

4/02781/18/MFA	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF 21 ONE-BED FLATS
Site Address	MILBOR ENGINEERING HEMEL HEMPSTEAD LTD, BELSWAINS LANE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 9XE
Applicant	Hobbs Developments Ltd, Aston House
Case Officer	Rachel Marber
Referral to Committee	Contray views of Nash Mills Parish Council

1. Recommendation

- 1 That planning permission be **DELEGATED TO THE GROUP MANAGER WITH A VIEW TO APPROVAL** subject to satisfactory bat surveys and S.106 agreement for the following Heads of Terms:
 - Highway Improvement contribution of £16,875

2. Summary

2.1 The proposed residential use of the site is considered acceptable in principle. The proposal would result in substantial benefit by securing additional new homes on a brownfield site, helping to meet the Council's housing target. The development is therefore considered in accordance with the NPPF (2019), Policies NP1, CS1, CS2 CS4 and CS17 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policies 10, 31 and 34 of the Local Plan (2004) and Site Allocations 2006-2031 Map Books.

2.2 The scheme is also considered acceptable in terms of visual impact to the street scene, impact on non-designated heritage assets, securing a good standard of amenity for future and neighbouring residents, impact on highway safety and operation and other relevant matters; in accordance with the NPPF (2019), Policies CS8, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS18, CS19, CS26, CS27, CS28, CS31, CS32 and CS35 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policies 21, 18, 57, 58, 99, 100 and Appendices 3 and 5 of the Local Plan (2004).

3. Site Description

3.1 The application site is located to the south side of Belswains Lane accessible from Croxley Road. The site is located within a formally designated general employment area.

3.2 Large, mature Poplar trees form the north-west boundary of site. Immediately to the north of the site, along Belswains Lane, are 16th century cottages. These are not listed, but considered to be non-designated heritage assets.

3.3 The application site comprises an industrial building presently occupied by an

engineering and vehicle dismantling operation. The immediate area comprises the recent redevelopment of the former Nash Mills estate granted within app ref: 4/01382/09/MFA (Sappi development).

4. Proposal

4.1 The application seeks permission for the construction of a four storey building comprising 21 one bed flats.

4.2 29 parking spaces would be accommodated within the site to facilitate the development.

5. Relevant History

No Relevant Planning History

6. Policies

6.1 National Policy Guidance (2019)

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

6.2 Adopted Core Strategy (2013)

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
CS17 - New Housing
CS18 - Mix of Housing
CS19 - Affordable Housing
CS26 - Green Infrastructure
CS27 - Quality of the Historic Environment
CS28 - Carbon Emission Reductions
CS31 - Water Management
CS32 - Air, Soil and Water Quality
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 34 – Other Land with Established Employment Generating Uses
Policy 57 – Provision and Management of Parking
Policy 58 - Private Parking Provision
Policy 99 - Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands
Policy 100 - Tree and Woodland Planting
Appendix 3 - Gardens and Amenity Space
Appendix 5 - Parking 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)
Dacorum Regulation 123 List

7. Constraints

Predominantly residential area of Hemel Hempstead
The Site Allocations Map removed the application site and wider land from the Nash Mills 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

The main planning issues in the determination of this application would be:

Principle of Development
Impact to Street Scene
Impact on Non-Designated Heritage Assets
Effect on Amenity of Neighbours

Highway Safety and Parking Provision Impact on Trees and Landscaping

Other material planning considerations

- i) Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
- ii) Protected species
- iii) Contaminated land
- iv) Air Quality
- v) Flooding and Drainage
- vi) Planning obligations & legal agreement CS18 & CS19
- vii) Consultation responses

Principle of Development

9.1 The application site was removed from the Nash Mills Employment Area within the Site Allocations 2006-2031 Map Book therefore the loss of the site for employment use is not protected via policy. Further, the application site does not comprise a storage or distribution site over 2 hectares in size, in accordance with Saved Policy 31 of the Local Plan (2004). Saved Policy 34 of the Local Plan (2004) states that alternative non-employment development of an employment site will be acceptable if the proposal accords with the development strategy and urban structure outlined below.

9.2 Thus, the application site is a windfall site located within the residential town of Hemel Hempstead. As such, the infrastructure in the immediate area has been developed to provide good transport links for existing residents. There are also services and facilities available within close proximity of the site.

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

9.4 Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) encourages the provision of more housing within towns and other specified settlements and the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed. Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy (2013) also seeks to optimise the use of brownfield land available within urban areas. The application site comprises a brownfield site within the existing residential settlement of Hemel Hempstead. The development of the application site would prevent further Green Belt releases in the future.

9.5 Taking all of the above into account, the proposal would make a valuable contribution to the Borough's existing housing stock (in accordance with Policy CS17) and complies with the Council's settlement strategy. As such, given that the development would be located in a sustainable location the principle of development is acceptable in accordance with the NPPF (2019), Policies, CS1, CS2, CS4, CS17, of

the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policies 10 and 34 of the Local Plan (2004) and Site Allocations 2006-2031 Map Book.

Impact to Street Scene

9.6 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.

9.7 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.

9.8 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.

9.9 The application site falls between the residential new town zone and employment zone in accordance with the Hemel Hempstead Urban Design Assessment (2010). In the residential new town zone there may be opportunities to develop four-storey buildings on block sites of increased density. Modern styles and materials are also encouraged in order to enliven the neighbourhoods. While it is important that the neighbourhoods maintain a diversity of typologies this zone could potentially become slightly more dense, ranging from medium to very high densities. The employment zone can also accommodate new buildings of up to four storeys high with residential buildings usually constructed from brick. High density development is also encouraged within this zone.

