposed that 27 car parking spaces be provided for the 1,095 sqm Office.

The Dacorum Borough Council Parking Guidance provide the following maximum car parking standards for Offices (B1):

- 1 parking space per 30 sqm.

Based on the above standards, a maximum provision of 36.5 car parking spaces is calculated. The proposals include the provision of 27 car parking spaces which is equivalent to 73% of the maximum provision. Given the accessibility of the site by sustainable transport modes, this is considered acceptable. However, it is ultimately the decision of the LPA to agree parking.

The Dacorum Borough Council Parking Guidance provide the following cycle parking standards for office units:

- 1 short stay spaces per 500sqm; and,
- 1 long stay space per ten full time staff.

Based on the above standards a provision of 14 cycle parking spaces would be

required (based on 120 staff). The proposals include the provision of 20 cycle parking spaces, going above the recommended provision.

The provision of 107 car parking spaces, equivalent to 73% of the maximum provision, is acceptable and is justified considering the site's accessibility. However, it is ultimately the decision of the Local Planning Authority to determine the suitability of parking.

Travel Plan

HCC's Travel Plan Guidance states that a full Travel Plan is required for residential developments of over 80 units. The applicant will therefore need to provide a full Travel Plan prior to occupation of the site. This Travel Plan is actually an Interim Travel Plan rather than a Framework Travel Plan as suggested as it only covers the residential element of the site. The Travel Plan requires more information and development in certain areas. HCC require interim mode shift targets set as an indication of commitment to significant mode shift away from single occupancy car use. These can be amended after the initial survey is undertaken and actual data is known. HCC also require annual review of the plan and there is a lack of clarity over this. Whilst the package of measures proposed is satisfactory, given the size of development it would be appropriate for a wider range of measures to be available in order to promote the use of sustainable modes.

Travel Plan Management

Details have been given of an interim Plan Co-Ordinator. Details of the actual Co-Ordinator is to be provided on appointment, along with those of a secondary contact in the event of any personnel changes. Information regarding the approximate time allocated to the role and frequency on site will also need to be provided.

Package of Measures

The measures suggested are satisfactory but measures to encourage walking are limited. The Travel Plan should include information on safe walking routes to key destinations, local walking groups/buddy scheme, equipment providers. Similarly, information could be provided on local cycle groups and equipment providers with possible investigation of discounts at local cycle shops. The Intalink website should be promoted as this is the main source of public transport information, specifically for Hertfordshire - <https://www.intalink.org.uk/>.

With regards to residential travel pack contributions, please refer to Appendix E of our guidance (www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/travelplans) for suggested amounts that can be used towards vouchers for residents to encourage use of sustainable modes.

Targets, Monitoring and Action Plan

No interim mode shift targets have been provided, paragraph 7.2.3 suggests these will be provided after surveys have been done. HCC require interim mode shift targets as an indication of commitment to challenging but achievable mode shift away from private car use. These targets can be amended once actual baseline data is known.

The Travel Plan review frequency is suggested as every other year in paragraph 4.3.2, whereas Table 7b p22 appears to suggest annual review. Given the size of

development, annual review of the plan after each survey would be appropriate.

It should also be noted that an evaluation and support fee will be sought for the plan and will be secured through S106 Agreement.

Construction

A Construction Traffic Management Plan would be required to ensure construction vehicles would not have a detrimental impact on the vicinity of the site and a condition would be required to provide adequate parking for demolition and construction vehicles on-site to prevent on-street conflict and impacts to the highway safety. A Construction Traffic Management Plan would be required for all phases of the construction, including demolition, excavation and construction of all elements of the building.
Planning Obligations / Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Dacorum Borough Council has adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and therefore contributions towards local transport schemes would be sought via CIL if appropriate.

Summary

HCC as highway authority has reviewed the application submission and wish to object to the proposed development as there is insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the local highway network. HCC do not agree with the applicant's approach of comparing the impact of the development with the permitted development from 2010 as it is out of date and the character of the highway within the vicinity of the site has changed. Further to this, it has not been justified that the planning permission from 2010 is live or has expired. Additional assessment is required to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a severe impact on the operation of the highway near the site.

Amended Comments

Amended Comments

Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) as highway authority wish to object to the proposed development at Plots 2 and 3 Kier Park due to the following information required for consideration:

- The refuse vehicle in the drawings is shown to conflict with the central island. HCC would like confirmation that the central island will be designed with over-run areas to accommodate the refuse tracking. If not, the island will need to be redesigned to accommodate the safe manoeuvring of the refuse vehicle.

However, if the Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) as the Local Planning Authority (LPA) wishes to permit the development, HCC would request the following conditions:

Condition 1: Construction Management Plan / Statement

No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan (or Construction Method Statement) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be

carried out in accordance with the approved Plan. The Construction Management Plan / Statement shall include details of*:

- a. Construction vehicle numbers, type, routing;
- b. Access arrangements to the site;
- c. Traffic management requirements
- d. Construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking, loading / unloading and turning areas);
- e. Siting and details of wheel washing facilities;
- f. Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway;
- g. Timing of construction activities (including delivery times and removal of waste) and to avoid school pick up/drop off times;
- h. Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities;
- i. Post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and temporary access to the public highway;
- j. where works cannot be contained wholly within the site a plan should be submitted showing the site layout on the highway including extent of hoarding, pedestrian routes and remaining road width for vehicle movements.

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way in accordance with Policies 5, 12, 17 and 22 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

Condition 2: Servicing and Delivery Plan

Prior to commencement of the development, the applicant shall submit a Servicing and Delivery Plan to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Servicing and Delivery Plan shall contain the delivery and servicing requirements (including refuse collection) for the proposed uses, a scheme for coordinating deliveries and servicing for the proposed development, areas within the development site that would be used for loading and manoeuvring of delivery and servicing vehicles, and access to / from the site for delivery and servicing vehicles.

Reason: In the interests of maintaining highway efficiency and safety.

Condition 3: Car Parking Management Plan

Prior to first occupation of the development, a Car Parking Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. It shall include the information

prescribed in the TA and the following:

- Details of car parking allocation and distribution;
- Methods to minimise on-street car parking;

- A scheme for the provision and parking of cycles; and,
- Monitoring required of the Car Parking Management Plan to be submitted to and approved in

in accordance with a timeframe to be agreed by the local planning authority.

The Car Parking Management Plan shall be fully implemented before the development is first

occupied or brought into use, in accordance with a timeframe agreed by the Local Planning Authority

and thereafter retained for this purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure sufficient available on-site car parking

the provision of adequate cycle parking that meets the needs of occupiers of the proposed

development and in the interests of encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport.

Condition 4: Travel Plan - Requested Prior to Use

At least 3 months prior to the first occupation / use of the approved development a detailed Travel Plan for the site, based upon the Hertfordshire Council document 'Hertfordshire's Travel Plan Guidance', shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented at all times.

Reason: To ensure that sustainable travel options associated with the development are promoted and maximised to be in accordance with Policies 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

S106 Agreement

A Travel Plan Statement for the residential and commercial developments, consisting of a written agreement with the County Council setting out a scheme to encourage, regulate, and promote green travel measures for owners, occupiers, and visitors to the Development in accordance with the provisions of the County Council's 'Travel Plan Guidance for Business and Residential Development', which is subject to a sum of £2,000 towards the County Council's costs of administering and monitoring the objectives of the Travel Plan Statement and engaging in any Travel Plan Statement Review.

Hertfordshire County Council would seek for S106 developer contributions for the installation of display screens (£8,000 per screen) at the southbound and northbound bus stop, and a shelter at the southbound bus stop (£10,000). A total of £26,000 for the bus stop improvements.

HIGHWAY INFORMATIVES:

HCC recommend inclusion of the following Advisory Notes (ANs) to ensure that any

works as part of this development are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highways Act 1980 and other relevant processes.

AN1) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 123 4047.

AN2) Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 123 4047.

AN3) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 123 4047.

AN4) Construction standards for works within the highway: All works to be undertaken on the adjoining highway shall be constructed to the satisfaction and specification of the Highway Authority, by an approved contractor, and in accordance with Hertfordshire County Council's publication "Roads in Hertfordshire - Highway Design Guide (2011)". Before works commence the applicant would need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 123 4047.

Description of the Proposal

The proposal consists of the erection of 268 flats and 1,095 sqm of commercial floorspace split across six blocks with associated car parking, landscaping and amenity space at Plots 2 and 3 Kier Park, Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead.

History

Plots 2 and 3 have previously had permission granted for 6,455sqm of office space with 152 car parking spaces (reference 04/02124/08/MOA). The permission was

granted in 2010.

The applicant is required to clarify when the permission was granted in 2010 and whether it is extant or has since expired.

Site Description

The site comprises circa 1 hectare of vacant brownfield land. The site is located on the corner of St Albans Road and Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead.

Analysis

A Design and Access Statement (DAS) is required for all planning applications that have an impact on the highway, as outlined in Roads in Hertfordshire: Design Guide (3rd Edition), this has been provided by the applicant.

A Transport Assessment is required for a development of this scale, in line with the guidance set out in Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide (3rd Edition). A Transport Assessment has been provided as part of the application package.

Policy Review

The applicant has provided a review of relevant national and local policy, including:

- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG);
- Hertfordshire County Council Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) 2011-2031;
- HCC Transport Vision & Emerging LTP4 (2014 & 2015);
- Hemel Hempstead Urban Transport Plan 2009;
- Maylands Gateway Development Brief (May 2013)
- Dacorum Borough Council Adopted Core Strategy 2006-2031 (Sept 2013)
- Dacorum Borough Council Local Plan 1991-2011

Trip Generation

A trip generation profile for the proposed development (residential and office) has been provided. The applicant has also provided a comparison of the proposed and permitted development trips.

Proposed Development

The applicant used the TRICS database to determine the number of trips the development is likely to generate.

For the residential trip rate calculation, the applicant used the following parameters:

- 03 - Residential
- C- Flats Privately Owned
- 56-135 units
- Suburban Area

The proposed total person trip rates generated by the TRICS interrogation for the residential land use were summarised in the TA, as were the vehicle trip rates. The vehicle trip generation was determined to be:

- AM Peak: 17 arrivals, 62 departures for a total of 79 two-way trips
- PM Peak: 50 arrivals, 26 departures for a total of 76 two way trips

For the office trip rate calculation, the applicant used the following parameters:

- 02 - Employment
- A - Office
- 186 to 70291 sqm
- Suburban Area

The proposed total person trip rates generated by the TRICS interrogation for the office land use were summarised in the TA, as were the vehicle trip rates. The vehicle trip generation was determined to be:

- AM Peak: 26 arrivals, 4 departures for a total of 30 two-way trips
- PM Peak: 3 arrivals, 22 departures for a total of 25 two way trips

The total vehicle trip generation for the proposed development is:

- AM Peak: 43 arrivals, 66 departures for a total of 109 two-way trips
- PM Peak: 53 arrivals, 48 departures for a total of 101 two way trips

The applicant has also provided trip generation for sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport. It is considered that the majority of trips generated by the development can be accommodated within existing infrastructure.

Trip Distribution

The applicant has provided local trip distribution and assignment diagrams as part of the TA.

The methodology for trip distribution is acceptable.

Impact on the Highway Network

Committed Development

As part of the TA, the applicant has considered the following as committed developments:

- Heart of Maylands (4/00676/14/MFA)
- Land at Maylands Avenue (4/03157/16/MFA)
- Maylands Gateway (4/00064/17/MFA)
- KFC and Hotel (4/02981/17/MFA)
- Diamond Point (4/03421/15/MFA)

- Wood House, Maylands Avenue (4/03252/15/MFA)
- Spring Park (4/03054/17/MFA)

Trips from Heart of Maylands, Land at Maylands Avenue, and Maylands Gateway have been taken into consideration. This methodology is acceptable.

Growth Rates

The applicant states that TEMPRO has been interrogated to determine the forecast growth rates for the year 2023. For growth over the period 2017 to 2023, the factors 1.0820 and 1.0824 were determined for the morning and evening peak hours respectively.

This approach is considered acceptable.

Traffic Surveys

Traffic survey data (for 2017) was obtained for:

- Maylands Avenue (ATC)
- St Albans Road (ATC)
- Maylands Avenue / Breakspear / Leaverstock / St Albans (MCC)

Junction Assessment

The applicant has undertaken a capacity assessment of the site access only. The results indicate that the operation of the junction would exceed capacity in both peak periods; however, the impact will be contained within the site, i.e. no queuing would occur onto Maylands Avenue.

The applicant does not include any further junction assessments. The applicant justifies this approach by stating that the permitted development for this site generated more traffic. This approach is acceptable.

Highway Safety

Personal Injury Collision (PIC) data has been sourced from Hertfordshire for a period covering the past five years, encompassing the local highway network surrounding the site.

Over the study period, there were a total of 17 collisions, with thirteen classified as slight and four classified as serious, with no fatalities. Three of the serious collisions occurred on Maylands Avenue (one at the site access) and one occurred at the roundabout junction to the south. Five of the slight collisions occurred at the roundabout. The remaining slight collisions occurred on Maylands Avenue, three of which occurred at the signalised junction with the access to the fitness centre, and three collisions occurred on the junction of Wood Lane End.

It was stated in the TA that the collision at the junction involved a cyclist, which could mean that visibility is an issue at this location. Further details are required with regards to this collision. In addition to this, HCC would like the most recent five years of data to be reviewed to ascertain whether there are any trends in collision in the area that could be exacerbated by additional trips generated by the proposed development.

Highway Layout

Access

There is an existing access to Plots 2 and 3 from Maylands Avenue constructed for the hotel development on Plot 1.

The visibility splays at the access are a minimum of 2.4 metres x 43 metres and hence, comply with current guidance for a road subject to a 30-mph speed limit. The drawings show that visibility up to the Maylands Avenue / A414 Breakspear Way / St Albans Road roundabout is possible.

Delivery, Servicing and Refuse Vehicles

Swept path analysis has been carried out by the applicant showing refuse and delivery vehicles entering / exiting the site in a forward gear. Refuse vehicles are expected to represent the largest vehicles that will be accessing the site.

The refuse vehicle in the drawings is shown to conflict with the central island. HCC would like confirmation that the central island will be designed with over-run areas to accommodate the refuse tracking. If not, the island will need to be redesigned to accommodate the safe manoeuvring of the refuse vehicle.

Accessibility

Public Transport

There are bus stops located on Maylands Avenue, approximately 200m north of the site. These bus stops are provided with a shelter, seats and timetable in the northerly direction but are 'flag only' for southbound journeys. Both bus stops have easy access kerbing. Neither bus stop has a display screen.

These stops provide access to 5 bus services which are summarised below:

- 758 - 21 services per day
- 301 - 6 morning services and 4 evening services
- 320 - every 30 mins, reducing to every hour after 19:00
- PB2 - every 30 mins from 16:30.

Additional bus services are available along the A414 Breakspear Way, approximately 300 metres southwest of the site which are served by the same routes as well as services 300/301 which run every hour between Stevenage and Hemel Hempstead from Monday to Sunday, and the H10 service between Hemel Hempstead and Boxmoor/Leverstock Green that run hourly Monday to Saturday.

Hemel Hempstead railway station is situated approximately 6km away in the town centre, but is accessible by bus or taxi. The main terminating destinations accessible from this station include Milton Keynes, Tring and London Euston.

HCC notes that the site is adequately served by bus which provide services to Hemel Hempstead town centre, railway station, London, and surrounding areas. Traveling by bus is deemed a viable method of travel for potential future residents and office employee of the development.

Walking and Cycling

There are footways on both sides of Maylands Avenue and the signalised junction which provides access to the Aviva site includes pedestrian crossing facilities over Maylands Avenue.

Footpaths are provided on both sides of all the roads forming the four arms of the roundabout junction at Maylands Avenue / A414 Breakspear Way / St Albans Road adjacent to the site.

A footbridge is provided across the A414 on its eastern arm. This footbridge provides access to the site for pedestrians approaching from the south and east. For those approaching from the south and west, there is a signalised pelican crossing on the A414, west of the junction.

A shared cycleway/footway runs along the northwest boundary of the site. The shared cycleway/footway provides pedestrian access to Broadfield Primary School (located approximately 1.7 kilometres west of the site), The Queens Square shopping centre (located approximately 1.3 kilometres west of the site) and Adeyfield School (located approximately 1.1 kilometres west of the site).

Hemel Hempstead is serviced by the National Cycle Network with a traffic-free route entering from the north. It runs alongside Hemel Hempstead Road and the A4147 Link Road just

To the north of Maylands Avenue, a National Cycle Network route runs alongside Hemel Hempstead Road and the A4147 Link Road before heading south into Hemel Hempstead.

HCC concludes that walking and cycling are viable travel options for potential future residents of the development and that the locality is conducive to both. The accessibility of the area is deemed suitable for the proposed level of development.

Parking

Residential

It is proposed that 268 car parking spaces be provided for the 268 residential units.

The mix of units proposed is as follows:

- 119 x 1 bed units;
- 128 x 2 bed units.

The Dacorum Borough Council Parking Guidance provide the following maximum standards for residential units:

- 1 bed units - 1.25 spaces per dwelling; and,
- 2 bed units - 1.5 spaces per dwelling.

Based on the above standards a maximum provision of 366 car parking spaces can be provided. The proposals include 268 car parking spaces, this is significantly 73% of the maximum standards and represents one space per dwelling. Given the accessibility of the site by sustainable transport modes, this is considered acceptable. However, it is

ultimately the decision of the LPA to agree parking.

The Dacorum Borough Council Parking Guidance provide the following minimum cycle parking standards for residential units:

- 1 bed units - 1 space per dwelling;
- 2 bed units -1 spaces per dwelling.

Based on the above standards a provision of a minimum of 268 cycle parking spaces is required. The proposals include the provision of 268 cycle parking spaces, this meets the recommended standards.