9.10 The application site comprises a two and a half storey industrial building. The surrounding land use comprises a more recent residential development of two to three storey terrace houses and four/ five storey apartment blocks of uniformed architectural style and material. There is an evident character to the new development.

9.11 The proposal seeks to demolish the existing industrial unit and construct a four storey apartment block with under croft parking partly at ground floor level. The existing industrial building is of two storeys post war period design, with little architectural interest or merit; no objection is raised to its demolition.

9.12 The replacement apartment block would relatively retain the same neat corner plot positioning as the existing industrial building. Although, the built form of the

apartment block would be more concentrated within one section of the site.

9.13 The design of the apartment block would be modern and would somewhat reflect the adjacent new development in terms of flat roof design, projecting elements and material palette and therefore look in-keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

9.14 The development has been modulated in height so that it would not appear as a stark, bulky addition in the street scene; with projecting balconies also proposed to add further interest and definition to different elements of the development. The design of the proposal underwent several design revisions through discussions with the Conservation and Design Officer who now considers the final scheme to '*sit comfortable in the context and not detract from the wider built environment*'. Due to the flatted units of the Sappi estate situated in close proximity to the application site and varied design of properties within the immediate area, there is no regular form to the layout of buildings within the immediate site context which needs to be followed. Material details have been requested by condition to ensure a high quality of build. A condition has also been recommended requesting that flat roof be used as a biodiverse/ green roof and for details of this. This would enhance the visual appearance of the scheme as well as result in biodiversity gains.

9.15 The proposed development would not be visible from Belswains Lane and therefore would not be read from this street scene context. The development would be visible from Kingfisher Drive however, as it would be situated further away from this site boundary (approximate 5 metres distance) the proposed development would be read as only 1.45 metres higher than the existing industrial building from this perspective. It is also considered that the proposed development would replace the existing building with a better quality, more architecturally interesting build.

9.16 The proposed development would result in a density of 116 dwellings per hectare. Which although is high, meets national and local policy guidance push for optimal, efficient use of brownfield land to secure new homes within urban areas. This concentration of development is not considered to be out of character with the surrounding area. This is reflected in the NPPF (2019), Saved Policies 10 and 21 of the Local Plan (2004) and the Hemel Hempstead Urban Design Assessment (2010).

9.17 Access to the site is softened by grass verge and landscaping, which would prevent a hard edge from being formed between the two new development sites. Concerns are raised in regards to the close boarded boundary fence which is proposed to run along the access of the development site, and abut the boundary with the Sappi development. This is considered to create a visual barrier between the two developments and cause conflict between vehicle movements between the two sites. A condition requesting landscaping and boundary treatment has been requested in order to resolve this concern and devise a more appropriate solution.

9.18 The majority of parking would be undercroft and therefore not visible from the street scene; the remaining on-site parking spaces would be broken up with soft landscaping.

9.19 To summarise, the proposed development is considered to be of relatively high quality, well thought-out design which would assimilate well into the surrounding environment of the recent Sappi development.

Impact on Non-Designated Heritage Assets

9.20 To the immediate north of the site sit properties Nos. 280- 292 Belswains Lane which are circa 16th century and considered non-designated heritage assets. Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013) outlines that the integrity, setting and distinctiveness of designated and undesignated heritage assets will be protected, conserved and if appropriate enhanced. Paragraph 197 of the NPPF (2019) states that the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. The DBC conservation officer considers the proposal would have limited impact on the setting of these non-designated heritage assets and therefore the less than substantial harm is attributed to the impact on the development on these assets.

9.21 Paragraph 196 of the NPPF (2019) states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The benefits of the scheme would be securing 21 new homes on a brownfield plot within a sustainable location. This benefit is given significant weight as it would reduce the amount of Green Belt land required for release in the future. There would also be the economic benefits of the construction including jobs secured in building the development and in the manufacture of building materials. People living in the homes would spend money in the local area including the shop and public houses and would participate in community activities, they would help to support local services; these benefits of the scheme would carry modest weight given the loss of the employment site.

9.22 Overall, the combined public benefits would be significant to outweigh the less than substantial harm to non-designated heritage assets.

Effect on Amenity of Neighbours

9.23 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.

9.24 The development would be located to the rear of properties Nos. 286 – 276 Belswains Lane at a distance of 27 metres to the first three storeys of the proposed development; the fourth floor would be located over 39 metres away from these properties. DBC rear-to-rear separation distance standard outlined within Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) requires a minimum separation distance of 23 metres in order to provide sufficient privacy and outlook to neighbouring residents. This separation distance may increase depending on character, level and other factors. This separation distance is considered sufficient to retain sufficient standards of outlook, daylight and sunlight and privacy serving these neighbouring residents.

9.25 Similarly, the application site would be located 29 metres approximately away from the front elevations of Nos. 6 – 14 Kingfisher Drive. Again, this distance is considered acceptable especially given that the proposed development would only be perceived as 1.45 metres higher than the existing industrial building,

9.26 The proposed development would also be located at oblique angles to the apartment blocks: Basildon Court and Lion Court. These buildings would be located 24-30 metres away from the proposed development which is considered acceptable in same regards.

9.27 Number 1 Kingfisher Drive would be located at an oblique angle, 19 metres away from the proposal, which again, given the site relationship is considered acceptable in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook and privacy to these neighbouring residents.

9.28 Turning to the living conditions the proposal would afford future residents. Units have been designed to be dual aspect where possible. Some units would have north-facing aspect only. Which although is not ideal must 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. Outlook from these north aspect flats are considered to be acceptable given the 5 metre separation distance to site boundary. Moreover, shading diagrams have been submitted alongside the planning application to demonstrate that the mature trees along the north-west boundary of site would not result in significant overshadowing to future residents of these units. The loss of outlook to future residents as a result of this tree line is also not considered to be significant, due to only three flats anticipated to be affected.

9.29 The Environmental Health noise team were consulted on the planning application and raised no objection to the residential use of the site on grounds of noise and disturbance grounds for future or existing residents.

9.30 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. The proposal would provide only 231.5 sq.m of external amenity provision for the proposed development which is significantly less than the 600 sq.m footprint of the proposed development. However, the majority of units proposed (18 out of 21) would have access to a balcony. The site also has easy access to the canal side and sits within close proximity to other areas of open space, such as the Nash Mills Parish Council playground, which is a three minute walk away.

9.31 In summary, the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of level of amenity maintained and secured for neighbouring and future residents.

Highway Safety and Parking Provision

9.32 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.

9.33 The proposed development seeks to utilise the existing access within the site and the private access off the Sappi development (Croxley Road) off Belswains Lane. Hertfordshire Country Council Highways was consulted on the planning application due to the intensification of site use, and provided the following summative comments:

- The site has an existing access from Croxley Road/ Lion Court which is to be utilised for the proposed development. This access is acceptable.
- A swept path analysis should be requested by condition to illustrate that all vehicles (including waste and emergency vehicles) accessing the site can easily turn around and egress the site in forward gear.
- The level of parking is considered to be acceptable.
- The access arrangements would enable emergency vehicles to access the site within 45 metres from all units.
- Apsley station is approximately 1.6km (1 mile) from the site and therefore within reasonable cycling distance with pedestrian routes to the station reducing the distance by 1km. The application site is considered to be located in a sustainable location.
- Developer contribution of £16,875 for Towpath improvement works between Two Waters Road and Red Lion Lane should be sought.
- The development would not have a significant or detrimental impact on the local highway network.

9.34 Hertfordshire Fire and Rescue have raised no objection to the proposed development on fire safety grounds.

9.35 The proposal seeks to provide 21, 1 bedroom flats which would require 27 (26.25) off street parking spaces (this figure incorporates visitor parking spaces). The application seeks to provide 29 parking spaces, which includes 2 visitor spaces. This exceeds DBC maximum standards in the hope to elevate the parking pressures within the immediate area. No details of cycle storage provision has been submitted alongside the planning application. 21 cycle spaces should be provided in-line with Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004); details of where this cycle parking would be facilitated within the site has been recommended by condition.

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.36 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.

9.37 The proposed scheme has the potential to provide soft and hard landscaping on site. Well placed landscaping would improve the hard edges of the scheme and could be used to soften the appearance of the development. The submission of a comprehensive landscaping scheme has been requested by condition.

9.38 Only two low amenity trees are proposed to be removed from the site with re-planting proposed. A tree survey, assessment and shading diagram were submitted alongside the planning application. The shading diagram demonstrates that the mature polar trees along the north-west boundary of site would not result in significant overshadowing and loss of daylight and sunlight to future residents of these units. Therefore, there should be no undue pressure from future residents to fell the adjacent trees in the future. The tree survey and assessment demonstrate that the proposed development would not impact upon the root protection area of these adjacent trees. Recommended tree work (reduction in height to original points) to maintain the health of the north-western trees has been identified within the Tree Condition Survey. Adequate protective tree fencing to be installed on-site and to remain during construction has been shown on plan ref: 1836-01-Rev 4.

9.39 The DBC Trees and Woodlands team were consulted on the planning application and stated that the impact of the development on high quality site trees is minor, although further details of replanting works are required. The Tree Officer considered that the five Poplar trees to the north-western boundary would have an impact on both screening and shading the development however, the shading diagrams submitted alongside the planning application demonstrates that this impact would not be significant, and would be late afternoon, in summer months only.

9.40 The development falls below the threshold (25 units) required to provide a leisure

contribution in accordance with Saved Policy 76 and Appendix 6 of the Local Plan (2004).

Other Material Planning Considerations

– Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

9.41 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.

9.42 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.

9.43 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

9.44 The application site is situated within an existing residential area of Aspley in Hemel Hempstead, on brownfield land. As such, the infrastructure in the immediate area has been developed to provide 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.

Social

9.45 The proposal would make a valuable contribution to the Borough's housing supply providing 21 new homes, thereby facilitating the Government's aim of boosting the supply of housing. Further, public realm contributions would also be secured for Towpath improvement works. The proposal would however, fail to deliver the Council's affordable housing policy criteria of 35% affordable units at a tenure split of 75% social rented and 25% shared ownership. Further, the scheme would only deliver 12% profit to the developer, according to Dacorum's independent viability consultant. This makes the scheme high risk, and reduce the likelihood of the development actually being built. Overall, this reduces the social benefit the proposal would deliver.

Economic

9.46 The proposal would result in the loss of employment land, for residential use thereby resulting in the loss of employment infrastructure to the immediate area and increased deficit in Dacorum's employment target. Although, a small element of employment provision would be secured through the construction phase of the development and economic gains of future residents utilising the local services, this is not considered to outweigh the level of employment provision currently on the site.

Conclusion

9.47 Taking into consideration all of the above, the proposal would result in small Environmental and Social gains however, the LPA would emphasise that the loss of the existing employment use and no affordable housing contribution would significantly lessen the weight given in favour of the development.

i) Protected Species

9.48 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.