Office

It is proposed that 27 car parking spaces be provided for the 1,095 sqm Office.

The Dacorum Borough Council Parking Guidance provide the following maximum car parking standards for Offices (B1):

- 1 parking space per 30 sqm.

Based on the above standards, a maximum provision of 36.5 car parking spaces is calculated. The proposals include the provision of 27 car parking spaces which is equivalent to 73% of the maximum provision. Given the accessibility of the site by sustainable transport modes, this is considered acceptable. However, it is ultimately the decision of the LPA to agree parking.

The Dacorum Borough Council Parking Guidance provide the following cycle parking standards for office units:

- 1 short stay spaces per 500sqm; and,
- 1 long stay space per ten full time staff.

Based on the above standards a provision of 14 cycle parking spaces would be required (based on 120 staff). The proposals include the provision of 20 cycle parking spaces, going above the recommended provision.

The provision of 107 car parking spaces, equivalent to 73% of the maximum provision, is acceptable and is justified considering the site's accessibility. However, it is ultimately the decision of the Local Planning Authority to determine the suitability of parking.

Travel Plan

HCC's Travel Plan Guidance states that a full Travel Plan is required for residential developments of over 80 units. The applicant will therefore need to provide a full Travel Plan prior to occupation of the site. This Travel Plan is actually an Interim Travel Plan rather than a Framework Travel Plan as suggested as it only covers the residential element of the site. The Travel Plan requires more information and development in certain areas. HCC require interim mode shift targets set as an indication of commitment to significant mode shift away from single occupancy car use. These can be amended after the initial survey is undertaken and actual data is known. HCC also require annual review of the plan and there is a lack of clarity over this. Whilst the

package of measures proposed is satisfactory, given the size of development it would be appropriate for a wider range of measures to be available in order to promote the use of sustainable modes.

Travel Plan Management

Details have been given of an interim Plan Co-Ordinator. Details of the actual Co-Ordinator is to be provided on appointment, along with those of a secondary contact in the event of any personnel changes. Information regarding the approximate time allocated to the role and frequency on site will also need to be provided.

Package of Measures

The measures suggested are satisfactory but measures to encourage walking are limited. The Travel Plan should include information on safe walking routes to key destinations, local walking groups/buddy scheme, equipment providers. Similarly, information could be provided on local cycle groups and equipment providers with possible investigation of discounts at local cycle shops. The Intalink website should be promoted as this is the main source of public transport information, specifically for Hertfordshire - <https://www.intalink.org.uk/>.

With regards to residential travel pack contributions, please refer to Appendix E of our guidance (www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/travelplans) for suggested amounts that can be used towards vouchers for residents to encourage use of sustainable modes.

Targets, Monitoring and Action Plan

No interim mode shift targets have been provided, paragraph 7.2.3 suggests these will be provided after surveys have been done. HCC require interim mode shift targets as an indication of commitment to challenging but achievable mode shift away from private car use. These targets can be amended once actual baseline data is known.

The Travel Plan review frequency is suggested as every other year in paragraph 4.3.2, whereas Table 7b p22 appears to suggest annual review. Given the size of development, annual review of the plan after each survey would be appropriate.

It should also be noted that an evaluation and support fee will be sought for the plan and will be secured through S106 Agreement.

Construction Traffic Management Plan

A Construction Traffic Management Plan would be required to ensure construction vehicles would not have a detrimental impact on the vicinity of the site and a condition would be required to provide adequate parking for demolition and construction vehicles on-site to prevent on-street conflict and impacts to the highway safety. A Construction Traffic Management Plan would be required for all phases of the construction, including demolition, excavation and construction of all elements of the building.

Servicing and Delivery Plan

A Servicing and Delivery Plan would be required to outline the delivery and servicing arrangements for the proposed development. The plan should include a scheme for coordinating deliveries and servicing for the proposed development, identification of areas within the development site that would be used for loading and manoeuvring of

delivery and servicing vehicles, and a description of the access to / from the site for delivery and servicing vehicles.

Planning Obligations / Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Dacorum Borough Council has adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and therefore contributions towards local transport schemes would be sought via CIL if appropriate.

Hertfordshire County Council would seek for S106 developer contributions for the installation of display screens (£8,000 per screen) at the southbound and northbound bus stop, and a shelter at the southbound bus stop (£10,000). A total of £26,000 for the bus stop improvements.

Hertfordshire County Council would also seek S106 developer contributions for Travel Planning monitoring.

Summary

HCC as highway authority has reviewed the application submission and wish to object to the proposed development as there is insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the local highway network.

Amended Comments

Proposal Construction of 268 flats and 1095 sqm of office space split across six blocks, with associated car parking, landscaping and amenity space.

Amendment Additional information received by applicant. Construction of 268 flats and 1405 sqm of office space split across six blocks, with associated car parking, landscaping and amenity space.

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

Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) as highway authority has no objection to the proposed development, subject to conditions.

Condition 1: Construction Management Plan / Statement

No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan (or Construction Method Statement) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan. The Construction Management Plan / Statement shall include details of*:

- a. Construction vehicle numbers, type, routing;
- b. Access arrangements to the site;
- c. Traffic management requirements
- d. Construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking, loading / unloading and turning areas);
- e. Siting and details of wheel washing facilities;
- f. Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway;
- g. Timing of construction activities (including delivery times and removal of waste) and to avoid school pick up/drop off times;
- h. Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities;
- i. Post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and temporary access to the public highway;
- j. where works cannot be contained wholly within the site a plan should be submitted showing the site layout on the highway including extent of hoarding, pedestrian routes and remaining road width for vehicle movements.

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way in accordance with Policies 5, 12, 17 and 22 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

Condition 2: Servicing and Delivery Plan

Prior to commencement of the development, the applicant shall submit a Servicing and Delivery Plan to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Servicing and Delivery Plan shall contain the delivery and servicing requirements (including refuse collection) for the proposed uses, a scheme for coordinating deliveries and servicing for the proposed development, areas within the development site that would be used for loading and manoeuvring of delivery and servicing vehicles, and access to / from the site for delivery and servicing vehicles.

Reason: In the interests of maintaining highway efficiency and safety.

Condition 3: Car Parking Management Plan

Prior to first occupation of the development, a Car Parking Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. It shall include the information

prescribed in the TA and the following:

- Details of car parking allocation and distribution;
- Methods to minimise on-street car parking;
- A scheme for the provision and parking of cycles; and,
- Monitoring required of the Car Parking Management Plan to be submitted to and approved in

in accordance with a timeframe to be agreed by the local planning authority.

The Car Parking Management Plan shall be fully implemented before the development is first

occupied or brought into use, in accordance with a timeframe agreed by the Local Planning Authority

and thereafter retained for this purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure sufficient available on-site car parking

the provision of adequate cycle parking that meets the needs of occupiers of the proposed

development and in the interests of encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport.

Condition 4: Residential Travel Plan - Requested Prior to Use

At least 3 months prior to the first occupation / use of the approved development a

detailed Residential Travel Plan for the site, based upon the Hertfordshire Council document 'Hertfordshire's

Travel Plan Guidance', shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented at all times.
Reason: To ensure that sustainable travel options associated with the development are promoted and maximised to be in accordance with Policies 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

Condition 5: Business Travel Plan Statement- Requested Prior to Use

At least 3 months prior to the first occupation / use of the approved development a detailed Business Travel Plan Statement for the site, based upon the Hertfordshire Council document 'Hertfordshire's Travel Plan Guidance', shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Travel Plan Statement shall be implemented at all times.

Reason: To ensure that sustainable travel options associated with the development are promoted and maximised to be in accordance with Policies 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

S106 Agreement

A Travel Plan for the residential and commercial developments, consisting of a written agreement with the County Council setting out a scheme to encourage, regulate, and promote green travel measures for owners, occupiers, and visitors to the Development in accordance with the provisions of the County Council's 'Travel Plan Guidance for Business and Residential Development', which is subject to a sum of £6,000 towards the County Council's costs of administrating and monitoring the objectives of the Residential Travel Plan and engaging in any Residential Travel Plan Review. As the business element of the scheme requires a Travel Plan Statement, monitoring fees are not required.

Hertfordshire County Council would seek for S106 developer contributions for the installation of display screens (£8,000 per screen) at the southbound and northbound bus stop, and a shelter at the southbound bus stop (£10,000). A total of £26,000 for the bus stop improvements.

HIGHWAY INFORMATIVES:

HCC recommend inclusion of the following Advisory Notes (ANs) to ensure that any works as part of this development are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highways Act 1980 and other relevant processes.

AN1) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 123 4047.

AN2) Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 123 4047.

AN3) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the

party responsible. Therefore, best practical

means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 123 4047.

AN4) Construction standards for works within the highway: All works to be undertaken on the adjoining highway shall be constructed to the satisfaction and specification of the Highway Authority, by an approved contractor, and in accordance with Hertfordshire County Council's publication "Roads in Hertfordshire - Highway Design Guide (2011)". Before works commence the applicant would need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 123 4047.

Description of the Proposal

The applicant has submitted an amended proposal which would comprise the erection of 268 flats and 1,405 sqm of commercial floorspace, rather than 1095 sqm of floor space, split across six blocks with associated car parking, landscaping and amenity space at Plots 2 and 3 Kier Park, Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead.

History

Plots 2 and 3 have previously had permission granted for 6,455sqm of office space with 152 car parking spaces (reference 04/02124/08/MOA). The permission was granted in 2010.

The applicant is required to clarify when the permission was granted in 2010 and whether it is extant or has since expired.

Site Description

The site comprises circa 1 hectare of vacant brownfield land. The site is located on the corner of St Albans Road and Maylands Avenue, Hemel Hempstead.

Analysis

A Design and Access Statement (DAS) is required for all planning applications that have an impact on the highway, as outlined in Roads in Hertfordshire: Design Guide (3rd Edition), this has been provided by the applicant.

A Transport Assessment is required for a development of this scale, in line with the guidance set out in Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide (3rd Edition). A Transport Assessment has been provided as part of the application package.

Policy Review

The applicant has provided a review of relevant national and local policy, including:

- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG);
- Hertfordshire County Council Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) 2011-2031;
- HCC Transport Vision & Emerging LTP4 (2014 & 2015);
- Hemel Hempstead Urban Transport Plan 2009;
- Maylands Gateway Development Brief (May 2013)
- Dacorum Borough Council Adopted Core Strategy 2006-2031 (Sept 2013)
- Dacorum Borough Council Local Plan 1991-2011

Trip Generation

A trip generation profile for the proposed development (residential and office) has been provided. The applicant has also provided a comparison of the proposed and permitted development trips.

Proposed Development

The applicant used the TRICS database to determine the number of trips the development is likely to generate.

For the residential trip rate calculation, the applicant used the following parameters:

- 03 - Residential
- C- Flats Privately Owned
- 56-135 units
- Suburban Area

The proposed total person trip rates generated by the TRICS interrogation for the residential land use were summarised in the TA, as were the vehicle trip rates. The vehicle trip generation was determined to be:

- AM Peak: 17 arrivals, 62 departures for a total of 79 two-way trips
- PM Peak: 50 arrivals, 26 departures for a total of 76 two way trips

For the office trip rate calculation, the applicant used the following parameters:

- 02 - Employment
- A - Office
- 186 to 70291 sqm
- Suburban Area

The proposed total person trip rates generated by the TRICS interrogation for the office land use were summarised in the TA, as were the vehicle trip rates. The vehicle trip generation was determined to be:

- AM Peak: 33 arrivals, 5 departures for a total of 38 two-way trips
- PM Peak: 4 arrivals, 29 departures for a total of 34 two way trips

The total vehicle trip generation for the proposed development is:

- AM Peak: 50 arrivals, 67 departures for a total of 117 two-way trips
- PM Peak: 54 arrivals, 55 departures for a total of 109 two way trips

The applicant has also provided trip generation for sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport. It is considered that the majority of trips generated by the development can be accommodated within existing infrastructure.

Trip Distribution

The applicant has provided local trip distribution and assignment diagrams as part of the TA.

The methodology for trip distribution is acceptable.

Impact on the Highway Network

Committed Development

As part of the TA, the applicant has considered the following as committed developments:

- Heart of Maylands (4/00676/14/MFA)
- Land at Maylands Avenue (4/03157/16/MFA)
- Maylands Gateway (4/00064/17/MFA)
- KFC and Hotel (4/02981/17/MFA)
- Diamond Point (4/03421/15/MFA)
- Wood House, Maylands Avenue (4/03252/15/MFA)
- Spring Park (4/03054/17/MFA)

Trips from Heart of Maylands, Land at Maylands Avenue, and Maylands Gateway have been taken into consideration. This methodology is acceptable.

Growth Rates

The applicant states that TEMPRO has been interrogated to determine the forecast growth rates for the year 2023. For growth over the period 2017 to 2023, the factors 1.0820 and 1.0824 were determined for the morning and evening peak hours respectively.

This approach is considered acceptable.

Traffic Surveys

Traffic survey data (for 2017) was obtained for:

- Maylands Avenue (ATC)
- St Albans Road (ATC)
- Maylands Avenue / Breakspear / Leaverstock / St Albans (MCC)

Junction Assessment

The applicant has undertaken a capacity assessment of the site access only. The results indicate that the operation of the junction would exceed capacity in both peak periods; however, the impact will be contained within the site, i.e. no queuing would occur onto Maylands Avenue.

The applicant does not include any further junction assessments. The applicant justifies this approach by stating that the permitted development for this site generated more traffic. This approach is acceptable.

Highway Safety

Personal Injury Collision (PIC) data has been sourced from Hertfordshire for a period covering the past five years, encompassing the local highway network surrounding the site.

Over the study period, there were a total of 17 collisions, with thirteen classified as slight and four classified as serious, with no fatalities. Three of the serious collisions occurred on Maylands Avenue (one at the site access) and one occurred at the roundabout junction to the south. Five of the slight collisions occurred at the roundabout. The remaining slight collisions occurred on Maylands Avenue, three of which occurred at the signalised junction with the access to the fitness centre, and three collisions occurred on the junction of Wood Lane End.

It was stated in the TA that the collision at the junction involved a cyclist, which could mean that visibility is an issue at this location. Further details are required with regards to this collision. In addition to this, HCC would like the most recent five years of data to be reviewed to ascertain whether there are any trends in collision in the area that could be exacerbated by additional trips generated by the proposed development.

Highway Layout

Access

There is an existing access to Plots 2 and 3 from Maylands Avenue constructed for the hotel development on Plot 1.

The visibility splays at the access are a minimum of 2.4 metres x 43 metres and hence, comply with current guidance for a road subject to a 30-mph speed limit. The drawings show that visibility up to the Maylands Avenue / A414 Breakspear Way / St Albans Road roundabout is possible.

Delivery, Servicing and Refuse Vehicles

Swept path analysis has been carried out by the applicant showing refuse and delivery vehicles entering / exiting the site in a forward gear. Refuse vehicles are expected to represent the largest vehicles that will be accessing the site.

The refuse vehicle in the drawings is shown to conflict with the central island. HCC would like confirmation that the central island will be designed with over-run areas to accommodate the refuse tracking. If not, the island will need to be redesigned to accommodate the safe manoeuvring of the refuse vehicle.

Accessibility

Public Transport

There are bus stops located on Maylands Avenue, approximately 200m north of the site. These bus stops are provided with a shelter, seats and timetable in the northerly direction but are 'flag only' for southbound journeys. Both bus stops have easy access kerbing. Neither bus stop has a display screen.

These stops provide access to 5 bus services which are summarised below:

- 758 - 21 services per day
- 301 - 6 morning services and 4 evening services
- 320 - every 30 mins, reducing to every hour after 19:00
- PB2 - every 30 mins from 16:30.

Additional bus services are available along the A414 Breakspear Way, approximately 300 metres southwest of the site which are served by the same routes as well as services 300/301 which run every hour between Stevenage and Hemel Hempstead from Monday to Sunday, and the H10 service between Hemel Hempstead and Boxmoor/Leverstock Green that run hourly Monday to Saturday.

Hemel Hempstead railway station is situated approximately 6km away in the town centre, but is accessible by bus or taxi. The main terminating destinations accessible from this station include Milton Keynes, Tring and London Euston.

HCC notes that the site is adequately served by bus which provide services to Hemel Hempstead town centre, railway station, London, and surrounding areas. Traveling by bus is deemed a viable method of travel for potential future residents and office employee of the development.

Walking and Cycling

There are footways on both sides of Maylands Avenue and the signalised junction which provides access to the Aviva site includes pedestrian crossing facilities over Maylands Avenue.

Footpaths are provided on both sides of all the roads forming the four arms of the roundabout junction at Maylands Avenue / A414 Breakspear Way / St Albans Road adjacent to the site.

A footbridge is provided across the A414 on its eastern arm. This footbridge provides access to the site for pedestrians approaching from the south and east. For those approaching from the south and west, there is a signalised pelican crossing on the A414, west of the junction.

A shared cycleway/footway runs along the northwest boundary of the site. The shared cycleway/footway provides pedestrian access to Broadfield Primary School (located approximately 1.7 kilometres west of the site), The Queens Square shopping centre (located approximately 1.3 kilometres west of the site) and Adeyfield School (located approximately 1.1 kilometres west of the site).

Hemel Hempstead is serviced by the National Cycle Network with a traffic-free route entering from the north. It runs alongside Hemel Hempstead Road and the A4147 Link Road just

To the north of Maylands Avenue, a National Cycle Network route runs alongside Hemel Hempstead Road and the A4147 Link Road before heading south into Hemel Hempstead.

HCC concludes that walking and cycling are viable travel options for potential future residents of the development and that the locality is conducive to both. The accessibility of the area is deemed suitable for the proposed level of development.

Parking

Residential

It is proposed that 268 car parking spaces be provided for the 268 residential units.

The mix of units proposed is as follows:

- 119 x 1 bed units;
- 128 x 2 bed units.