9.49 A bat survey was submitted alongside the planning application. This survey demonstrates that the existing building has a low likelihood of bats being present. However, further bat emergence/re-entry surveys are required in order to confirm this Hertfordshire Ecology was consulted on the planning application and agree with these findings. The application cannot be approved before the three further bat emergence/re-entry surveys are submitted and considered satisfactory by Hertfordshire Ecology specialist.

ii) Contaminated Land

9.50 Policy CS32 of the Core Strategy (2013) seeks to maintain soil quality standards and ensure any contaminated land is appropriately remediated. The DBC Contaminated land team were consulted on the planning application. As the development is located on a radon affected area where 1-3% of homes are above the action level as well as on a former contaminated land use i.e. plastic factory, the standard contaminated land conditions and informatives have been recommended with the grant consent.

iii) Air Quality

9.51 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.

9.52 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.

9.53 The application site falls within 1.0 and 1.2 miles respectively, of two of the council's Air Quality Management Zones. As a result an Air Quality report has been requested by condition. This report should show areas where there are, or likely to be, breaches of an air quality objective, and include proposals for possible mitigation.

iv) Flooding and Drainage

9.54 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.

9.55 The majority of the application site falls within Flood Zone 1 however, small sections of the site fall within flood zones 2 (north eastern boundary and eastern end of site) and 3 (western end of site). As these zones fall only on the periphery of the application site the sequential and/or exception test is not considered necessary in this instance. A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy was subsequently submitted with the planning application. This Assessment outlines the low probability of flooding on-site however, mitigation measures have been outlined to ensure the finished floor level of units is raised above natural ground levels of the site. The proposed drainage strategy would manage runoff from the site in lined permeable paving, which would filter runoff before it is discharged. The Lead Local Flood Authority was consulted on this submitted information and have raised no objection to the proposed development, considering the site can be adequately drained and mitigate any potential existing surface water flood risk. Three conditions have been requested and attached to the recommendation to reduce the risk of flooding further.

v) *Planning Obligations & Legal Agreement CS18 & CS19*

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

Contributions

9.57 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 and financial contributions towards the physical and social infrastructure requirements generated by the development.

9.58 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 for a Highway Improvement contribution of £16,875.

Affordable units

9.59 The Council's planning policies also 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. Therefore, 7.35 units should be provided for affordable housing. With a tenure mix of the affordable housing provision comprising 75% affordable rented and 25% shared ownership, in line with DBC Affordable housing SPD.

9.60 A viability assessment was submitted alongside the planning application to demonstrate that the development costs of the scheme made it unviable to provide any affordable housing. This viability assessment was independently reviewed by an external viability consultant on behalf of Dacorum, whom agreed that the scheme was unviable to deliver 35% affordable housing and that the developer would only achieve a profit of 12.4%. The LPA are satisfied with the evidence submitted to demonstrate that the scheme cannot make an affordable housing contribution.

vii) *Consultation responses*

9.61 Several concerns were received as a result of the proposed development. The main concerns are addressed below:

Insufficient Parking Provision in immediate area: The development delivers above the maximum standard of parking provision required by policy in order to try and help elevate the parking problem within the immediate area by facilitating parking for surrounding residents within the development site.

Loss of light and privacy to properties on Kingfisher Drive and Basildon Court: This has been addressed within the 'Effect on Amenity of Neighbours' section above. Sufficient separation distances are retained around the site, to adjacent neighbours, in order to prevent a significant loss of daylight, sunlight and privacy levels to neighbouring residents from resulting. The proposed development would also not be significant in height (approximately 9 metres), with the fourth floor set in and away from neighbouring properties.

Not in character with immediate area: The visual appearance of the development has been discussed within the 'Impact to Street Scene' section above.

Increase traffic making roads unsafe: Hertfordshire Highways were consulted on the planning application and have raised no objection to the proposed intensification of site use on the grounds that the development would not result in severe highway impact.

Inadequate infrastructure and resources (hospitals, sewage system)- 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 as 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. Please see 'Planning Obligations & Legal Agreement' section.

Noise and disturbance from use and during construction- The Environmental Health noise and pollution team were consulted on the planning application and have raised no objection to the proposed works. The residential use of the site, for 21 units, would not result in significantly further noise and disturbance to adjacent residents given the existing residential surroundings. The noise and disturbance during construction would be temporary and mitigated through the request of a construction management plan condition.

Negative impact to Poplar trees on Kingfisher Drive- The development would be constructed outside the Root Protection Area of these trees. Please see 'Impact on Trees and Landscaping' section above for full assessment.

Impact on local wildlife- Three further surveys have been requested by condition to ensure that the proposed development would not result in detrimental impact to local wildlife. These additional surveys would need to be considered satisfactory by the Hertfordshire Ecology team before the development permission is granted.

Conclusion

10.1 The proposed residential use of the site is considered acceptable in principle. The proposal would result in substantial benefit by securing additional new homes on a brownfield site, helping to meet the Council's housing target. The development is therefore considered in accordance with the NPPF (2019), Policies NP1, CS1, CS2

CS4 and CS17 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policies 10, 31 and 34 of the Local Plan (2004) and Site Allocations 2006-2031 Map Books.

10.2 The scheme is also considered acceptable in terms of visual impact to the street scene, impact on non-designated heritage assets, securing a good standard of amenity for future and neighbouring residents, impact on highway safety and operation and other relevant matters; in accordance with the NPPF (2019), Policies CS8, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS18, CS19, CS26, CS27, CS28, CS31, CS32 and CS35 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policies 21, 18, 57, 58, 99, 100 and Appendices 3 and 5 of the Local Plan (2004) and Hemel Hempstead Urban Design Assessment (2010).

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:

- Highway Improvement contribution of £16,875.

3. That the following conditions or such other conditions as the 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:**

WH/1836/501

WH/1836/502

Tree Condition Survey 30th November 2017

Arbtech TPP 01 Con October 2018

A1619-T 17th January 2019

Arbtech AIA 01 Rev A

Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy January 2019

Arboricultural Method Statement 1 November 2018

Planning Design and Access Statement EA/AT/2018.016/Rpt04 October 2018

Bat Survey- Preliminary Roost Assessment 04/10/18

Arbtech TPP 01 Demo October 2018

D0418-Tr1 17th April 2018

1836 08

1836 06 Rev 6

1836 05 Rev 6

1836 03 Rev 7

1836 02 Rev 4

1836 01 Rev 6

1836 04 Rev 4

1836 07 Rev 1

D0418-MB-E2 17th April 2018

D0418-MB-E1 17th April 2018

D0418-G 17th April 2018

D0418-1 17th April 2018

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 of the Core Strategy (2013). 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 **No development shall take place until details of the green roof of the development hereby permitted have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority.**

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

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 and biodiversity enhancement to the development; in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy (2013). The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been agreed by the applicant.

- 5 **The flat roof area of the development hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.**

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenities of the adjacent dwellings; in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

- 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**
- **hard surfacing materials.**

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.**

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 and Green Roof 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 and Green Roof 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 roof and landscaping 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 **The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy carried out by EAS reference 2042/2019 dated January 2019 and the following mitigation measures:**

- 1. Provide 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. Implement drainage strategy based on infiltration and include lined permeable paving as indicated on the proposed drainage strategy**

drawing.

3. Restrict the runoff from the site to 1 l/s for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants, by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site; in accordance with Policy CS31 of the Core Strategy (2013).

10 **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 EAS reference 2042/2019 dated January 2019. The scheme shall also include:**

1. Detailed engineered drawings of the proposed SuDS features including their, location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features including any connecting pipe runs and all corresponding calculations/modelling to ensure the scheme caters for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + 40% allowance climate change event.

2. Details of final exceedance routes, including those for an event which exceeds to 1:100 + cc rainfall event.

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.

11 **Upon completion of the drainage works for the development hereby permitted a management and maintenance plan for the SuDS features and drainage network shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall include:**

1. Provision of complete set of as built drawings for site drainage.

2. Maintenance and operational activities.

3. Arrangements for adoption and any other measures to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details and maintained thereafter for the lifetime of the scheme.

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

- 12 **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.

- 13 **All remediation or protection measures identified in the Remediation Statement referred to in Condition 12 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 www.dacorum.gov.uk

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.

- 14 **Prior to demolition works commencing a Demolition Method Statement**

shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This Demolition Method Statement should include the following details:

-a management scheme whose purpose shall be to control and minimise emissions of pollutants from and attributable to the demolition of the development; and

- a risk assessment and a method statement in accordance with the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance.

The demolition of the existing building shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way as well as in the interests of the amenities of surrounding occupiers during the construction of the development in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS8.

15 Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted an Air Quality Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Air Quality Report shall include the following details:

- areas where there are, or likely to be, breaches of an air quality objective;

- mitigation measures if there are predicted exceedances in exposure to levels above the Air Quality Objectives;

- The source of energy among others such as impact of the construction vehicles and machinery to the proposed development; and

- The post construction impact of the development to the existing development.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details and mitigation measures outlined.

Reason: Due to the nature of this condition it necessary to be pre-commencement as mitigation measures would need to be used in construction of the development. In order to ensure the amenities of the neighbouring premises are protected from increased air quality arising from the development; in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS32 of the Core Strategy (2013). 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, movements, 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

No development shall commence until a swept path analysis shown on a scaled plan, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This swept path analysis should include details of:

- the largest anticipated vehicles that will access the site e.g. waste collection; fire tender. b. Surface materials to be used for the access roads; and

- take into consideration that the access roads would need to act as shared surface road providing access for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.

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 as details required for construction are required. This is to ensure suitable, safe and satisfactory planning and development of the site in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).The pre-commencement nature of this condition has been agreed by the applicant.

- 18 **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).

- 19 **Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted details of cycle storage facilities to accommodate 21 bicycles shall be shown on scaled plans submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authorities.**

These details of cycle storage provision shall be carried out prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure sustainable forms of transport are available to future residents in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Thames Water Informative

Waste Comments

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>

Thames Water would recommend that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol / oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses.

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, 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>.

Thames Water would advise that with regard to waste water network and waste water process infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided

'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 wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality."

Affinity Water Informative

You should be aware that the proposed development site is located within an Environment Agency defined groundwater Source Protection Zone (GPZ) corresponding to Hunton Bridge Pumping Station. This is a public water supply, comprising a number of Chalk abstraction boreholes, operated by Affinity Water Ltd.

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

monitoring and remediation methods will need to be undertaken.

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

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:

Thames Water

Waste Comments

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>

Thames Water would recommend that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol / oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses.

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, 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>.

Thames Water would advise that with regard to waste water network and waste water process infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided

'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 wwqriskmanagement@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.

Environmental Agency

This application falls under our Flood Risk Standing Advice (FRSA) so we will not be providing a formal detailed response. However I thought I would flag up that part of the site that appears to be where residential units are located does fall within Flood Zone 2. Under the FSRA this requires applications to submit a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and one has not been submitted in support of this application. The planning statement states that the Site is within Flood Zone 1. While this is true for most of the site is it not correct for the whole site.