The Dacorum Borough Council Parking Guidance provide the following maximum standards for residential units:

- 1 bed units - 1.25 spaces per dwelling; and,
- 2 bed units - 1.5 spaces per dwelling.

Based on the above standards a maximum provision of 366 car parking spaces can be provided. The proposals include 268 car parking spaces, this is 73% of the maximum standards and represents one space per dwelling. Given the accessibility of the site by sustainable transport modes, this is considered acceptable. However, it is ultimately the decision of the LPA to agree parking.

The Dacorum Borough Council Parking Guidance provide the following minimum cycle parking standards for residential units:

- 1 bed units - 1 space per dwelling;
- 2 bed units -1 spaces per dwelling.

Based on the above standards a provision of a minimum of 268 cycle parking spaces is required. The proposals include the provision of 268 cycle parking spaces, this meets the recommended standards.

Office

It is proposed that 65 car parking spaces be provided for the 1,405 sqm Office.

The Dacorum Borough Council Parking Guidance provide the following maximum car parking standards for Offices (B1):

- 1 parking space per 30 sqm.

Based on the above standards, a maximum provision of 47 car parking spaces is calculated. The proposals include the provision of 65 car parking spaces which is equivalent to 138% of the maximum provision. Given the accessibility of the site by sustainable transport modes, this is considered unacceptable. However, it is ultimately the decision of the LPA to agree parking.

The Dacorum Borough Council Parking Guidance provide the following cycle parking standards for office units:

- 1 short stay spaces per 500sqm; and,
- 1 long stay space per ten full time staff.

Based on the above standards a provision of 14 cycle parking spaces would be required (based on 120 staff). The proposals include the provision of 20 cycle parking spaces, going above the recommended provision.

Travel Plan

HCC's Travel Plan Guidance states that a full Travel Plan is required for residential developments of over 80 units. The applicant will therefore need to provide a full Travel Plan prior to occupation of the site. This Travel Plan is actually an Interim Travel Plan rather than a Framework Travel Plan as suggested as it only covers the residential element of the site. The Travel Plan requires more information and development in certain areas. HCC require interim mode shift targets set as an indication of commitment to significant mode shift away from single occupancy car use. These can be amended after the initial survey is undertaken and actual data is known. HCC also require annual review of the plan and there is a lack of clarity over this. Whilst the package of measures proposed is satisfactory, given the size of development it would be appropriate for a wider range of measures to be available in order to promote the use of sustainable modes.

Travel Plan Management

Details have been given of an interim Plan Co-Ordinator. Details of the actual Co-Ordinator is to be provided on appointment, along with those of a secondary contact in the event of any personnel changes. Information regarding the approximate time allocated to the role and frequency on site will also need to be provided.

Package of Measures

The measures suggested are satisfactory but measures to encourage walking are limited. The Travel Plan should include information on safe walking routes to key destinations, local walking groups/buddy scheme, equipment providers. Similarly, information could be provided on local cycle groups and equipment providers with possible investigation of discounts at local cycle shops. The Intalink website should be promoted as this is the main source of public transport information, specifically for Hertfordshire - <https://www.intalink.org.uk/>.

With regards to residential travel pack contributions, please refer to Appendix E of our guidance (www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/travelplans) for suggested amounts that can be used towards vouchers for residents to encourage use of sustainable modes.

Targets, Monitoring and Action Plan

No interim mode shift targets have been provided, paragraph 7.2.3 suggests these will be provided after surveys have been done. HCC require interim mode shift targets as an indication of commitment to challenging but achievable mode shift away from private car use. These targets can be amended once actual baseline data is known. The Travel Plan review frequency is suggested as every other year in paragraph 4.3.2, whereas Table 7b p22 appears to suggest annual review. Given the size of development, annual review of the plan after each survey would be appropriate. It should also be noted that an evaluation and support fee will be sought for the plan and will be secured through S106 Agreement.

Construction Traffic Management Plan

A Construction Traffic Management Plan would be required to ensure construction vehicles would not have a detrimental impact on the vicinity of the site and a condition would be required to provide adequate parking for demolition and construction vehicles on-site to prevent on-street conflict and impacts to the highway safety. A Construction Traffic Management Plan would be required for all phases of the construction, including demolition, excavation and construction of all elements of the building.

Servicing and Delivery Plan

A Servicing and Delivery Plan would be required to outline the delivery and servicing arrangements for the proposed development. The plan should include a scheme for coordinating deliveries and servicing for the proposed development, identification of areas within the development site that would be used for loading and manoeuvring of delivery and servicing vehicles, and a description of the access to / from the site for delivery and servicing vehicles.

Planning Obligations / Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Dacorum Borough Council has adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and therefore contributions towards local transport schemes would be sought via CIL if appropriate.

Hertfordshire County Council would seek for S106 developer contributions for the installation of display screens (£8,000 per screen) at the southbound and northbound bus stop, and a shelter at the southbound bus stop (£10,000). A total of £26,000 for the bus stop improvements.

Hertfordshire County Council would also seek to secure a fee of £6,000 by Section 106 contributions for Travel Planning monitoring of the residential Travel Plan. A Travel Plan Statement is required for the Business use; however, this would not require monitoring fees.

Summary

HCC as highway authority has reviewed the application submission and has no objection to the proposed development subject to suitable conditions.

DBC conservation

This is currently an area of cleared land adjacent to Maylands and Breakspear Way. Nearby are the relatively tall buildings of the Travel Lodge hotel and a self storage business. Opposite is the Aviva regeneration site. To the rear of the site is a housing development dating from the construction of the new town. We would not object to redeveloping this site and would not object to this including some relatively high rise form of development.

Conflicting Plans

We note that there are conflicts in the plans

16960-03-TP- 10- 01 Stair access to the cycle way differs from the Landscape Master

Plan.

We also note in this location that the site wide sections show a straight vertical drop from the edge of the cycle way but the N and W elevations show a banked section. It would be useful to confirm what is actually proposed for this area.

Application

The proposals are for three larger blocks A, B and E with A being the main tower/entrance feature facing the roundabout. These are to be linked with lower (6 storey) elements C, D and F. The main material proposed to be used is brick. In relation to the separate elements we would comment as follows:

In principle we would question the lack of underground car parking. We raised this at the pre application stage and have noted underground car parking elsewhere in the borough. Recently we have received an application 4/02205/18/MFA for 46 flats near the village of Markyate which accommodates underground car parking. Given that it can be accommodated at this site in the borough outwith the main market towns of Tring and Berkhamsted it would appear that underground car parking is viable for flats.

The Tower (block A)

This is proposed to be the landmark feature of the site and play a prominent part of the entrance to Hemel. We note that one of the corners is chamfered and would question if the other corners should also be similarly chamfered. This would in particular to the round about/ travel lodge elevation allow the tower to perhaps appear more elegant and help turn the corners. We would not object to a slight increase in height to this element given the prominence of the site.

In relation to the detailing we would question a number of proposals. We note brick type 4 extends the full height. It would be questioned in relation to the other brick elements as we are concerned that it weakens the effect of the podium level (brick 2). It may be advisable to start above the podium level. If there remains an intention to anchor it to the ground level it would be recommended that perhaps its width be increased or perhaps it could project slightly at the plinth level to give it a stronger emphasis and therefore re-enforce the plinth rather than visually weaken it.

Adjacent lower blocks

We would be somewhat concerned that this block is not distinctive enough from the main tower in particular the proposals for the external balconies. It would be useful to contemplate certainly for the main elevation to Maylands that the balconies be recessed within the apartments. This would allow the horizontality of this block to be better expressed. To the corner area where the access to the site is formed perhaps this area and the return along the access road could have a different treatment in terms of the balconies. We would also highlight that we have major concerns about the proposed louver elements to the road facing onto Maylands. This is the main entrance into the area and this element would be detrimental to the streetscape of this area. It appears more back of house than the façade to the main access to this area of the town. Therefore it should be reviewed. This should also be considered for the adjacent block on the opposite side of the access road.

Lower Tower

The tower block E should have further consideration with regards to the detailing. In particular we would recommend a plinth element similar to block A. as noted with the above blocks it needs to have a more distinct character when compared to the

adjacent lower blocks.

Balconies/ railings

Given the dominance of these features within the design we would recommend that style varies on the different towers, walkways, podium and lower blocks. This would provide visual interest and help define different characteristics of the blocks.

Green Walls

We note the design aesthetic behind the green wall idea but would recommend that they be combined to form larger continuous areas of green wall to break up the mass of brickwork at ground level. This could be particularly beneficial when considering the west elevation of the main block opposite the Travel lodge Car Park and could indeed be extended to the edge of the vents. The other area which could benefit would be to the podium deck to plot 3 facing the entrance road area. In addition we would question the viability of the green wall on the north west corner of block D which appears to be mainly below ground level. With the walls we would expect a long term maintenance plan to ensure that they benefit the scheme permanently.

Solar panels

The solar panels appear to be a somewhat token effort. For example why is there a relatively limited number of panels and why are some areas of the “ballast roofs” and indeed complete roofs not more intensively used to provide solar power or heating. Block C for example which has the largest surface area of ballast roof has no solar panels. If more intensive use of solar panels is not possible it would be recommended that the roof be either sedum or a green roof to provide appropriate environmental benefits.

Flat Layout Concerns

We note the designs of the layouts and would raise some issues

Block D

We note the outside walkway and the lack of windows from the flats facing this space. This would appear to repeat the mistakes made when designing brutalist estates from the mid 20th century. Windows onto this space would be strongly recommended.

Some flats appear to have particularly poor environments. In particular in building F there is a recessed mono-aspect flat facing NW (noted F3.05 and above) which is recessed from the building line. This would result in a particularly bleak living environment and should be reconsidered.

Landscape

In general we would be most concerned about the proposed landscaping. To the main podiums it appears somewhat lacking in imagination being a large area of grass with some planters round the edge. We would recommend that this be reviewed, more organic forms be explored including a variety of planting and that seating and destinations be provided within the garden areas. To the roofs of the main building it is noted that the roof will be biodiverse. This provides no useful information and it would be recommended that this be reconsidered and a more suitable description be noted. It would also be highlighted that these areas will need maintenance with regards to both weeding and watering in very dry conditions. To the street frontages whilst we support the hedging element the ground cover could perhaps have perennial flowering plants

and grasses which could help to provide rain garden areas.

To the cycle path we note that trees are shown on the drawings however in the landscape assessment it states that a hedge will be used in the widest areas and tree planting will be incorporated where possible. This would appear to suggest that this area has not been carefully considered. Given its increasing use for a cycle route towards the developing east of Hemel this area should be reconsidered and enhanced.

The large "piazza" area appears to be a remnant of the original design. We would recommend that this portion of the site be radically re-considered as at present seems somewhat disjointed and has lost its original purpose.

We would hope that the architects and landscape architects have accurately assessed the wind conditions in particular for the pleached trees on the deck adjacent to the tower where the wind would appear to be funnelled between this and the travel lodge building.

Recommendation The above points should be address and the designs reconsidered in light of the above.

Amended Comments

This is currently an area of cleared land adjacent to Maylands and Breakspear Way. Nearby are the relatively tall buildings of the Travel Lodge hotel and a self storage business. Opposite is the Aviva regeneration site. To the rear of the site is a housing development dating from the construction of the new town. We would not object to redeveloping this site and would not object to this including some relatively high rise form of development.

Application

The proposals are for three larger blocks A, B and E with A being the main tower/entrance feature facing the roundabout. These are to be linked with lower (6 storey) elements C, D and F. The main material proposed to be used is brick in only 2 bonding types vertical and stretcher bond. Many of our earlier concerns have been addressed through the process of the application and it should be noted that we would not object to the proposals due to the design of the building. It would also be welcomed that the office development now appears visually to the exterior to the entire ground floor plate to the main road. The entrance area and the green walls have also been improved. However in relation to the separate elements we would comment as follows:

The Tower (block A)

We note that details to the tower block design has been amended and it would now appear to sit more comfortably in its location than the original designs. As seen from the original concept drawings the scheme has been somewhat diluted over the development of the scheme with the crown element and rooftop garden area removed although detailing to the brickwork and the vertical elements have been enhanced. The key to the proposals now would appear to be the materials and detailing and this should be conditioned.

Adjacent lower blocks

However we continue to be concerned that these blocks are not distinctive enough from the main tower and follows through the design detail and materials. As there would appear to be a lack of breaks, shadow lines or change in materials and detailing we remain concerned that this could appear somewhat monolithic and overpowering to the streetscape. This would be detrimental to the wider area and not provide the high standard of landmark building envisaged for this highly visible corner entry site.

Lower Tower

The tower block E again appears to reflect the other upper and lower blocks as such we remain concerned that the lack of variety would be detrimental to the overall feel of the new development. This coupled with the lack of variety and detailing causes concern in a similar manner to the development of blocks A,B and C.

Balconies/ railings

Given the dominance of these features within the design we would continue to recommend that style varies on the different towers, walkways, podium and lower blocks. This would provide visual interest and help define different characteristics of the blocks.

Green Walls

We welcome the changes to the green walls and believe that a more acceptable cohesive scheme has been arrived at which we believe would work in an acceptable manner. A long term maintenance plan would need to be agreed as a condition should the proposals be approved.

The Roofs

In relation to green roofs and solar panelled roofs we would welcome the introduction of a more balanced scheme that would be beneficial for the character of the area and to ensure some reasonable sustainable features are included within the site. The management and maintenance of the roofs should be agreed by conditions so that they survive in the long term if the officer is minded to approval the proposal.

Flat Layout Concerns

We note the designs of the layouts and continue to be concerned that some flats appear to have particularly poor environments. In particular in building F there is a recessed mono-aspect flat facing NW (noted F3.05 and above) which is recessed from the building line. Although the amount of glazing has increased we are still most concerned that the internal living space would be somewhat dark, gloomy and depressing reliant on artificial light. We would also note that a large proportion of the flats seem to be below the national space standards ie 37m² for 1 person and 50m² for 2 people. We are therefore concerned that this would not be a particularly pleasant for any future residents given that this is the governments recommended minimum standard. Many appear to be 35.3/35.4m² and 46.5-48.4m². We also note some of the plans appear to have errors e.g. studio C2.04, C3.04, 4.04, 5.03 etc all appear to have doors opening into space rather than a balcony.

Landscape

In general the proposed landscaping in particular to the podium levels would still appear somewhat bland however the proposed sedum roofs and bio-diverse brown roofs are to be welcomed. We remain concerned that the large "piazza" area appears to be a remnant of the original design and could appear more as a roundabout rather

than a designed are if landscape.

Recommendation We do not believe that the building would particularly enhance the architectural quality of the borough however it is noted that it would appear an enhancement on the adjacent travel lodge building. If there is a recommendation to approve we would recommend that sample panels of the external materials be constructed on site for final agreement and a maintenance plan be agreed for the areas of planting and the roof areas which may also need planting and watering depending on the conditions.

Spatial Planning

1. The permitted scheme

The original planning permission for Kier Park (4/02124/08) was for an hotel (Travelodge) and A3/A5 on plot 1 and offices (6,455 sq. metres) on plots 2 and 3. The hotel (Travelodge) and A3/A5 units have been built, so the permission for the offices cannot lapse, but is unlikely to be implemented.

2. Planning policy context

(i) National context

Paragraph 8 in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that achieving sustainable development has three overarching objectives, including the following:

“a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity...;

NPPF section 6 provides guidance on building a strong, competitive economy. In particular, paragraph 80 advises that:

“Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development...”

(ii) Dacorum planning policy context

Local Plan (2004)

The site is located in the Maylands Avenue General Employment Area (GEA), which is allocated for business uses (i.e. B1 uses) in saved Local Plan Policy 31. This GEA is designated as a ‘Core Office Location’ in the table in this policy.

Maylands Master Plan (2007)

This master plan was adopted by the Council as a planning policy statement in September 2007. It shows the site as located in the Maylands Gateway character zone. Paragraph 2.2.1 in the master plan states that Maylands Gateway will be a first rate business park for uses such as higher education, HQ offices, conference facilities

and hotel uses.

Maylands Gateway Development Brief (2013)

Further guidance on the future planning of the Gateway site can be found in the revised Maylands Gateway Development Brief, adopted as a planning policy statement in July 2013. The revised brief gives increased flexibility over the type of jobs to be provided, but does not support residential development, except adjacent to Hales Park.

Dacorum Core Strategy (2013)

One of the key aims of the Core Strategy is to encourage employment development on the Maylands Business Park. Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS14, CS15 and CS34 and Figure 18 are particularly relevant. In particular:

- Policy CS1 point c) on Hemel Hempstead refers to “maintaining a balanced distribution of employment growth, with growth and rejuvenation in the Maylands Business Park”.
- Policy CS14 states that “Hemel Hempstead will be the main focus for new economic development uses, which will be used to support the regeneration of the Maylands Business Park and Hemel Hempstead town centre”.
- Policy CS15 indicates that GEAs will be protected for B-class uses and that new office uses will be directed to core office locations and Hemel Hempstead town centre. This policy also sets a target of around 131,000 sq. metres (net) additional office floorspace in the Borough over the plan period and states that the stock of floorspace for industry, storage and distribution should remain broadly unchanged.
- Policy CS34 provides more detailed guidance on the Maylands Business Park and states that specific opportunities for each character zone are identified in Figure 18.
- Figure 18 states with regard to Maylands Gateway that:

“The types of uses suited to this area will primarily be HQ offices, conference facilities and a hotel. There may also be opportunities for other development that accords with its high-status and green character.”

Site Allocations Development Plan Document

The Site Allocations document was on 12 July 2017. However, this plan does not deal with the Maylands Business Park, including the current application site. The site is now being considered in the new Dacorum Local Plan.

New Dacorum Local Plan

In November 2017, the Council published the Issues and Options consultation document on the new Local Plan. Section 7.2 on “how many new jobs are needed in Dacorum by 2036” referred to two important evidence base documents for the new plan i.e. the South West Hertfordshire Economic Study (2016) and the Dacorum

Employment Land Availability Assessment (2017).

The Economic Study estimated a need for an additional 13 hectares of land for office development in Dacorum by 2036. However, the main conclusions in the Employment Land Availability Assessment, including the following:

- Dacorum is not a commercially attractive location for new office development and almost no new offices have been built recently. Office floorspace has been reducing and there is vacant office space. Several buildings have been converted to housing and this is continuing through the Government's 'prior approval' process.
- The Maylands Gateway area, next to Junction 8 of the M1 in Hemel Hempstead, is the only site in the Borough where major office building is proposed. 23 hectares of land remains undeveloped there, but warehousing has recently been allowed on part of the site (and is currently being implemented). Maylands Gateway has good road access, but is poorly served by public transport, partly due to its distance from a train station. This and other factors are likely to continue to limit office development there, at least in the short term.

An update to the South West Hertfordshire Economic Study is currently being prepared. This will contain updated advice on the need for office floorspace in the period to 2036.

3. Should a residential led scheme be accepted?

Residential development on this site is contrary to the Council's planning policies, as explained above. Therefore, the key issue is whether a residential led development should be permitted as an exception to policy. In considering this issue, the following points should be taken into account:

- Despite the extant planning permission for offices, the site has been vacant since 2008.
- The character of the southern part of Maylands Avenue up to the Heart of Maylands site at Wood Lane End is undergoing a major change. It is changing from a traditional industrial area into a mixed use area, including significant retail and residential elements. Particularly significant are the permitted Aviva development opposite the site (largely retail) now under construction and the recently completed Heart of Maylands local centre (mainly retail and housing). The latter is associated with further housing that currently has planning permission and/or is under construction. Also as mentioned above, hotel and A3/A5 uses have been built on Kier Park plot 1, whilst a drive-through restaurant and hotel has been permitted on part of the 47 Maylands Avenue site immediately north of Kier Park.
- Consideration will need to be given in the new Local Plan to possible changes to the boundaries of the GEAs within the Maylands Business Park. It should be noted that the Heart of Maylands residential element forms part of a planned regeneration project – aimed at supporting delivery of a local centre and other environmental improvements. Schemes elsewhere in Maylands Avenue were approved as a result of site specific considerations.

- The application site is on the periphery of the Maylands Business Park and adjoins the established residential area of Adeyfield.
- Since 2006 (the start of the Core Strategy plan period), office floorspace in Dacorum has declined by 75,000 sq. metres. This decline is not consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS15, which proposes a large increase (see section 2 (ii) above).
- The evidence base on employment for the new Local Plan is not yet complete (see section 2(ii) above). Whilst the South West Hertfordshire Economic Study indicated a need for substantial office development in Dacorum, the Dacorum Employment Land Availability Assessment expressed doubts about the viability of office development on the Maylands Business Park (see section 2 (ii) above).
- Brasier Freeth's Planning Report accompanying the planning application refers to the lack of commercial interest for office development on the site in particular and on the Maylands Business Park in general. The report also refers to the high level of vacant office floorspace in Hemel Hempstead. It concludes that the existing approved scheme for offices is not viable.
- Brasier Freeth also looked at the potential for employment floorspace in a new consent. They consider that the majority of the demand for office space in Maylands is for small suites under circa 2,500sq.ft. However, they concluded that that there can only be a small allocation of office space, say no more than 9,000sq.ft – 11,000sq.ft total, based on demand, poor public transport and restrictive parking.
- Initial work on the South West Hertfordshire Economic Study Update shows that the office vacancy rate in South West Hertfordshire has fallen steadily in recent years and is now only 4.3%. Also, office rents have been rising. Speculative office development has become viable again in Watford and the consultants consider that it may again become viable elsewhere in South West Hertfordshire. In addition, recent work by Brasier Freeth for the Council in November 2017 indicates that office vacancy rates in Hemel Hempstead have continued to fall and are now half the level reached in the recession.
- Paragraph 11.11 in the Brasier Freeth report accompanying the application states that: "The impact of Permitted Development Rights has lessened as the "easy wins" have been sold for residential conversion. As a consequence the factor that has driven underlying office demand is no longer a key factor."
- The Council's own evidence on the impact of permitted development rights suggests otherwise. Between 2014 and 2018, there was a loss of 17,300 sq. metres of office floorspace from such schemes, but permission has been granted for the loss of a further 27,800 sq. metres of floorspace. Completed and permitted schemes (if all implemented) are likely to result in the loss of some 3,000 office jobs. Most of these losses are in Hemel Hempstead town centre and the Maylands Business Park.
- The Pre-submission version of the St Albans Local Plan proposes 55 hectares of

employment development at East Hemel Hempstead, on a site bounded by Breakspear Way, Green Lane, Punchbowl Lane and the M1 motorway. The proposals for this site in Policy S6 i) include:

“A significant new Business Park consisting primarily of B1 office accommodation on the southern approximately 17 Hectares of the site.”

This is a major employment development proposal, which would form an extension to the Maylands Business Park.

- With regard to the East Hemel Hempstead proposal, the Dacorum Employment Land Availability Assessment advised that: “...while our market research has not shown support for office development in this location in the short term, particularly given the deliverability issues associated with major office developments in Maylands, there are reasons to expect that this development may come forward during the plan period.”
- The Kier Park site is visually prominent, so a high quality design should be sought irrespective of use. There is also a need to screen the side of the bulky self-storage building being built on the adjacent land to the north. It appears that only office or housing development on Kier Park could deliver a building of the necessary quality.
- Accepting some housing on this site would probably help longer-term to reduce the scale of potential Green Belt releases required. A very high density residential development is proposed on Kier Park plots 2 & 3.

4. Conclusions

The proposed residential led development is clearly contrary to the Council’s planning policies. However, the points made in section 3 above should be taken into account. A balancing exercise should be undertaken to decide whether these points are sufficient to justify making an exception to policy.

On balance, we conclude that a housing led scheme with an office component should be accepted in principle, particularly as the proposed offices would help to meet the clear need for more small office accommodation. However, it is necessary to consider whether the proposed office component is large enough.

Recent evidence from the emerging South West Hertfordshire Economic Study Update and by Brasier Freeth for the Council paint a picture of falling office vacancy rates, increasing rents and the possibility that speculative office development may become viable again. Therefore, we consider that the site may be able to support a somewhat higher quantity of office floorspace than that proposed in the application. We welcome the fact that negotiations are taking place with the applicants aimed at securing this. We would also like to see the provision of an active frontage along the full length of the proposed built frontages to Maylands Avenue.

If it is concluded that the proposed development is acceptable in principle, it should also be assessed against Core Strategy Policy CS19 on affordable housing. This policy requires 35% affordable housing, with 75% of the affordable housing being

rented. However, the viability assessment accompanying the application concludes that the development can provide only 20.8% affordable housing and no rented affordable housing. The views of the Council's Strategic Housing Team should be sought on this mix.

Herts Ecology

The area associated with the application is a previously developed, brown field site now containing a mixture of common grassland, ruderal and scattered scrub species of low ecological value. A Preliminary ecological Assessment (PEA) of the site was carried out by the AECOM ecologists on the 15th February 2018.

Habitats

The woodland adjacent and bordering the west of the site represents a refuge, as well as a foraging and commuting habitat for wild life; including protected species such as bats. This area of a woodland forms a green corridor in an otherwise highly urbanised environment. To protect this habitat from the adverse effects of this development both during and post construction and in line with the recommendations of the PEA, I advise the inclusion of the following **Conditions, submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of works:**

Construction Ecological Management Plan

Prior to the commencement of development, a Construction Ecological Management Plan should be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning

Authority for approval, detailing how it is planned to mitigate for ecological impacts, on the adjacent woodland.

lighting design strategy

Prior to occupation, a lighting design strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the use of the woodland by bats and other nocturnal wildlife.

Post construction disturbance by lighting of the habitat should be avoided and a lighting plan detailing where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the use of the woodland by bats or other nocturnal creatures.

Badgers

The ecological report also highlights the suitability of this adjacent wood as viable badger habitat and the potential of the use of the bund on the site boundary as a sett location. There are badger records in the area and although the dual carriage way provides a commuting barrier to badgers from any land to the south there is potential that badgers from areas to the north and east may be using the area. To prevent any offence being committed in relation to the badger act 1992 should form I advise the following Informative is added to any permission granted

Prior to commencement of any works on site, a Badger survey of the bund shall be carried out and details including an assessment of the impact of the proposed development and any appropriate mitigation measures to alleviate such impacts shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

Nesting Birds

The clearance of the site will result in the loss of any existing nesting habitats. To avoid harm to these protected species I advise Informative is added to any permission granted:

“Any significant tree/shrub works or removal should be undertaken outside the nesting bird season (March to August inclusive) to protect breeding birds, their nests, eggs and young. If this is not practicable, a search of the area should be made no more than 2 days in advance of vegetation clearance by a competent Ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest.”

Ecological enhancements and biodiversity gain.

I support the landscape statement in respect of the proposals to use native species and plant species with wildlife benefit for all the hedges, the mixed planting along the west boundary, and large areas of the groundcover. A landscape plan detailing the number of plants and species relating to this proposal should be submitted as a Condition of Approval, to allow the LPA to assess the efficacy of this proposal in terms of meeting the aims of the NPPF regarding a net gain in biodiversity for the site. The ecological enhancements suggested in the PEA are proportional to the scale of the ecological disturbance caused by the development and should be adopted in full as part of the landscape plan.

DBC Contaminated Land

Thanks for contacting the Pollution and Environmental Protection Team in respect of the above planning application 4/02286/18/MFA for the construction of 268 flats and 1404.5 square metres of office space split across six blocks, with associated car parking, landscaping and amenity space.

Please be advise that we have **no objection to the proposed development in relation to Land Contamination. However, you will need to contact my colleague Stuart Nixon and Neil Polden on the likely impact of the development in relation to Noise and Air Quality respectively.**

However, having given adequate consideration to the submitted Planning Statement, Design and Access Statement and with the proposed development located on a radon affected area where 1-3% of homes are above the action level and also on a landmark historic contaminated land use of an un-specified factory or works site of medium risk and former contaminated land use i.e. depot, the following planning conditions and informative are recommend should planning permission be granted.

1a). Contaminated Land Condition

No development, shall take place until a Phase I Report to assess the actual or potential contamination at the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. If actual or potential contamination and/or ground gas risks are identified, further investigation shall be carried out and a Phase II report shall be

submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development. If the Phase II report establishes that remediation or protection measures are necessary, a Remediation Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

For the purposes of this condition:

- A Phase I Report consists of a desk study, site walkover, conceptual model and a preliminary risk assessment. The desk study comprises a search of available information and historical maps which can be used to identify the likelihood of contamination. A simple walkover survey of the site is conducted to identify pollution linkages not obvious from desk studies. Using the information gathered, a 'conceptual model' of the site is constructed and a preliminary risk assessment is carried out.
- A Phase II Report consists of an intrusive site investigation and risk assessment. The report should make recommendations for further investigation and assessment where required.
- A Remediation Statement details actions to be carried out and timescales so that contamination no longer presents a risk to site users, property, the environment or ecological systems.

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

1b). All remediation or protection measures 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.

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

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

Informative:

Paragraph 121 of the NPPF states that all site investigation information must be prepared by a competent person. This is defined in the framework as 'A person with a recognised relevant qualification, sufficient experience in dealing with the type(s) of pollution or land instability, and membership of a relevant professional organisation.' Contaminated Land Planning Guidance can be obtained from Regulatory Services or via the Council's website www.dacorum.gov.uk

2). Construction Management Plan Condition

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:

- 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.
- i) Construction or Demolition Hours of Operation
- j) Dust and Noise control measure
- k) Asbestos survey and control measure where applicable

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.

3). Un-expected Contaminated Land Informative

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.

Environmental Health

I refer to the above application. I have read the information provided with the application which considers the air quality impact.

Further information is required as there are some issues with the reporting of results. This is noted when comparing the results of the baseline assessment with the predicted impact of the development.

The impact from air quality is assessed against a baseline of 2017. It assumes no change in background concentrations of vehicle emissions. However the baseline assessment and the opening year results show some unusual figures based on these assumptions. For example at R1 the modelled outcome is a 7 µg/m³ reduction in the annual average for NO₂, but no clear explanation as for the difference in this value. Noting the comparison with R2 this is 5 µg/m³ increase and so something is amiss.

In reality assuming there is no change in background or vehicle emissions, then the likelihood will be an increase at all receptor locations near the roadside due to projected growth. The modelled predictions need to be revisited or explained in further detail.

I've copied the baseline and predicted results (do minimum only) below.

Receptor name	Annual Mean NO2 (µg/m3)	Existing Receptor	Do Minimum NO2 (µg/m3)
R1	36.8	R1	29.2
R2	30.8	R2	35.7
R3	26.9	R3	29.3
R4	28.7	R4	28.5
R5	29.7	R5	23.9
R6	30.2	R6	23.3
R7	31.8	R7	24.5
R8	17.1	R8	17.5
R9	18.9	R9	18.7

The report also makes no reference to mitigation against the development from air quality, and consideration for cumulative impact from other development and nearby AQMAs. I note there is a travel plan, but no direct measures for air quality.

Amended Comments

I've read through the AQ update.

There is quite a change from the original report and with the development we are now very close to an exceedance of the national objective for nitrogen dioxide. Air quality modelling is a best estimate, and in this case I would be taking a precautionary approach and rounding up. Therefore this would indicate that with the scheme there would be a breach of the air quality objective. National planning policy requires that decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants as well as our own policy CS32 also advises against harm from a significant increase in pollution.

I am aware from previous comments from Kenny he had flagged air quality mitigation be provided by the development. I would require the same based on the latest revision and to condition the development on this basis. I don't have any conditions of this nature to hand and if we have done anything like this before? I can speak to our local Herts and Beds AQ group for examples?

I have had a read through of the acoustic report.

The assessment of noise with respect to measurement of prevailing noise conditions appears fine. The issue is with regard to recommended mitigation measures which relies upon building façade protection. I also have concerns regarding proposed external areas, balconies, on all flats. The assessment shows a high noise environment across a large part of the development site.

The developer has assessed noise on external amenity areas using guidance contained within BS8233, and derives from previous versions of World Health Organisation guidance. It suggests to avoid the onset of serious annoyance noise levels in outdoor areas should not exceed 55 dBA. The noise assessment ranges from

69 – 83 dBA on the most exposed facades, and quite substantially above this value. There is a suggestion for mitigation around balcony design, but nothing forthcoming as to what reduction might be achievable or alternative proposal for external amenity space where an adequate noise environment cannot be achieved.

For the internal environment the assessment does refer to additional guidance (ProPg). This introduces the principle of good acoustic design. Good acoustic design is defined as not just achieving compliance with recommended internal and external noise exposure standard, but should provide an integrated solution whereby the optimum acoustic outcome is achieved, without design compromises that will adversely affect living conditions and the quality of life of the inhabitants or other sustainable design objectives and requirements.

ProPg does advise against using fixed unopenable glazing for sound insulation purposes as generally unsatisfactory and should be avoided; occupants generally prefer the ability to have control over the internal environment using openable windows, even if the acoustic conditions would be considered unsatisfactory when open. Solely relying on sound insulation of the building envelope to achieve acceptable acoustic conditions in new residential development, when other methods could reduce the need for this approach, is not regarded as good acoustic design.

The mitigation proposed for the development is based on acoustic glazing and a mix of mechanical and background ventilation. Windows are proposed as operable (noting guidance above) but the façade noise levels assessed, in particular at night when sleeping, raise concerns that residents would be unable to rely on natural ventilation (openable windows) for maintaining thermal comfort. Noise could have a detrimental impact on health and quality of life.

The assessment does not demonstrate to the local authority how it minimises the exposure of future occupiers to noise, such as through site engineering design and layout. My review is based on the plan submitted in the acoustic report, below.

We would ask the developer for consideration of alternative design options. This could be internal layout design or single aspect layout.

EV Recharging Infrastructure Condition

Prior to occupation, the development shall incorporate an Electric Vehicle (EV) ready domestic charging point at the ration of one charge point per every 10 residential units.

Reason: To contribute to the objective of providing a sustainable transport network and to provide the necessary infrastructure to help off-set the adverse impact of the operational phase of the development on local air quality.

Informative

- **EV Charging Point Specification:**
12) Each charging point shall be installed by an appropriately certified electrician/electrical contractor in accordance with the following specification. The necessary certification of electrical installation should be submitted as

evidence of appropriate installation to meet the requirements of Part P of the most current Building Regulations.

- Cable and circuitry ratings should be of adequate size to ensure a minimum continuous current demand for the vehicle of 16A and a maximum demand of 32A (which is recommended for Eco developments).
 - A separate dedicated circuit protected by an RBCO should be provided from the main distribution board, to a suitably enclosed termination point within a garage or an accessible enclosed termination point for future connection to an external charge point.
 - The electrical circuit shall comply with the Electrical requirements of BS7671: 2008 as well as conform to the IET code of practice on Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment installation 2012 ISBN 978-1-84919-515-7 (PDF). This includes requirements such as ensuring the Charging Equipment integral protective device shall be at least Type A RCD (required to comply with BS EN 61851 Mode 3 charging).
 - If installed in a garage all conductive surfaces should be protected by supplementary protective equipotential bonding. For vehicle connecting points installed such that the vehicle can only be charged within the building, e.g. in a garage with a (non-extended) tethered lead, the PME earth may be used. For external installations the risk assessment outlined in the IET code of practice must be adopted, and may require additional earth stake or mat for the EV charging circuit. This should be installed as part of the EV ready installation to avoid significant on cost later.
 - A list of authorised installers (for the Government's Electric Vehicle Homecharge Scheme) can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/office-for-low-emission-vehicles>
- The above condition is considered relevant and reasonable for the following reasons:
- Paragraphs 170 (e), 181 of the NPPF, which refer to the effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution (including air pollution) on health, the natural environment (including air quality).
 - 13) Paragraphs 102 (d), 105 (e) and 110 (e) of the NPPF, which refer to the need to promote sustainable transport including the provision for charging plug-in and other ultra low emission vehicles'.
 - HCC Local Transport Plan (LTP4) 2018-2031 which includes an objective to 'preserve the character and quality of the Hertfordshire environment' and 'make journeys and their impact safer and healthier', as well as its Emissions Reduction Policy 19.
 - Policy CS32 of the Dacorum Borough Council Local Plan – any development proposals which could cause harm from a significant increase in pollution (into the air, soil or any water body) by virtue of the emissions of fumes, particles, effluent, radiation, smell light, noise or noxious substances, will not be permitted.