Strategic Housing

Strategic Housing comments are as follows in response to the proposal below:

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

Therefore, 9 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.

Amended Comments

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

Therefore, 9 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.

Lead Local Flood Authority

Thank you for consulting us on the above application for the demolition of existing buildings and construction of 27 one-bed flats.

No detailed information has been submitted in relation to surface water management. Without this information, the flood risks resulting from the proposed development are unknown. In order for the Lead Local Flood Authority to advise the relevant local planning authority that the site is not increasing flood risk to the site and elsewhere and can provide appropriate sustainable drainage techniques, the following information is required as a minimum as part of the surface water drainage assessment;

1. A drainage strategy which includes a commitment to providing appropriate SuDS in line with the non-statutory national standards, industry best practice and HCC Guidance for SuDS.
2. Drainage plan including location of all the drainage features.
3. Where infiltration is proposed, evidence of ground conditions/ underlying geology and permeability including BRE Digest 365 compliant infiltration tests should be provided.
4. Detailed calculations of existing/proposed surface water storage volumes and flows with Initial post development calculations and/or modelling in relation to surface water are to be carried out for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year including an allowance for climate change.
5. Evidence that if the applicant is proposing to discharge to the local sewer network, they have confirmation from the relevant water company that they have the capacity to take the proposed volumes and run-off rates.

For further advice on what we expect to be contained within the FRA to support a planning application, please refer to our Developers Guide and Checklist on our surface water drainage webpage

Informative to the Applicant/LPA

There is an ordinary watercourse located within the vicinity of the site. Please note any works proposed to be carried out that may affect the flow within an ordinary watercourse will require the prior written consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. This includes any permanent and or temporary works regardless of any planning permission.

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

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

Please note if the LPA decides to grant planning permission we wish to be notified for our records.

Amended Comments

Thank you for consulting us on the above application for the demolition of existing buildings and construction of 27 one-bed flats.

Following a review of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy carried out by EAS reference 2042/2019 dated January 2019 submitted in support of the above application, we can confirm that we have no objection in principle on flood risk grounds and can advise the Local Planning Authority (LPA) that the proposed development site can be adequately drained and can mitigate any potential existing surface water flood risk if carried out in accordance with the submitted drainage strategy.

The site is located mainly in Flood Zone 1 however there is a small part of the north eastern boundary and access in Flood Zone 2 and a small area to the west of the site in Flood Zone 3. The area in Flood Zone 3 currently benefits from defences.

Due to the high groundwater levels and information from a nearby site relating to the risk of solution features locally means that infiltration is not being recommended. The proposed drainage strategy will manage runoff from the site in lined permeable paving outfall would be limited to 1l/s and runoff would be directed to the Thames Water surface water sewer in Kingfisher Drive. The existing discharge runoff rate has been estimated as 25l/s therefore the proposed drainage system offers significant improvements to existing scenario.

The proposed drainage strategy has been modelled in WINDES MicroDrainage for a 1 in 100 year (+40%CC) rainfall event using which demonstrates that a minimum sub-base depth of 436mm is required to manage up to and including the 1 in 100 year (+40%CC) storm event. The outfall from the lined permeable paving will be restricted by an orifice plate or vortex control. To restrict the runoff from the site to 1 l/s, a 27mm orifice plate is required. 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 Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy carried out by EAS reference 2042/2019 dated January 2019 and the following mitigation measures;

1. Provide 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. Implement drainage strategy based on infiltration and include lined permeable paving as indicated on the proposed drainage strategy drawing.
3. Restrict the runoff from the site to 1 l/s for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event

Reason

To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants.

Condition 2

No development shall take place until the final design of the drainage scheme is completed and sent to the LPA for approval. The surface water drainage system will be based on the submitted the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy carried out by EAS reference 2042/2019 dated January 2019. The scheme shall also include;

1. Detailed engineered drawings of the proposed SuDS features including their, location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features including any connecting pipe runs and all corresponding calculations/modelling to ensure the scheme caters for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + 40% allowance climate change event.
2. Details of final exceedance routes, including those for an event which exceeds to 1:100 + cc rainfall event.

Reason

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

Condition 3

Upon completion of the drainage works for each site 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.
2. Maintenance and operational activities.
3. Arrangements for adoption and any other measures to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime

Reason

To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site.

Informative to the LPA

We note that the Hemel relief culvert runs through the site, we would advise the LPA to consult Thames Water in relation to any concerns they may have.

Please note if the LPA decides to grant planning permission we wish to be notified for our records.

Affinity Water

Thank you for notification of the above planning application. Planning applications are referred to us where our input on the issues relating to water quality or quantity may be required.

You should be aware that the proposed development site is located within an Environment Agency defined groundwater Source Protection Zone (GPZ) corresponding to Hunton Bridge Pumping Station. This is a public water supply, comprising a number of Chalk abstraction boreholes, operated by Affinity Water Ltd. The construction works, and operation of the proposed development site should be done in accordance with the relevant British Standards and Best Management Practices, thereby significantly reducing the groundwater pollution risk. It should be noted that the construction works may exacerbate any existing pollution. If any pollution is found at the site then the appropriate monitoring and remediation methods

will need to be undertaken.

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

Herts Property

Hertfordshire County Council's 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 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).

Canal & River Trust

No Comment

Environmental Health

Thanks for contacting the Pollution and Environmental Protection Team in respect of the above planning application 4/02781/18/MFA for the demolition of existing building and construction of 27 one – bed flats.