Travel Plan Condition

Prior to the commencement of the development details of a residential / commercial travel plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Measures within the approved travel plan shall be implemented in full within an agreed

timetable set out in the plan, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable transport and minimising the impact on local air quality

Amended Comments

It has taken a lot of effort for the developer to detail that an alternative balcony design (with the exception of full enclosure) is not achievable.

Their statement is that they you can do no more, meaning you have external amenity spaces quite beyond what is recommended by guidelines. However, if the view of planning is that the balconies are not intrinsic to the design then I would refer to the final line detailed in BS 8233, bold text below. I would not have an objection on the basis that the more critical internal living spaces can be mitigated.

7.7.3.2 Design criteria for external noise

For traditional external areas that are used for amenity space, such as gardens and patios, it is desirable that the external noise level does not exceed 50 dB LAeq,T, with an upper guideline value of 55 dB LAeq,T which would be acceptable in noisier environments. However, it is also recognized that these guideline values are not achievable in all circumstances where development might be desirable. In higher noise areas, such as city centres or urban areas adjoining the strategic transport network, a compromise between elevated noise levels and other factors, such as the convenience of living in these locations or making efficient use of land resources to ensure development needs can be met, might be warranted. In such a situation, development should be designed to achieve the lowest practicable levels in these external amenity spaces, but should not be prohibited.

Suggested Condition – noise generated by the development

Before the development hereby approved is occupied, a noise assessment and mitigation / control scheme shall be submitted for the approval of the LPA which specifies and rates sources of noise associated with the development and details measures to be made for its control. Sources of noise include, but are not restricted to general building services plant and emergency generators.

The assessment and mitigation / control scheme shall be compiled by appropriately experienced and competent persons.

The mitigation / control measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approval, appropriately validated before coming into first operation and retained thereafter.

Reason

Policy CS32 – any development proposals which could cause harm from a significant increase in pollution (into the air, soil or any water body) by virtue of the emissions of fumes, particles, effluent, radiation, smell light, noise or noxious substances, will not be permitted.

Suggested Condition – protection of future residential occupiers from noise

With reference to the AECOM report (Maylands Avenue Noise Survey and Assessment; Project Number 60566365; April 2018) and prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, a scheme of façade protection and alternative ventilation measures for the protection of future residential occupiers from noise shall be submitted for the approval of the LPA.

The scheme of façade protection and alternative ventilation measures shall be compiled by appropriately experienced and competent persons.

The scheme of façade protection and alternative ventilation measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approval, appropriately validated before coming into first operation and retained thereafter.

Reason

Policy CS32 – any development proposals which could cause harm from a significant increase in pollution (into the air, soil or any water body) by virtue of the emissions of fumes, particles, effluent, radiation, smell light, noise or noxious substances, will not be permitted.

Construction Hours of Working – (Plant & Machinery) Informative

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: 0730hrs to 1830hrs on Monday to Saturdays, no works are permitted at any time on Sundays or bank holidays.

Construction Dust Informative

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.

Noise on Construction/Demolition Sites Informative

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.

Appendix B**Neighbour notification/site notice responses**

Objections

Address	Comments
8 GREENWAY,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QG	<p data-bbox="624 327 1437 544">: I strongly object to this application on the basis that the building is too tall and will infringe on sunlight and privacy. This will negatively effect the value of my property as who wants to look out into an eye sore. It is higher than all other buildings and is not in line with other buildings and will be an eye sore.</p> <p data-bbox="624 584 1437 763">The parking will add to the lack of spaces currently available in the area and the parking overflow from the flats will overspill to our streets and make life more difficult to park outside our own houses. As it is a fire engine would struggle to reach my property.</p> <p data-bbox="624 804 1437 983">We will suffer noise and air pollution as this was unbearable when the travelodge area was developed. The building works could cause structural damage to my property and the amount of dust and noise would be unacceptable.</p> <p data-bbox="624 1023 1437 1059">Therefore I strongly object to this application.</p>
3 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH	<p data-bbox="624 1099 1437 1279">I would like to know what 'associated parking' means! We all know that there will never be enough parking provided for 268 flats, let alone the proposed offices. The application states 11,787 feet of office space but fails to inform us of the amount of proposed parking.</p> <p data-bbox="624 1319 1437 1543">The Flags, a residential street which is situated directly behind the proposed flats, currently does not have enough parking for it's own residents. If the proposed application is granted it is almost certain that the Kier residents and office employees will use The Flags as an overflow car park.</p> <p data-bbox="624 1583 1437 1619">I object strongly on this basis.</p>
2 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH	<p data-bbox="624 1615 1437 1906">On this planning app. It states there are 268 flats & 11787 feet of officers, but I cant see any carparking. So dose this mean the car and van will be parking in the Flags. This is a residential street which at present does not have enough parking at presents. So once again we are going to have Kier employee and the flat owners parking in the flags cause parking problems, the same as for the Travel lodge.</p> <p data-bbox="624 1946 1437 2040">Also over the past number of months there has been a large number of flats built in this area. But I can't find any new schools or doctor's surgery. hence putting more</p>

	<p>strain on the existing services.</p> <p>The entrance is very close to one of the busiest roundabouts in the area and I can't see any traffic management in this allocation. By increasing the traffic in this area, it will cause more vehicles to use the rat runs that are already dangerous with cars cutting through the housing estates.</p> <p>I object strongly on this basis,</p>
<p>57 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 4HH</p>	<p>This building will be twice the height of all other buildings in the area (which are already intrusive) The twelve stories proposed will adversely affect and overlook an area as far as the football ground.</p> <p>Height should be limited to 6 stories and be at least 30 feet from the back boundary.</p> <p>130 parking spaces is derisory for 268 and over 1000m2 of office space. It will cause overspill of hundreds of cars into already congested adjoining streets. Kier should provide at least one parking space per flat and a separate car park of a similar size for the office build WITHOUT going higher than 5-6 stories in keeping with other developments.</p> <p>I strongly object to this development as it stands.</p>
<p>7 GREENWAY,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 4QG</p>	<p>I refer to the Planning Application made for the Kier Development on Maylands. I am also in receipt of Dossier prepared by Kier sent to all neighbourhood residents.</p> <p>I have read and studied the details of the planning application and feel aggrieved by the size of the proposed building both in number of flats and height of the building structure. I am also aggrieved by the misleading schematic produced by the developers showing incorrect height of the building. The proposed scheme does not provide for adequate parking space so much so that it will encroach on the surrounding streets. I would request planning committee to make a visit in our area and see the already overcrowded parking issue.</p> <p>I would request the Committee not to compromise on the commercial aspect of the project but consider other important issues such as environment, overcrowding and traffic concerns.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that good sense will prevail.</p>
<p>71 LEVERSTOCK</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed plans that have been</p>

<p>GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4HL</p>	<p>made. The height of the large tower block buildings are not in keeping with the existing buildings already built, the buildings will overlook existing residential homes meaning a huge loss of privacy. Instead of the view of trees, residents will now be forced to look at ugly high rise blocks of flats .</p> <p>The amount of parking provided is nowhere near enough for the amount of proposed homes. Existing residents can expect nearby roads to be clogged with residents and visitors cars from the new development. The amount of cars coming and going from the development will cause traffic chaos at an already extremely busy road and roundabout.</p>
<p>31 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH</p>	<p>My major objection is concerning the HUGE overspill of vehicles from the new flats, their visitors and office staff which will inevitably park on the FLAGS as it's the closest and easiest route through the lane to the new development.</p> <p>There is no doubt this overspill will happen and as we're in a cul-de-sac, with already very limited parking, we will not be able to park in our own street let alone outside our own house.</p> <p>The proposed parking on the site is completely inadequate</p> <p>If this development is to go ahead then the council must introduce residence parking for the flags and surrounding roads. Although this will incur costs to the current residence it's a cost worth bearing as the alternative will be horrendous for all concerned.</p> <p>Yes develop and expand but not to the detriment of local residents.....</p> <p>Please learn and don't just approve the planning proposal without considering the locals that have been here for many years</p> <p>I object strongly on this basis.</p>
<p>10 GREENWAY,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QG</p>	<p>I have a number of key concerns and objections to the proposal for offices and residential development in Maylands.</p>

1. An 11,000 sq ft office devt is going to have 27 car parking spaces assigned to it. Your traffic assessment seems to suggest that the typical number of vehicles coming in and out at peak times associated with this will average around 23. This is completely against experience on the estate. Working at Vanarama further up Maylands, the office is 19,000 sq ft, has 220 employees and 95 spaces. The company managed to rent another 40 from a neighbouring plot. However, our staff continually upset neighbours by parking illegally in their spaces and by using the local retail parks in Mark Road who have now instigated fines and clamping as a result. Surrounding streets are overflowing with parked cars from Maylands employees who cannot park at their offices. Go to Briery Way to see how many cars are parked outside the park during the day. There will be considerably more than 27 employees in an 11,000 ft property and based on your own assessment only 8% are likely to use public transport. Therefore where is the assessment of the number of actual employees likely to be housed in the development and what impact will this have?

2. Just adding 300 additional cars as you are intending to do in your development, will add considerable strain on the area. Your traffic assessments do not seem to cover the time taken to get from Maylands to the M1 junction just down the road. At the peak times covered in your report, it can take 25 minutes to get to and from the motorway. This is ludicrous and will only be made worse by the additional cars without taking into account additional employees in the offices.

3. Parking in residential streets on all sides is under huge pressure. Living in Greenway, we see parking on our road in Maddox Road, the Flags gets unwanted parking as does much of New Park Drive. Progress to Briery Way and surrounding roads you get the same. The fall out on residents is considerable and stressful.

4. We were hugely upset by the building of the Travelodge. This overlooks our house and acts as a real eyesore. You now intend to put an even taller building next to it, which will have a practical impact in terms of light and aesthetic impact on the skyline. Your pictures seem to be misleading. Your elevations show a 12 storey building, yet on your additional documents showing the view from the roundabout and from north and south on Maylands Avenue, you seem to show a 9 storey building at roughly the same height as the Travelodge. If the building is another 4 stories higher I would suggest that

	<p>you stop misleading the public and make clear just how much this will extend above the current hotel building. I cannot protest strongly enough about this and would urge reconsideration.</p> <p>4. You say the rail station is easily accessible. At peak times, it would take around 45 minutes to arrive in Maylands by bus. Walking is between 45 to 60 minutes whilst taxis would be quicker, they would prove expensive for employees and residents on a regular basis at that peak time. The transport network is under great strain and frankly I am puzzled as to how you think this is going to help?</p> <p>5. I struggle to understand why you think we need another 11,000 square feet of office space, when it is obvious walking around Maylands, Mark Road, Maxted Road Boundary Way, just how much office space is currently vacant. Local agents are clear that office space has slowed considerably in the last 12 months and they see little likelihood of this changing in the next year or two.</p> <p>6. I also agree with previous comments - creating another 268 residences is all very well but all services are under pressure. Schools are not plentiful - we have a few primary schools, several with problems due to demographic of kids. In secondary Adeyfield has deteriorated significantly in recent years, Longdean just gets bigger. The other secondaries are the other side of town. GPs cannot cope. We have no local hospital and Watford is creaking. We lack key leisure facilities such as a theatre or youth activities. Our transport network is congested across the town not just at the St Albans Road, Maylands Avenue junction. Adding potentially 400 new residents and a significant number of additional employees will merely exacerbate these issues. I would like to understand how you would deal with these issues?</p>
2 GREENWAY,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 4QG	<p>Twelve stories is far too high for a building in this location: we loose privacy, light and space.</p> <p>The parking schedule is totally inadequate and will result in even more vehicles attempting to park in our already overcrowded streets. Would an underground car park not solve the problem?</p> <p>The location of the proposed development being so close to a major traffic intersection will make an already bad situation even worse.</p> <p>I believe this to be the wrong development, in the wrong place, and strongly object to this plan</p>
3 NEW PARK	This building proposal is too tall and will negatively affect

<p>DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QE</p>	<p>the outlook from my property and negatively affect my property value as it will overlook my house. It is being deliberately misleading in the application photos as it is shown as about the same height as an 8 storey building, when it is half as tall again at 12 storeys. There is woefully inadequate parking plans for the amount of housing planned, there needs to be at least a 1 to 1 parking to accommodation ratio or it will completely jam my road amongst others with the car parking for the residents. I fully agree with encouraging less cars, but at an out of town Development that is a long way from the station and town center bus links, whilst appealing to car based commuters being so close to the M1, I think it is completely foolish to expect housing in this location to not rely on at least 1 car per dwelling.</p>
<p>45 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4HH</p>	<p>i feel that 12 stories is not in keeping with the area. I think that the flats should not be any taller than the existing travelodge at 8 floors. i recognise the need to build new properties but 12 stories is too much. Given the amount of traffic congestion there already in the area that i am not sure how the infrastructure will be able to support so many additional cars. i am also aware that there will only be 124 parking spaces which will have an impact on the local area as this is insufficient - especially as most flats will be occupied by 2 people who may both have a vehicle. public transport is poor in hemel and therefore a car will be required. The flats will overshadow a number of properties and will be an eye sore as it is so out of character for the area. if the flats were the same height as the travelodge i would be happier with this proposal.</p>
<p>11 GREENWAY,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QG</p>	<p>I understand the need for new homes and welcome new developments as long as they take into consideration the impact on the surrounding areas. I don't believe this development has considered the impact on residential parking, commuter congestion (especially queuing at J8 in the mornings), capacity of surrounding schools, lack of hospital facilities and doctors. To assume that the new residents of the flats will travel on public transport is ludicrous. Buses are never on time, it take ages to get anywhere and walking to the train station would take up to an hour. Cycling is quicker but I suspect residents wouldn't want to leave their cycles outside overnight in case of theft. What actually will happen is residents will have cars, they will use the train, avoid parking in the station car park because its too expensive and cause parking problems to the residents in Boxmoor.</p>

	<p>The height of the main 12 storey building is misleading in the artistic drawing. It will be visible by all residents in the Adeyfield area and will have a significant impact on the value of the properties in this area.</p> <p>We currently have the unsightly view of the Travelodge from our back garden and it doesn't matter which angle I look out from my garden it is there. The trees that have been planted have not provided any shield against the building. Not to mention the bins are always overflowing and they continually leave the doors jammed open which means the alarms are always on. We have had mice problems and I don't see this getting any better when the new development is built. There will be more big bins overflowing along with more noise and light pollution.</p> <p>My property is already overlooked by the flats that are in Maddox road but when I purchased my house they were already there. I don't think it is right to impose lack of privacy to the local residents who didn't have this issue before.</p> <p>I agree with one of the other comments made that the planning committee should visit the site and surrounding areas at different times of the day, especially from about 6pm when everyone is home and there is nowhere to park, before they make any decisions.</p>
<p>59 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4HL</p>	<p>Further to the receipt of Kier's Development Update Newsletter, I am writing to object this proposal.</p> <p>Firstly, the artistic drawings shown are inaccurate in the height of 12 storeys, and do not predict the true scale of the buildings in relation to the Travelodge and its 8 storeys, or the other buildings, and will dwarf the existing buildings in Maylands Avenue. Keir are leading us to believe that their 12 storey build is of a similiar height, or shorter, than the Travelodge!</p> <p>Secondly, it does not show any additional parking facilities other than the existing spaces on the Travelodge site. So where do you propose that the people residing in all these 268 flats, plus the commercial development on the site, will be parking their cars? If additional parking does not exist, this will result in an overspill into the neighbouring area causing an impact on the existing residents of which there is already inadequate parking spaces, never mind the environmental impact. Traffic is already a major issue in the entire area, especially during rush hour. So how will you deal with this environmental impact?</p>

	<p>What about schools/doctors/dentists? Is the council taking into consideration the additional pressure on the already over-stretched services?</p> <p>Thirdly, the neighbouring properties are already enduring light pollution from the orange obtrusive building that is lit for 24 hours a day with no regard to energy conservation. There is also the environmental impact from light pollution, skyglow, and light trespass which will have an adverse health effect on the local residents. See Defra's guidance on sections 101 to 103 of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005.</p> <p>Kier quote in their vague Newsletter "268 high quality flats, including affordable housing contribution." We have heard all this before. What percentage is affordable housing? What does this actually mean? At what price is it being marketed at? This supposed Newsletter, or blurb, is disingenuous and inaccurate and an insult to the residents.</p> <p>This is purely a development to profit Kier and not profit the local neighbourhood.</p>
<p>32 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH</p>	<p>In am objecting to this development in its current form on the grounds that it gives inadequate parking which will overflow onto already busy residential roads. The planning application states a 1:1 ratio of parking spaces per flat. It also states Dacorum planning regulations state there should be 1.5 spaces per 2 bedroom property and 1.25 spaces per 1 bedroom property. Therefore I submit that this would not meet Dacorum requirement as stated and that the application, would cause immense parking problems in already busy surrounding roads should be rejected in its current form. I would also suggest that households in existing surrounding roads should be consulted about resident only parking.</p>
<p>39 NEW PARK DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QJ</p>	<p>This development is too large and not in keeping with the surrounding residential area. The increase in vehicles, both domestic and commercial will result in current quite, residential roads becoming extremely busy and dangerous to the residents living there. It will also create substantial parking problems for residents that have lived there years and who currently pay a lot of money to be able to park near their homes. I strongly object to this planning going ahead.</p>
<p>9 GREENWAY,HEMEL</p>	<p>I have lived in this area for 38 years and the thought of</p>

HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QG	<p>these proposed flats going up is quite worrying for me. Its very noisy living in this area now .the travel lodge is terrible for us and so will be to people living in flats next to it.car alarms at all hours .hundreds of bottles suddenly being tipped into skips and people shouting and meeting up in cars and on motorbikes at night.Lorries with there backing up alarms at all hours sometimes very early and very late.Also if you go along to the site with the artists drawing you will see that itis not quite correct.They have a way of making it look like it all going to look ok .You will see that it is all going to look crammed into the space there and look awful.Also drawing the picture at an angle makes it look shorter its all rather crafty.There will not be enough car spaces and people will start parking in the roads behind,this happens already sometimes.I think its a terrible shame and greedy putting up all these flats any space thats found .My granddaughter is 19 and never had a garden,People with not so bright shiny futures get stuck in flats for life ,so down size them and make bigger garden areas or put up two story flats with gardens or those cluster one or two bedroomed houses with the little lawns.i have visited someone in the flats further up maylands ,there are kids roaming around the corridors,its glum.Lets think about people instead of how many flats can go up in one space and about privacy and noise.The wooded area helps a little in summer but not in th winter months.</p>
22 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH	<p>I object to this development in it's current form due to problems with parking and road safety issues.</p> <p>I see from the application that there will be one parking space for each residential unit plus spaces for the commercial space. I have concerns that, due to the site's position on the road network, there will be above average levels of car ownership. As no overflow parking area is proposed cars, not able to park on the site, will park on the nearby residential road especially since there is a footpath connecting the site to The Flags.</p> <p>My second concern is the junction onto Maylands Avenue. The site is close to a major roundabout and turning right is difficult and potentially dangerous. Cars turning right into the site will block traffic flow and there is a danger of creating a problem similar to the Aldi entrance on the Redbourn Road.</p> <p>Please consider what could be done to decrease parking in residential areas and look into any road safety measures before granting this permission.</p>
33 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH	<p>I object to the size of this development for a number of reasons as follows:</p> <p>The effect it will have on the local infrastructure, currently it can take 30mins plus to get from the roundabout adjacent to the proposed development to the M1</p>

	<p>junction, this will increase with the size of this development and other building works in the area. The affect on parking on the Flags due to the lack of parking spaces in the new development, the area has suffered from workers and builders parking in the area, if getting to the development is grid locked as it is currently we will see an increase in parking in the flags as it is a quick short cut for the new residents of the blocks. The increase of pedestrian using the flags we are already suffering from an increase in people using the flags to access Maylands Road which is causing increased noise and ASB, litter and shouting at all times of the night etc.. In short I feel the size and height of this development will affect the whole area and there would seem to be little thought to the affect it will have on local residents or the infrastructure in the area.</p>
<p>4 GREENWAY,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 4QG</p>	<p>12 storeys is still too high. The picture looks like it is the height of the travel lodge but that is impossible as that is only 8 storeys. I am very disappointed that Kier is trying to pull the wool over our eyes. I am also concerned about the parking as I live round the corner. If there is not enough spaces for the amount of flats they are building where will it go. To our neighbourhoods!!</p>
<p>34 SARRATT AVENUE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 7JF</p>	<p>I object to the planning application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased traffic to the local area - Insufficient parking in the current proposed plans - Not in keeping with the area <p>I would like to see that the council consider enforcing that Keir Group are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not to touch the tree's that form a natural boundary between the residential area of Adeyfield and the industrial area of Maylands <p>I travel through Maylands on a daily basis and the congestion in the area, and leading to the M1 Motorway is already beyond capacity. The addition of so many extra residential properties is likely to only increase this. Whilst I appreciate a need for increased housing within Hemel Hempstead, consideration should be given to the number of properties that are concentrated within an already heavily congested area.</p> <p>The current plans do not allow sufficient levels of parking for residents and visitors. This will undoubtedly lead to the surrounding residential streets in Adeyfield being used as an overflow car park. Particular consideration should be given to 'The Flags' - HP2 4QH, which has a direct footpath through to the development. This</p>

residential street is already heavily congested at peak times and it is impossible for visitors to find parking. As a result, cars are frequently parked such that emergency vehicles would be unable to reach some properties in the event of a fire. Insufficient parking at the proposed Kier Group site is likely to further worsen the situation as residents of the new development seek alternative parking opportunities. This will without a doubt put more lives at risk in the event of a residential fire.

The height of the building is not in keeping with the existing buildings in Maylands. The existing Travelodge building should form as a marker for the maximum appropriate height of such a development. Having a high rise building like this at the entrance to a low rise town such as Hemel Hempstead is quite frankly an eye sore. When residents wish to make changes to their homes, the council requires that such adjustments be in keeping with the surrounding areas. Such rules should not be allowed to be flouted by large construction companies with money.

There is currently a line of woodland that flows along the edge of Maylands Avenue, and the trees in along here should be protected such that adjustments to the width or height is forbidden. Moreover, consideration should be given to the screening these provide during the summer months.

It is worth noting that the trees do not provide screening during the winter months. As such any balconies or windows above the level of the buildings in the streets the complex that face residential areas will have views over and into the other properties. Consideration for the adjustment of plans so that the balconies are removed should be given. Additional consideration should be given for the use of frosted or privacy glass where the windows look out over the residential properties behind.

Finally, the board should consider whether the plans are seeking the best for the local area or that of Kier Groups profits. Whilst I appreciate the need for additional residential properties within Hemel Hempstead, the appropriateness of cramming so many properties into such a dense and already congested area of town should be considered carefully. I'd ask the planning team to consider whether Kier Group's short term profit margins are more important than the long term visuals of Hemel Hempstead as a town, and the current congestion issues that Hertfordshire County Council are attempting to battle.

41 NEW PARK DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QJ	I am worried about the height of the building, the amount of extra traffic it will bring to the surrounding area and also the lack of adequate parking .
13 GREENWAY,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QG	<p>The amount of flats and not realistic provision of car park will drastically affect the scarce spaces in neighboring road.</p> <p>Potential parking permits in neighboring roads without provision of paid or free car park within 1 miles will affect the home business and social life of neighbours.</p> <p>The increment in road traffic will worsen the already overcrowded road, particularly the roundabout in Mayland avenue and St Albans road at pick hours.</p> <p>the height of the building will affect our privacy due to overlooking.</p>
1 GREENWAY,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QG	<p>The housing density for this plan is too high. Where are all the residents going to park? The whole plan needs to be reduced in scale. Give everybody, both new and existing residents more space to enjoy. The height of the proposed block will be oppressive to surrounding area. People should not be squeezed together like this.</p>
16 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH	<p>I object with this planning in its current form because there is not enough parking being allocated for these flats. Therefore, this does not meet Dacorum Borough Council's requirement and will have a huge impact on The Flags and the already busy residential roads.</p> <p>The Flags already has inadequate parking for the residence of this cul-de-sac and if at peak times there was to be a fire the emergency services would not be able to get through. By Kier Group proposing to build flats & office space and not supplying adequate parking this will make the situation a lot worse as we have direct access via a public footpath.</p> <p>Although they say they have reduced it by 1 floor it is still larger than the Travelodge & Lok'n'Store on the same site and it's not in keeping with the rest of the buildings in Maylands Avenue.</p> <p>The congestion in Maylands Avenue and surrounding roads off the roundabout is likely to get worse and Kier Group would need to consider making these surrounding roads more accessible as part of this plan.</p> <p>The trees that line the boundary between the Industrial Estate and the residential area of Adeyfield do not provide a screen during the winter months. Therefore, the noise will also have a big impact on the surrounding neighborhood and any Bat roosts in the trees.</p>
31 NEW PARK DRIVE,HEMEL	The information that has been sent is misleading. The images suggest the building will be in line with

HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QJ	<p>the current high rise building - the Travelodge. However, after reading its clear the image has been created form a particular angle that makes it look a similar height.</p> <p>The next problem is the severe lack of parking facilities for both residential and business parking.</p> <p>I live behind the proposed build and there is already issue with parking. My neighbours are a four car family, with only one driveway space. We frequently visit the park on Briery way and it is always filled with cars parked that have walked through the alleyway to get to the industrial estate. I have witnessed them doing this in the morning. I know that businesses on the industrial estate have limited parking and often not enough parking for their employees (Vanarama for example)</p> <p>Our street also has an alleyway (opposite my house) that will very conveniently lead to this proposed development. I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that both residents, residents partners, friends and family and business employees will use this road to access the development at all times of the day.</p> <p>Whilst i appreciate that affordable housing is needed - it seems that it is all being built in the same area without the planning and thought for the surrounding area and people who have worked hard to purchase their properties. I know that in the future if we decide to move potential buyers will be put off by parking issues and an overlooking high rise development.</p> <p>Careful consideration also needs to be made about rubbish facilities - we are already experiencing problems with rats (in lofts and gardens) because of the food developments. Large bin areas will add to this problem.</p> <p>Also, we are a hugely developing town that has very limited access to essential facilities. This amount of people will add even more pressure to the struggling Watford hospital. We can't even offer an A&E to all these residents.</p>
57 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4HH	<p>I have already commented on the parking disaster this will cause. I walk past this site every day walking the dog. The roundabout is virtually gridlocked most days between 8 and 9. This and the other development on the other side of the road is going to make this worse.</p> <p>Kier have been very mendacious and inaccurate in both</p>

	<p>the publicity info and also, I believe, in the side elevations in the planning submission. The 12 storey block will be half the height again of the Travelodge which is already intrusive and will be on a slightly higher elevation. The 10 storey block on the other end will be almost twice the height of the lok'n'store and BSI, which. These will dwarf the entire area and create an eyesore to the whole of Adeyfield. It would also create a precedent the wil be many more such developments..</p> <p>The 'statement building' argument is claptrap. This is a cheap block of flats. No doubt the argument for having the Travelodge at 8 storeys was that it would be a 'statement at Hemel Gateway' Hemel doesn't need another cheap nasty 'statement' building.</p> <p>This development should be reduced to 6 storey, like the similar developments on Maylands, with NO reduction in the parking provided.</p>
<p>13 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH</p>	<p>The proposed development is likely to adversely impact traffic and parking in the local area. There is already huge congestion in this area at peak times which means even a short journey needs to be planned to avoid sitting in queues. The residents' parking in the nearby streets is already a problem, particularly in the evenings and weekends. Additional requirements for residential parking in the neighbourhood due to inadequate provision on the proposed new development would mean additional strain on the availability of spaces in the streets around our houses and inevitably dangerous parking on pavements with limited emergency access.</p> <p>There are already proposals for massive residential and commercial development In and around Hemel Hempstead and I would hope that consideration would be made on the impact this would have on the infrastructure, e.g. schools, hospital, and other public amenities.</p>
<p>84 NINIAN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 6NB</p>	<p>This area is already built up enough during peak times as it is, this will cause road works, road closures, less parking etc causin this main stretch of hemel becomming even more of a nightmare. the roundabout is a mess at the best of time let alone once this starts get goin.</p> <p>where is there goin to be atleast 2 spaces per flat goin to be accomodated? the parking is bad enough around that area as it is.</p> <p>i hugely disagree with more flats being stuck here because an area of land is there to be used, maylands already has plenty of builds goin up and is already</p>

	<p>becoming an overly populated area for the space it has.</p>
<p>171 FENNYCROFT ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP1 3NP</p>	<p>The parking will not be sufficient and will cause an over-spill into the surrounding residential roads. There are already too many commuters trying to exit Hemel via the M1, Will there be any infrastructure changes to accommodate 250+ flats trying to exit the property via Maylands onto an already over crowded exit route? Not to mention where their children are going to school or what doctors surgery they are going to use?</p> <p>It is also too tall and going to overlook all the surrounding residential streets, I would like some privacy in my parents back garden (new park drive) which will be forcibly removed by this development, it will also block out AM light by casting a shadow over the houses directly impacting quality of life by preventing sunshine reaching properties in the mornings.</p>
<p>31 NEW PARK DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QJ</p>	<p>First issue: Misleading information. It's hard not to feel like local residents are being duped as to the exact nature of the height of the buildings proposed for construction. The images appear to show that the building will be the same height as the Travelodge. But dig a little deeper and it will clearly be taller - are we seriously supposed to feel like we're being given "all the information" when you resort to these shambolic deception tactics?</p> <p>Second issue: Parking, which will be an ever-worsening nightmare. What are the plans? Where are the residents of 268 flats and 1095 square metres of office space going to park? In my road? In the surrounding roads? This has clearly not been thought through.</p> <p>Third issue: Walking traffic. Opposite our house in an alleyway that connect through to the proposed placement of this building. Is New Park Drive set to become a car park and place to traipse throughout the day? What about kids - who already cause problems in the area with motorbikes and general bad (sometimes criminal) behaviour?</p> <p>Fourth issue: Vermin. The presence of restaurants is already causing issues for people in the road. More people means more rubbish means more vermin. Again, there's been no thought spared for this problem. And if there has, it should be shared, right?</p> <p>Fifth issue: Pressure on local amenities including hospitals, schools, doctors, police, fire, etc. Our local services are already overstretched. This development just means more people and more burden. It's not right, and current residents should not have to pay an even</p>

	<p>higher price for local service access.</p> <p>In summation, even if the images and information already given wasn't incredibly misleading, this development is only going to put more pressure on residents and services in the local area. It is short-sighted and opportunistic, and could not have been a worse place to develop (considering the development already taking place in this area). My objection to this project couldn't be stronger.</p>
<p>11 HILLDOWN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP1 3JE</p>	<p>I live on the other side of Hemel Hempstead, however my family home, owned and occupied by my parents, will be directly, negatively, affected by the proposal in it current format.</p> <p>I acknowledge the need for additional houses, and indeed development, in the area, and agree that the currently unoccupied site that Kier Property are proposing to develop would be a good site to do so.</p> <p>I disagree strongly with the proposed height of the buildings, in particular the marker buildings. As the Design and access statement explains, the buildings across the site will all be designed at different heights to blend well with the current infrastructure, which I think is a positive decision.</p> <p>I don't agree, however, that any of the buildings should be noticeably taller than the current Travelodge building that's already in place. The 'design and access statement' explains that the surrounding buildings will be used as 'shoulder height' for the proposed new building, however I feel the description here is inadequate as the proposed buildings are stated to be up to 12 storeys high, which is using the phrase 'shoulder height' very leniently when this is more than double some of the buildings already in place (which are being used as a 'shoulder height' reference).</p> <p>To clarify, I don't believe that any building should be more than a maximum of 1 storey taller than the Travelodge building; this is based on the objects received when the Travelodge was built originally, regarding the height of the hotel. The residents have already had to accept this 'giant' building overlooking them, and it would be disrespectful to ask them to accept even taller building ruining their views (not to mention the negative affect on their property value or indeed their levels of sunlight!).</p>

In the start of the provided 'development update newsletter', as provided in the application, the site is called "highly visible" and there is comment stating that "a marker building of prominence" is required to match this. I'd like to politely remind the developers that, yes, it is a highly visible site, from ALL angles that include many residential areas, and its understandable that many of these residents would not want to look out of their windows to see a whole development, let alone one that towers above their property by a monstrous amount. I am also concerned by the need to make a building 'prominent'.

I also urge Kier Property to revisit the parking plan for the development. I have read the parking note provided by ADL Traffic and Highways Engineering LTD, and whilst I acknowledge the Dacorum Car Ownership by Type of Dwelling (2011 Census) data, I believe it to be very short-sighted to use only this data when designing the available parking for the development. The location of the development leads it to be desired by commuters and those wishing to access the M1, who are likely to own their own cars and require at least one car parking space per dwelling. Alongside the high likelihood of more than one car per household, there are currently not plans to accommodate the proposed 40 full time members of staff who will be working on the development, or indeed any visitors of those who live in any of the properties. I strongly urge Kier Property to consider extra parking facilities, or less dwellings to reduce this need.

I don't recall reading any plans to support the vehicles accessing the M1 - it's apparent that the traffic from the development will need to access the main road and indeed the Motorway, and with the current layout of the roads adjacent to the roundabout, this is going to be difficult to do with an influx of vehicles, causing huge delays for all commuters in that area. I believe this needs further thoughts about the affects of adding an extra over-200 dwellings into an already busy area.