Please be advise that we have **no objection to the proposed development in relation to Air Quality and Land Contamination.**

However, having given adequate consideration to the submitted planning statement and with our contaminated land record shown that the site is located on a radon affected area where 1-3% of homes are above the action level, on a former contaminated land use i.e. plastic factory, been adjacent to another former contaminated land use i.e. mill as well as been within 46.75m of a landmark historical contaminated land use of an un-specified factory or works site of medium risk; 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 as well as in the interests of the amenities of surrounding occupiers during the construction of the development in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS8.

3). Air Quality Assessment condition

With the proposed development within 1.0 and 1.2 miles respectively of two of the council AQMA, the number of proposed residential unit and car parking spaces, a simple air quality assessment report assessing the impacts of the proposed development will need to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority having, regard to the Environment Act 1995, Air Quality Regulations and subsequent guidance.

The report should indicate areas where there are, or likely to be, breaches of an air quality objective. If there are predicted exceedances in exposure to levels above the Air Quality Objectives then a proposal for possible mitigation measures should be included.

The source of energy among others such as impact of the construction vehicles and machinery to the proposed development must also be consider in the air quality assessment report to be submitted. The post construction impact of the development to the existing development will also need to be consider in the report to be submitted.

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

4). Demolition Method Statement

Prior to demolition works commencing a Demolition Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for a management scheme whose purpose shall be to control and minimise emissions of pollutants from and attributable to the demolition of the development. This should include a risk assessment and a method statement in accordance with the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance published by London Councils and the Greater London Authority. The scheme shall set out the secure measures, which can, and will, be put in place.

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way as well as in the interests of the amenities of surrounding occupiers during the construction of the development in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS8.

5). 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.

Amended Comments

Please be advise that we have **no objection to the proposed development in relation to Land Contamination.**

However, having given adequate consideration to the submitted planning statement, and with the proposed development located on a radon affected area where 1-3% of homes are above the action level as well as been on a former contaminated land use i.e. plastic factory as well as been directly adjacent to a landmark historic contaminated land use i.e. un-specified factory or works site of medium risk, the following planning condition 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). 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 Noise

I note the site was subject to a pre-application but I am unable to access any previous comments by ECP. However there is potential for noise impact on some of flats due to noise from road traffic which overlook Belswains Lane and the application is not supported by any information which considers noise due to road transportation sources. Noise is recognised within national planning policy and supporting documents (Noise Policy Statement of England, Planning Policy Guidance: Noise) as relevant to planning due to impacts on health and quality of life.

I would recommend this development is subject to a planning condition which requires an assessment of noise impact prior to commencement. I suggest this be addressed prior to commencement as the development may require an alternative, and mechanical, means of ventilation (in place of or in addition to opening windows) to provide an adequate level of amenity. Alternative control mechanisms may be to reorient the internal layout so that the living space and bedroom is located at the rear and shielded by non-habitable spaces.

I have suggested a condition below.

Suggested Condition

Prior to development commencing the applicant shall submit to the LPA an assessment of noise on each habitable room due to its exposure to transportation noise. Where the assessment identifies that mitigation measures are required to protect likely future occupiers from noise, the assessment shall provide an outline mitigation statement having regard to the principles of good acoustic design. Any scheme of mitigation shall also be subject to approval by the LPA, and once approved, shall be implemented in accordance with the approval prior to first occupation 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.

Amended Comments

I've looked at the application and see that there's been a range of recent comments/docs, and its not yet been decided. Therefore, I've reviewed the application in detail. I note that the surrounding area is predominantly residential and therefore, cannot see a reason why we'd recommend refusal on the grounds of noise.

No objection subject to following conditions:

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 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.

2. Construction Hours (No weekend working)

The hours of site operation shall be restricted to Monday-Friday (excluding bank holidays, 08:00 – 18:00 hours. No site activity on Saturday or Sundays.

Reason: To protect local residential amenity.

This department advises that any permission which the Planning Authority may give shall include the conditions above, on the grounds of 'noise'.

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 does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:

1. No development shall commence until full details (in the form of scaled plans and/or written specifications) have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority, to illustrate the following:
a. Swept path analysis for the largest anticipated vehicles that will access the site e.g. waste collection; fire tender. b. Surface materials to be used for the access roads, taking into consideration that the access roads would need to act as shared surface road providing access for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. c. An appropriate level of secure and safe cycle parking. Reason: To ensure suitable, safe and satisfactory planning and development of the site in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

2. Provision of Parking & Servicing Areas Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed access, on-site car parking and turning areas shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaces and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use. Reason: To ensure permanent availability of the parking / manoeuvring area and to ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

3. Construction Management The development shall not begin until full details of all proposed construction vehicle access, movements, parking arrangements and wheel washing facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The relevant details should be submitted in the form of a Construction Management Plan or Statement and the approved details are to be implemented throughout the construction programme. Reason: To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway.

COMMENTS / ANALYSIS: The proposal comprises of the erection of 27 one-bed dwellings and associated works at Milbor Trading Estate, Croxley road, Apsley. Croxley Road is a private road and not maintainable at public expense. The nearest highway is Belswains Lane, which is designated as a classified 'C' local access road, subject to a speed limit of subject 30mph and is highway maintainable at public

expense.

ACCESS: The site has an existing access into the site from Croxley Road / Lion Court which is to be utilised for the proposed development. The access is approximately 5m wide, which is an acceptable width to enable two vehicles to pass on another and in accordance with design criteria as laid out in Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide.

Following consideration of the size and nature of the proposals with the access road into the site providing vehicular, cycling and pedestrian access, it is recommended that the access road be constructed as a shared surface road which is “acceptable in most cul-de-sac situations”. Further details on shared surface roads can be found in Roads in Hertfordshire, Sec 2, 5.2.2 and 8.5.3.