I support the proposal to include office space and commercial use of the land also, as this acknowledges the need to increase all nearby services with an influx of residents in the area. I don't believe that consideration has been given to other areas of growth that need to be in line with residential growth, such as the increase of schools and education centres. That area of Hemel Hempstead already has hugely oversubscribed primary schools that are being forced to take extra students into the school (with no extra support from the council), and an influx of new children will all need (and deserve) a top

	<p>quality education that they don't have to travel miles for.</p> <p>I urge Kier Property to reconsider the height of the buildings and the negative impact this could have on local residents privacy, sunlight levels and property value. I urge them to reconsider the lack of parking and the negative affect this will have on the surrounding areas, particularly the residential areas directly surrounding the development. I urge them to give consideration to the traffic implications of the spine road leading directly out into the main road, and the levels of vehicles who will be using this. I urge them to give consideration to the affect of such a large number of properties and the quality of life for those new residents, particularly children and their right to a good quality, local, education.</p> <p>I agree that the land has potential growth opportunities, and am supportive of the current site being redeveloped, but believe very strongly that this redevelopment must not come at the cost of the current residents who have called this area their homes for many years.</p>
<p>64 POYNDERS HILL,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4PH</p>	<p>I object to this planning of the Kier building as the added vehicles to an already very congested area in the industrial area of Hemel Hempstead would cause a complete standstill of traffic. I have to get to the motorway from where I live in the rush hour and just those two miles can take longer than my whole journey at the moment, it would be impossible if this application goes ahead. This planning is not viable. I hope you think again. I strongly object.</p>
<p>1 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH</p>	<p>I live in the Flags which lies behind this proposed project I object to the project based on the impact it will have on local residents. I have lived here since 1983 and my in laws before from when these houses were built in 1964</p> <p>The impact will be the parking of cars in the Flags and surrounding streets. This is happening now where I see people park and walk through. This is from existing companies so with these new flats and offices being built it will definitely happen more and more. The planning info that we had through our door said there will be adequate parking but this is probably based on 1 car per flat. The same was done for the Kodak tower and many had to park in Park Road or the Sports Centre as nowhere to park</p> <p>This is an old issue as Lucas and before that when Rotax workers used the street to park and after a campaign you the council put up resident only parking signs which solved the problem</p> <p>This time there will a bigger parking problem and we</p>

	<p>residents are the ones who will be affected. I strongly object to this development. More flats but less schools and no hospital and no one can see an issue in that alone! Flats further up by Tesco have squatters and drug waste left outside (as shown on social media) so will these flats attract the same tenants? Crazy money making schemes with no concern for what our town is becoming</p>
<p>24 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH</p>	<p>I am objecting to the recent plans to build flats and offices behind my house.</p> <p>I feel the application has misleading photos, showing the building a lot lower than it will be. the travelodge is 8 storeys high and this will be 12. It is shown in the picture to be the same height. The majority of buildings across Maylands are a lot lower in height than these plans. I feel privacy will be lost to such a lovely quiet, private neighbourhood.</p> <p>I am also very concerned about where all these people who will be living and working there will park. Majority of 1 bedroom flats will now have 2 adults living in them, with 2 cars. There aren't even enough spaces for 1 per flat and 1 per anticipated member of staff in the offices. This could really affect a lot of local residents in The Flags and other streets surrounding. If this plan does go ahead, I feel it would be acceptable for us to expect our road will be made residents only, to protect such a lovely quiet road and not cause us any problems parking near our houses.</p> <p>Also I would like to question about part of the plans, as it is not very clear to me. It looks as if there will be an entrance/access from the alley way going between lol n store and the flats, to get to the development. This will encourage people even more to park this end, if they have an easy access from there. It will also cause a lot more noise disruption with people coming and going, and give people living in the flats a place for hanging about smoking or drinking after a night out.</p>
<p>4 GREENWAY,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QG</p>	<p>Kier have revised their plans since the neighbourhood consultation, however it is incorrect for them to convey the opinion that they have support from the local neighbourhood. Most people are against the development.</p> <p>They make statements that local transport is good, but their own business consultants have stated that transport is poor, so it would not be any use for prospective</p>

	<p>commuters from the development. The train station is over 3 miles away and is not easily walkable on a daily basis. Nor is it commutable by bike daily, due to the hills that must be encountered to get there, some steep. The bus service is inadequate, driving residents towards greater car ownership, or use of the 1 club car between the 100 or so who statistically do not own a car.</p> <p>Their parking provisions are inadequate for the proposed residents, given the standard of properties they intend to provide. They have also not made provision for visitors to the properties, who no doubt would not park on Maylands Avenue (a busy main road) but may well park on (in)convenient side roads (The Flags, New Park Mews, Maddox Road, New Park Drive). The overall effect on these already congested side streets would be appalling. Indeed, at certain times of day, Maylands Avenue itself is heavily congested, with tailbacks from the Travel Lodge all the way to Wood Lane End and beyond (and vice versa). Turning right out of the development is currently not easy which may cause people to take either unnecessary risks (potential accidents), or turn left and then perform U turns at the first traffic lights. Kier's documents indicate convenient rush hour access to M1 Junction 8. It can take up to 1 hour to get to Junction 8 from the roundabout by the Travelodge during peak periods.</p> <p>Kier have made many mentions about the protection given by the mature trees with a canopy of 20 metres, but their development exceeds this height. The documents that Kier have circulated around the neighbourhood purport the buildings to be the same level as Lok N Store, but the plans show that some of the buildings exceed this by at least two stories, which will lead properties in The Flags, New Park Drive, New Park Mews, Greenway and Maddox Road to be overlooked. Additionally, these trees are not evergreen, so between Autumn and Spring the protection is significantly reduced, with increase overlooking and presumably increased noise pollution.</p> <p>Keir's Site Location Plans contain inaccuracies. Three documents have marked "Greenway" as "Maddox Road" (44819901, 44819902 and 44820280). What other inaccuracies or miscalculations are elsewhere?</p>
<p>4 GREENWAY,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QG</p>	<p>Kier have revised their plans since the neighbourhood consultation, however it is incorrect for them to convey the opinion that they have support from the local neighbourhood. Most people are against the development.</p> <p>They make statements that local transport is good, but their own business consultants have stated that transport is poor, so it would not be any use for prospective</p>

	<p>commuters from the development. The train station is over 3 miles away and is not easily walkable on a daily basis. Nor is it commutable by bike daily, due to the hills that must be encountered to get there, some steep. The bus service is inadequate, driving residents towards greater car ownership, or use of the 1 club car between the 100 or so who statistically do not own a car.</p> <p>Their parking provisions are inadequate for the proposed residents, given the standard of properties they intend to provide. They have also not made provision for visitors to the properties, who no doubt would not park on Maylands Avenue (a busy main road) but may well park on (in)convenient side roads (The Flags, New Park Mews, Maddox Road, New Park Drive). The overall effect on these already congested side streets would be appalling. Indeed, at certain times of day, Maylands Avenue itself is heavily congested, with tailbacks from the Travel Lodge all the way to Wood Lane End and beyond (and vice versa). Turning right out of the development is currently not easy which may cause people to take either unnecessary risks (potential accidents), or turn left and then perform U turns at the first traffic lights. Kier's documents indicate convenient rush hour access to M1 Junction 8. It can take up to 1 hour to get to Junction 8 from the roundabout by the Travelodge during peak periods.</p> <p>Kier have made many mentions about the protection given by the mature trees with a canopy of 20 metres, but their development exceeds this height. The documents that Kier have circulated around the neighbourhood purport the buildings to be the same level as Lok N Store, but the plans show that some of the buildings exceed this by at least two stories, which will lead properties in The Flags, New Park Drive, New Park Mews, Greenway and Maddox Road to be overlooked. Additionally, these trees are not evergreen, so between Autumn and Spring the protection is significantly reduced, with increase overlooking and presumably increased noise pollution.</p> <p>Keir's Site Location Plans contain inaccuracies. Three documents have marked "Greenway" as "Maddox Road" (44819901, 44819902 and 44820280). What other inaccuracies or miscalculations are elsewhere?</p> <p>I Object strongly to this development.</p>
<p>21 MASONS ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 4QP</p>	<p>I object to this building being any higher than the properties adjacent to it, travelodge and storage unit. It will be an eyesore for residents and is not in keeping if the rest of the area.</p> <p>In addition another 250 approx. dwellings with one or two cars each will have a significant impact on congestion in</p>

	<p>the area as well as local parking.</p> <p>The location is an industrial area with limited amenities for more housing.</p> <p>The number of flats and overall height of the buildings needs to be addressed and reduced. it should not always be about making money, peoples well being and the environment should be considered.</p>
<p>7 NEW PARK DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QE</p>	<p>Maylands Avenue was originally designated land for industry and businesses moving out from London. It is worryingly becoming more and more residential.</p> <p>Too many new homes being built in Hemel and our services are continually being stretched. We need a new hospital not more houses/flats!!! Where will children go to school? Are new schools planned?</p> <p>I live in New Park Drive and fear the increase in traffic down my once quiet road. Cars use our road for a cut through and speed round the bend I live on. The new development will bring a greater volume of traffic. I would favour speed humps put in.</p> <p>Not enough parking for proposed development and residents will spill into New Park Drive. Do you propose issuing residents with parking permits?</p> <p>Artist impression is wrong and completely misleading. Travel Lodge is 8 storeys high and new development will be 12. Much higher than drawing suggests and will invade resident privacy. A correct drawing to scale MUST be issued to those this impacts on.</p>
<p>LITTLE COXPOND FARMHOUSE,LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4HL</p>	<p>We have just returned from holiday to find that we have only until today to object to the proposed Kier application. Having taken the trouble to explain why the proposed height of the building was totally unacceptable and the parking was totally inadequate we were informed that we had been timed out and our complete message was deleted.</p> <p>Suffice it to say that should this application be passed without very substantial modification we will have no hesitation in instructing our solicitors to instigate legal proceedings.</p>
<p>14 GREENWAY,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QG</p>	<p>The development has not been shown to scale in the drawings as it will be far higher than the current travelodge. The buildings will over look all the houses</p>

	<p>behind in the new park drive area giving us no privacy at the front of our houses. I believe there is also a planned roof terrace giving us even less privacy.</p> <p>There are fewer than 1/2 a parking space per flat which is completely unrealistic in this day and age as most household have at least one car and this also doesn't allow for any parking for the retail units.</p> <p>I currently drive to Welwyn every day and it takes at least 20 minutes every morning to queue along Breakspear way. The traffic deteriorated further with the closure of the road where the cemetery is and once this retail park has opened, traffic in and out of hemel will be at a standstill at rush hour. Another development of more than 250 homes will cause even more traffic to an already over congested road network.</p>
<p>23 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH</p>	<p>The proposed buildings will invade on the privacy of my back garden due to the number of stories. Having a young family, privacy is important to me.</p> <p>The sun light will be blocked by the proposed buildings, due to the position of my house and where the sun shines through, this will mean I will lose nearly all natural sunlight from my garden and rear of my house</p> <p>As the site will be on an already highly congested main route to/from the area (it can take 30 - 40mins to reach the M1 most mornings), there is huge potential to make it impossible to travel at peak times.</p> <p>As the proposed buildings are some what higher than the current buildings around it, it will be an eyesore and may put people off buying houses in the neighbouring area.</p> <p>Having been born in this town and lived here my whole life, I believe people want houses, not flats or apartments</p> <p>The proposed development area does not adequately accommodate for car parking, with most properties having at least one or two cars, this will mean people will use the neighbouring streets, which are already busy for current residents</p>
<p>37 HIGHLAND DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 8PT</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed construction for plots 2 & 3 Kier Park Maylands Avenue HP2 4FQ citing the road infrastructure is unable to accommodate the resultant extra traffic flow.</p> <p>I live adjacent to the Maylands avenue roundabout, the traffic noise is already disproportionately loud and constant day and night, I am unable to have my windows facing the road open for this reason and the heavy black residue from exhaust emissions.</p> <p>I use public transport to travel home from work and the 320 bus can take up to 30 minutes to travel the length of Maylands Avenue in rush hour and the roundabout is constantly gridlocked when there are problems with any of the motorways surrounding us.</p> <p>Add to this problem the new shopping centre due to open</p>

	soon opposite this proposed site, the additional vehicles associated with 268 new flats, one or two cars per flat, is just totally unacceptable for the present road system.
10 BURLEIGH ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4PT	There are so many new housing and commercial developments being built on or around Maylands Avenue, it has lost its purpose as an industrial estate. The roads are fit to bursting point as it is, so unless you are planning to turn Maylands Avenue and Leverstock Green roads into dual carriageway with traffic light junctions, the town will not be able to cope with the increased amount of traffic on these roads and will be standstill for pretty much the whole day. Not a very environmentally friendly approach to town planning, is it really??
FERNDAL, GROSVENOR TERRACE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP1 1QJ	I object to the planning application for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased traffic to the local area and will affect access to and from the M1 which is already congested - Insufficient parking in the current proposed plans which would affect the surrounding area parking. - Insufficient plans to increase other amenities that Hemel Hempstead would need i.e. hospital, schools, etc
26 EAST MIMMS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 5XR	Whilst I understand that we do need new houses and flats in Hemel Hempstead I feel that this development will create a number of issues: 1) The high of the flats will overshadow the existing residents of Greenaways and New Park Drive. This will effect the light into their gardens and properties and thus effect their quality of life. It would be preferable for the high of the flats to be restricted to the same height as the Travel Lodge. 2) The proposed number of parking spaces for the residents of the flats is far too low. People buying these properties are highly likely to commute as they are based near the motorway and the train station allows for easy and quick access to London. These people will have cars and with not enough parking spaces available people will park around the New Park Drive area and this will prevent local residents from parking near their properties. This is particularly not fair for elderly residents or families with children. 3) If the residents in the flats have children there are not enough primary school spaces locally and with School budgets being cut this will add additional pressure on local schools. 4) The traffic around the Industrial estate is already

	<p>heavily congested and to add this amount of additional properties on top of all the other the other new flats being built on the Industrial Estate will just make traffic unbearable.</p>
<p>9 NEW PARK DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QQ</p>	<p>I hugely disagree with the size of this building I moved here to get away from a concrete jungle, I have been very happy living here for the past 7 years if this building goes ahead I will be looking out my front room window and see this monstrosity, I have a tree outside my home and blocks a lot of light if this thing goes up i may as wall move into a cave. Bring it down in line with the height of the surrounding buildings please.</p>
<p>36 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4HJ</p>	<p>Maylands Avenue is the gateway to the Industrial Estate and is not a residential area. Kier's literature is very misleading - the perspective of the picture is wrong as it depicts the height of the proposed development of 12 storeys as being the same height as the Travelodge which is only 8 storeys high.</p> <p>Maylands Avenue and the roundabout at the junction with St Albans Road is always totally congested at peak times in the morning and evening during the week. It serves everyone coming in to and out of the town from the M1.</p> <p>Increased traffic means increased air pollution.</p> <p>The proposed parking provision is totally inadequate. Virtually all flat owners will require one parking space and a very high proportion will require two spaces. It also does not take into account adequate parking provision for business use. Where will everyone park? Local streets will become "car parks" and will be dangerous for pedestrians and children alike. Current local residents will not be able to park outside their own homes.</p> <p>The local infrastructure does not support a development of this size - there are insufficient local school places and doctors' surgeries to support an influx of residents of the number proposed. When we attended the consultation meeting at Adeyfield Community Centre, we were surprised to be told by a lady from Kier that the new residents could use the One Stop Doctor on the Industrial Estate - she had obviously not done her research as this is a private facility not an NHS surgery.</p> <p>We do not agree with the key benefits claimed by Kier in their literature and feel strongly that the height of the</p>

	<p>proposed development should be reduced to conform to the height of other neighbouring buildings in the local vicinity.</p>
<p>51 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4HH</p>	<p>Height - misleading photograph on latest Development Update Newsletter Parking - Unacceptable parking provision</p>
<p>37 NEW PARK DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QJ</p>	<p>I strongly object as the height of the block would exceed those in immediate area and be an invasion of privacy to local residents including myself. Furthermore, there are not sufficient parking spaces for the residents. There are already people parking in New Park Drive to go to work in offices on Maylands due to lack of parking facilities and public car parks - this obviously impacts us and things will only get worse when the other developments are put in place on Maylands as there has been no real thought to infrastructure to an area that is and has always suffered with great congestion. The Maylands area is an industrial estate and whilst I appreciate the needs for more housing especially social housing, this is not an appropriate or realistic place to build high rise flats.</p>
<p>3 NEW PARK DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QE</p>	<p>Objection on the grounds :</p> <p>I understand that we need to provide extra housing and am not being unreasonable, but I feel that trying to put that many people into such a small amount of space is not forward thinking. People generate transport and movement, especially where this proposal is situated right next to a motorway and nowhere near a railway station so you would definitely need a car to live there. With half the amount of parking spaces to flats proposed, this will encourage people to abandon their vehicles in and around surrounding residential roads and main roads within the industrial estate that will snarl up an already very busy area.</p> <p>The height of this proposal is still too tall, even though it has been reduced. We were told they wanted it to be imposing and stand out as a statement building when entering the Industrial estate, but I suspect the architects would not design such a tall building plus a roof garden overlooking their own property. Even changing the colour to a gradual sky blue on the back overlooking streets and putting less windows on that side would at least look as if they had half considered resident's feelings.</p> <p>Along with the above there is congestion on the already busy roundabout that is at a standstill most weekday mornings and the lack of schools, as the local ones nearest to this development are full.</p> <p>Please reconsider the size of this project and be realistic with parking.</p>

<p>10 MADDUX ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 4QF</p>	<p>Number of parking spaces. All we were told is parking is exsisting which already is used. You have flats, businesses going up and it will greatly effect the already congested parking in Maddox road and new park drive and all the others because there is a walk through by the storage company which they will use. You need lots more parking spaces as we know another housing plot is where the garages are behind your plot. So 100,s of new homes but no parking is being added.</p>
<p>48 NEW PARK DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 4QE</p>	<p>I object to the proposed planning application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The height of the proposed building is twice the heights of similar developments in this area. 2. The number of car parking spaces allocated is totally inadequate for a development of this size and therefore the surrounding streets will have to be used for overflow parking which is totally unfair on the residents who live in the surrounding streets.
<p>2 HARRIER CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 0FW</p>	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. The industrial estate is already cojested enough as it is this will just add to the problem. As Maylands is an industrial estate I believe there should be no residential housing here in my opinion.</p>
<p>12 MARNHAM RISE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP1 3JL</p>	<p>Where are the children going to go to school? The schools in this area are already over subscribed. How is all the traffic going to be directed around the roundabout in front? It is already very congested with long delays in the mornings and afternoons. Where are all the cars/visitor going to park? Most households have more than one car.</p>
<p>49 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 4HH</p>	<p>Understand the need for more dwellings in general, however Maylands avenue is an industrial estate and by its placement was not designed for Residential. The congestion at the Maylands avenue roundabout serving M1, Leverstock Green & Hemel Hemsptead is already an issue at times, this will just compound the issue several fold. The height of the buildings should be no taller than the Travelodge, in fact these should be considerably lower as they impact on peoples privacy in the adjacent long established residential area. Parking also appears to be inadequate and likely impact locally. Further consideration needs to be given to adjacent residents by arriving at some form of compromise on height and parking. Finally the residential part of this application is to far from schools and services (Its an industrial area). Its the responsibility of the Council to improve the image of Hemel Hempstead, this application does the opposite. This development is likely to contribute to Hemel Hempstead being put back on top spot voted worst town in the country.</p>

<p>47 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4HH</p>	<p>The Buildings are too high and will overlook and interfere with the enjoyment of existing dwellings. The height also causes concerns due to fire evacuation ie Grenfell scenario. The roads are already congested and parking will definitely be an issue.</p>
<p>40 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4HJ</p>	<p>We are already over shadowed by the hotel and the proposed 8 stories development was to be very unwelcome. The recent proposal of 12 stories is totally Unacceptable and detrimental to the houses of leverstock green road. Not only in the shadow cast by its stature our view will be considerably compromised this in turn will have a negative impact on the value of the properties in the shadow of this development.</p>
<p>55 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4HH</p>	<p>Dear Sir / Madam. Although I am not a direct neighbour of this planned construction I have concerns over the height of the building. Our house and garden are currently private and not over looked. I'm concerned that this new development will remove our privacy. I'm also concerned about the lack of parking being provided to this development. Roads in our area are already becoming congested with parked vehicles. Building this development with only a small number of parking spaces (compared to the number of planned homes) will increase the on road parking requirements in the area. I would like to see the building lowered in height to the same as they storage units next door. I feel for the residence of the home closer to the planned site as the height of the building and number of people moving in with cars to park will affect them greatly.</p>
<p>3 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH</p>	<p>I note in the letter I received today from Dacorum Borough Council, the proposal is now 1404.5 sq metres of office space. This is a considerable increase of the initial proposal of 1095 sq metres! How can a 28.3% increase be justified? It seems to me that all of the comments made on this website voicing concerns about parking, privacy and traffic continue to be unheard. The latest 'additional information' shown on the website states "an additional 721 vehicles per day is unlikely to cause a significant impact". This beggars belief - whoever penned these remarks has obviously not been in a vehicle on the dual carriageway during rush hour traffic. At times it can take longer to reach the entrance to Junction 8 of the M1 than it takes for the rest of the journey into London.</p>

	<p>I continue to object but sadly now have little faith that any objections will be taken into consideration.</p>
<p>10 GREENWAY,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QG</p>	<p>Having seen 60 comments objecting to your development, imagine my surprise to see that you are proposing to expand the office space available rather than reviewing the whole project.</p> <p>I come back to comments I made previously.</p> <p>Firstly there is no demand for additional office space in Hemel. The Marketing Report attached clearly demonstrates this, showing that only 106k sq ft are being moved per annum and this is projected to be below 80k in 2019. Furthermore, problems with transport, accessibility, poor landscaping etc are making Maylands less attractive to potential tenants who are more likely to take up space in Watford and St Albans.</p> <p>Brasier Freeth confirm that marketing efforts for the site to date have seen little interest. So why build offices when we are simply going to add to the nearly 400k sq ft of currently vacant space in Hemel?</p> <p>The report clearly states that public transport is not up to scratch. In fact the passage below is damning:</p> <p>'Bus routes to Hemel town centre, Watford and Rickmansworth are limited and considered not to be fast or frequent. By way of example, the bus route to Hemel mainline station is the ML1 running every 30 minutes. As a consequence, business people very often pay for taxis . Bus routes to St Albans, Harpenden, Berkhamsted and Chesham would require changing to a second bus along the route.</p> <p>The air quality report also estimates increases in traffic along Maylands South and St Albans Road by 1100 and 1178 vehicles a day. This is clearly ludicrous in an already congested zone.</p> <p>Both reports clearly contradict the traffic report provided as part of the application. I trust this will be taken very seriously by the planning committee.</p> <p>Nowhere in this application are the frequently quoted concerns about hospitals, GPs, schools or leisure facilities covered. Where will the residents of these 267 flats (presumably around 500 people) go?</p>

	<p>The council will have to do wonders to convince the local community that approving this application is in the interests of our town and not just Kier Group or anyone else with a financial stake. They certainly need to explain very clearly how this influx of people is going to be well serviced without causing major disruption.</p> <p>Business estates should not be mixed with residential areas. Working environments should be pleasant, spacious and allow people to be productive. But they should not infringe on people's personal living space, something that is happening more and more around the Maylands estate.</p> <p>This feels like another example of big corporate business running roughshod over hardworking citizens who simply want to live peacefully and comfortably in their local community, rather than having their locality ruined by high rises, traffic congestion, noise and light pollution and everything else that is generated by a major development such as this.</p> <p>Yes, build more housing in Hemel but do it in residential areas. And don't build more offices - give us a hospital, something every single person in this town would vote for.</p>
<p>57 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 4HH</p>	<p>Cannot see any improvement. Still way too obtrusively high, still too many flats, more office space (more cars), still woefully inadequate parking which will have a horrendous knock on effect to a large area of Adeyfield. 6 storeys is the maximum reasonable height, with the same amount of parking. Should be refused out of hand - they are just fiddling with details. Very stressful for all neighbours.</p>
<p>34 SARRATT AVENUE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP2 7JF</p>	<p>Further to the comments made previously there appears to have been no consideration for the comments around parking. Moreover, the plans appear to increase the office space which was originally planned. It may be worth pointing out that the entirety of the old Dixons Carphone building has remained empty since they departed, and therefore additional office space is unlikely to be required.</p> <p>Parking. I refer to the travel plan which Kier have commissioned to address the parking issues. Section 1.2.1 states the aim of the travel plan to 'achieve a reduction in car use and an increase in walking, cycling and public transport use. By choosing to travel by more sustainable modes, residents will reduce congestion,</p>

emissions, air pollution and the use of finite fuel reserves, whilst improving health and fitness if selecting walking or cycling for their travel requirements where possible'. Firstly, in order for more people to utilise public transport, improved public transport infrastructure needs to be in place. Which currently it is not. Busses in Hemel Hempstead are unreliable, inconvenient and infrequent. As a result many of the residents for these flats are likely to utilise a car.

Moving on, section 1.2.1. The main objective of the travel plan is to 'reduce the traffic generated by the development to a lower level of car trips than would be predicted for the proposed site without the implementation of the travel plan'. So Keir are hopeful that the development will reduce the amount of cars being used, however clearly have no plans on how they are going to do this. You can't just encourage people to walk and cycle and then hope for the best. At 6:30am on 09/01/2019 the A414 leading to the M1 was already queuing with traffic - this is now normal for a working weekday. Kier Group hoping that people will walk or cycle simply isn't good enough.

My prediction is that the existing local residents will be the ones who are no longer able to access their properties, as people will use the surrounding streets as overflow car parks. This development allows for parking provisions of 1 space per unit, which provides no parking facilities for anyone residing in the properties with more than one vehicle. Moreover, any visitors will be required to overflow into neighbouring streets which are already hugely congested.

Section 3.3.2 states that there are 21 services a day on the Arriva Bus service to London. Travel on this service during peak times is already at capacity and this service would not be able to facilitate such additional numbers. Moreover, the other busses are infrequent and unreliable often late or not turning up.

The revisions to this application are embarrassing to say the least. Kier have failed to address the concerns of residents and continue to live in an idealistic world about the number of people that will use public transport instead of a car. It's almost as if they have chosen to shout the same message a little louder with their fingers in their ears not listening to residents. I stand behind my initial comments that such lack of parking present a danger to life as emergency vehicles will not be able to access some properties when the parking worsens after this development is complete.

	<p>Finally, I do not appreciate having to provide a response to a letter within 14 days, when the letter has been predated the 3rd, and then posted out 2nd class a day later. It is quite clear that some residents will not have sufficient time to provide further commentary because of this intentional delay. Rachel Marber should be held accountable for her lack of punctuality in sending on these letters.</p>
<p>16 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH</p>	<p>The council have not listened to any of the residents concerns around this development. The number of car parking spaces is too few for the number of units both residential and office space being made available. The surrounding roads are already too busy and this block of flats isn't going to help that</p>
<p>48 GREEN DELL WAY,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 8PX</p>	<p>Our main concern is the increased levels of traffic on already busy and stretched roads. Maylands has never been intended to be residential, yet every current development seems to be residential, as the revenue from this is far more beneficial for the developer and council alike. The increased noise and pollution from the many additional cars cannot benefit the health and well being of the residents that would live there or those that live in the surrounding roads.</p> <p>The amount of parking is totally inadequate, with just one space per flat, most households consist of two adults, who both drive and both have a car, where will the additional cars park? This is totally unrealistic in this day and age! Our view is they will start clogging up the surrounding roads making it completely unbearable and congested for those already currently living there. If you can't supply enough parking don't build so many flats! We understand the need for more housing but considered development is what we need here. On the land opposite this site are retail units and warehouses which will increase traffic and noise, let alone the addition of 268 flats! It may seem like a great idea to fit in so many flats into a small unused space as this but it feels like a pure monetary gain rather than social or community gain. Where are the additional facilities like doctors surgeries, dentists, and most importantly schools. Where will all these people go?? This has not been considered in the slightest.</p> <p>The fact that Maylands is not a dual carriageway or being developed to deal with increased traffic, at peak times this whole area will just become a car park and restrict access to our house and road. We are annoyed and</p>

	<p>frustrated that this development is being considered and feel that even though there are many objections the council will still give it the green light.</p>
<p>32 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH</p>	<p>I reiterate my comment from October 2017.</p> <p>While the parking for commercial premises has increased, the parking for residential premises has not and my previous comments have been completely ignored. I therefore state them again in the hope someone will listen,</p> <p>The parking for residential premises is utterly inadequate and will spill onto already busy surrounding roads. The planning application still shows a ration of spaces to flats of 1:1. It also states that Dacorum planning regulations state there should be 1.5 spaces per 2 bedroom property and 1.25 per one bedroom property. I therefore again submit that this proposal does not meet Dacorum's parking requirements,would cause immense on already busy roads and should therefore be rejected. I would also suggest that households in existing surrounding roads should be consulted about resident only parking.</p>
<p>17 NEW PARK DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QQ</p>	<p>I do not see why the height of the development is out of keeping with neighbouring buildings,and as such is over developing the area of the site.</p> <p>Also I feel there will be insufficient parking</p>
<p>36 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4HJ</p>	<p>As stated in your attachments to the planning application, the development still retains a commercial appearance. Maylands Avenue is not a residential area but a commercial area and as such cannot support a residential development of 268 flats.</p> <p>Whilst commercial parking has more than doubled from 27 to 65 spaces, provision for residential parking does not seem to have been increased! It is naive to assume each of the 268 flats will only have one car! Where are these 268 vehicles supposed to park?</p> <p>The increased traffic in Maylands South and St Albans Road will only add to the existing traffic congestion and air pollution which is both a ridiculous idea and a health hazard. The area is also dangerous for pedestrians with the only pedestrian pelican crossing being situated further along Maylands Avenue.</p> <p>As Brasier Freeth's report points out, there is very poor, if any, demand in the town for commercial lettings so there is little prospect of filling the vacant units. Indeed, a large number of schemes previously proposed for this site</p>

	<p>have already "fallen by the wayside", in part due to current planning use categories. It is in a prime location for passing commercial/industrial traffic and yet even the large on-site advertisement hoardings and other extensive advertising seem to have so far failed to attract prospective tenants!</p> <p>Public transport in the Maylands area is very poor and there are no facilities (such as schools or doctors' surgeries) for residential use in the area. Brasier Freeth's report confirms this.</p> <p>The development is still too high and the whole scheme is out of keeping with the rest of the surrounding area - it should not be allowed to go ahead.</p>
<p>59 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4HL</p>	<p>There appears to be little change to the amended application other than increase the office space from 1095 square metres to 1404.5 square metres and again 268 flats.</p> <p>None of the previous objections have been taken into account. The building is still far too high in relation to the other flats and buildings in Maylands. The provision for adequate parking spaces has not been addressed which will only lead to the overflow of cars parking in the surrounding residential area as has been the case at Cupid Green.</p> <p>Why the increase in office space when there are buildings still vacant in Maylands and by their own admission Kier have said they were unable to develop the site in 10 years as there was no appetite for office space.</p> <p>This site will only increase the impact on the environment, air pollution, public and health services not to mention the increase to congestion in this area.</p> <p>Kier is a company with a strong presence in the Dacorum area. This is also a company heavily debt laden with a slump in its share price with investors looking to remove the chief executive and finance director. It's no wonder they want to rid themselves of this site after 10 years, irrespective of the impact on the area.</p>
<p>56 NEW PARK DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QQ</p>	<p>The height of the proposed flats are out of context with the surrounding properties and should only be as high as the orange storage building which we can also see from our living room.</p> <p>There is insufficient parking at the flats which will impact on the roads nearby as it is the norm for 2 adults to have a car each. Where will they park?</p> <p>Where are children in the properties going to go to school as the nearest is Leverstock Green which is already oversubscribed?</p>

	<p>During rush hour traffic the industrial estate is gridlocked, these buildings are only going to make the situation worse!!</p>
<p>3 NEW PARK DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QE</p>	<p>This proposal concerning block A is still too tall. The Travelodge is apparently 29.5M high. The plans (2.11) state "The Travelodge building, Woolmer Drive apartment buildings and BSI building to the immediate north of our site have facilitated the identification of a zone where taller buildings between 20m and 30m might be located" yet the Tower A will potentially be over 40M high as it is at least half as tall again compared to the Travelodge. Also note the plans for the other new hotel between LokNStore and the BSI building is 22.3M high - making Tower A completely out of character with both their Strategic context and normal peoples view of the area.</p> <p>Section 2.15 states that the Travelodge was subject to a reserved matters application that REDUCED its height from the planned 34.5M to the actual 29.5M - how can the new application be considered valid if it substantially breaches the current 30M height of adjacent buildings. The plans tell me how deep the window cills are (150mm) and what bricks will be used, but nowhere does the actual height of Building A - or any other building get a mention. Misleading outline sketches showing the hotel as a solid block no doubt roughly scaled to the height of the small glass atrium on the roof above the staircase. Also the plans mention the new development being "slightly taller" than the Travelodge (at 8 stories) when the new tower will be 12 storeys. Thankfully the roof garden has been removed, but the windows have been enlarged increasing the amount they overlook my House/garden - thus impeding further on my privacy and devaluing my property - It will be scandalous if these plans are passed in this state.</p> <p>The report from Brasier Freeth points out the severe lack of public transport for this area, yet the plans state "currently several bus routes", there are 4, only 1 of which runs at weekends. The Travel plan shows 2 are morning/evening only Mon-Fri and the other one only server central London making these blanket statements a blatant misdirection. 2 Bed flats with poor public transport links but close to the Motorway will attract professionals that want road links, where in a high proportion of cases more than 1 car will be in the household. Add to that the fact that there is already practically no places available close to the development for Primary</p>

	<p>aged school children, so the addition of over 260 flats without the provision of more schooling means many parents will NEED a car just to get young children to school. The travel plan stating 2 miles is an acceptable walking distance for under 8 Yr old children is in all honesty a fantasy that is far removed from any fact based reality of modern parents.</p> <p>Maylands Plaza is just up the road and this shows the problem where not enough car spaces have been created for this social housing. This is evidenced with overnight/weekend parking in Duxons Turn which previous to the opening of the plaza was virtually non existent out of office hours. This is likely to get worse once Kylna court is completed in Wood Lane. Add to that the Car parking standard showing 366 spaces needed for this number of apartments but only 73% being provided and AGREED BY DBC - where do the council think these other 98 cars are going to be parked? Transport links are not good in this area so cutting car parking below accepted standards shows the DBC's complete lack of regard for existing local residents, leading to the conclusion that none of the planning team nor local Councillors actually live anywhere near this proposed development.</p>
<p>31 THE FLAGS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4QH</p>	<p>After reading all The revised plans I can see that none of the previous objections have been taken into account.</p> <p>We stand by all our previous comments!</p> <p>Maylands according to the sign is a Business Park and not a residential estate! 268 flats with the lead building being much taller than any other building in the whole of maylands is still to tall, this will likely be a eyesore!!</p> <p>268 flats with not enough parking is going to cause neighbouring streets to be used by both these residents and their visitors, The Flags will be used to park their cars and than walk straight down the alleyway to the flats! This in a road where cars already double park because of the lack of spaces!</p> <p>To think that the residents are going to walk or use public transport is at best wishful thinking, the infrastructure is not in place and being situated where it is the residents will more than likely need a car!</p> <p>The roads around the area are only going to get busier and at the moment going anywhere near Maylands in the morning/evening is a very slow process!</p>

	<p>Also not sure why plans are still in place for offices when the report clearly states that there is no requirement for office space as there are many empty offices already in Hemel Hempstead.</p> <p>I would like to know what is the point of the consultation process if you do not listen to any of the residents concerns. There have been over 70 objections and as far as I can see all Concerns have been ignored!!!</p>
<p>45 LEVERSTOCK GREEN ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP2 4HH</p>	<p>I think the revised plans still don't take into account the issues we as residents have raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building too tall and not in keeping with area 2. Traffic already a complete nightmare - trying to get to the M1 in the morning takes forever and that's without the increased traffic - not only by this specific development but all the other developments currently taking place. 3. Where will people park? Naive to believe that flats will only have 1 car 4. Currently we seem to be converting office spaces to flats in many places in Dacorum, clearly there is no need for additional office space so why build it if no market 5. Maylands is meant to be a business park, not residential 6. Public transport connections are poor meaning people will use cars - especially when so far away from the station <p>I oppose this proposed development.</p>