PARKING & MANOEVRABILITY: The proposal includes the provision of 30 on site car parking spaces (provide through two separate parking areas, the layout of which is shown on submitted plan no. 01. The Layout and dimensions of the parking areas/bays are acceptable and in accordance MfS and Roads in Hertfordshire. HCC as Highway Authority would recommend that a swept path analysis is submitted to illustrate that all vehicles (including service, waste collection and fire trucks) accessing the site can easily turn and around and egress the site in forward gear.

The level of parking is considered to be acceptable by HCC as Highway Authority. Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) is the parking authority for the district and therefore should ultimately be satisfied with the level of parking.

REFUSE / WASTE COLLECTION: Provision would need to be made for on-site refuse stores within 30m of each dwelling and within 25m of the kerbside/bin collection points. Please also refer to the previous comments in relation swept path analysis for waste collection vehicles. The collection method must be confirmed as acceptable by DBC waste management.

EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS: The access arrangements would enable emergency vehicle access to within 45 metres from all dwellings. This adheres to guidelines as recommended in ‘MfS’, ‘Roads in Hertfordshire; Highway Design Guide’ and ‘Building Regulations 2010: Fire Safety Approved Document B Vol 1 – Dwellings’. Nevertheless following consideration of the size of the development, details of the proposal have been passed to Herts Fire and Rescue for their attention and any further comments in which they may wish to add.

SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL / PLANNING OBLIGATIONS / SECTION 106: The site lies in Nash Mills on the south-eastern edge of Hemel Hempstead. Apsley railway station is approximately 1.6km (1 mile) from the site and therefore within reasonable and cycling distance. There are also alternative pedestrian routes from the site to the railway station which reduce the distance to approximately 1km and therefore potential to encourage travel to the station on foot. HCC as Highway Authority would recommend the provision of a suitable level (e.g. one space for dwelling) of secure, safe and convenient cycle parking within the site to improve options for sustainable travel to be in accordance with ‘Hertfordshire’s Local Transport Plan’ and the ‘National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)’. DBC has adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and therefore contributions towards local transport schemes would be sought via CIL if appropriate. In order to make the proposals acceptable to maximize sustainable travel options, it is recommended that developer contributions are sought towards towpath upgrade works between Two Waters Road and Red Lion Lane. This development

would attract a sustainable transport planning obligation contribution of £16,875 derived in accordance with the document 'Planning Obligations Guidance - Toolkit for Hertfordshire (Hertfordshire County Council's requirements)' which can be downloaded at <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/about-the-council/freedom-of-information-and-council-data/open-data-statistics-about-hertfordshire/who-we-are-and-what-we-do/property/planning-obligations-guidance.aspx> The two nearest bus stops on Belswains Lane are approximately 70m from the site (and therefore within the recommended accessibility criteria of 400m). However these stops are served by the 501 route (Aylesbury to Watford), which is a Sunday only service and therefore it would be difficult to justify recommending any developer contributions to upgrading these stops. TRIP GENERATION & DISTRIBUTION: Following consideration of the replacement of an existing use and the acceptable access from Croxley Road onto Belswains Lane, the development would not have a significant or detrimental impact on the local highway network.

CONCLUSION: HCC as Highway Authority has considered that the proposal would not have an unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the surrounding highway. In order to make the proposals acceptable to maximize sustainable travel options, it is recommended that developer contributions are sought. Therefore HCC has no objections on highway grounds to the application, subject to the inclusion of the above planning conditions.

Amended Comments

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:

No additional or amended comments to those provided for original application.

Conservation

There does not appear to be a roof plan with the application. This should be submitted.

The existing buildings are of two storeys constructed in brick with flat roofs. They appear to date from the post war period. They are of no particular interest. We would not object to their demolition.

The site is surrounded by modern housing. To the south are modern blocks of flats. To the north are two storey properties constructed in brick with pitched tiled roofs. These date from the end of the 20th century. Of interest there are a number of large mature trees forming the boundary to the north west of the site.

We note the properties to Belswains lane which have a plaque stating 16th century cottages. These are 2 storey with pitched tiled roofs and rendered to the street frontage. To the rear these are brick. These properties are not listed however they would be considered to be non-designated heritage assets. On reviewing the setting we would advise that the proposals would have a limited impact on the setting. This should be given a low weight in the balancing process as outlined in the Framework.

We would not object to the construction of new flats. In terms of the scale and proportion they would appear to be in keeping with the character of the area and of a similar height. However we would recommend that some elements of the scheme be reconsidered. We note the pop up elements above both core access 1 and 2. Given that 2 appears to be the main access for the block it may be advisable that only this element has the pop up rather than 1 and 2. We would not object to the covered balconies adjacent to core 2. However to perhaps add to the visual interest it would be advantageous to flip the units between core 1 and 2 and move the balcony element over. This would have the added advantage that the living/ dining rooms of these flats could then be dual aspect. The balconies to this element could be enlarged or perhaps remain open rather than being fully enclosed as those beside the car park. With regards to the end elevation perhaps this could also have open balconies and maybe have them full width rather than just over the living/dining rooms.

The string course element to the ground/ first floor would be questioned. It may be better to perhaps use this to define specific openings or features. The plinth element could use either a different brick or a different brick bond to perhaps add to the visual interest and create a more subtle change to the elevations.

In relation to the detailing given that there is a lack of window headers and cills the windows could have a greater recess to provide the impression of quality and add to the visual interest of light and shade.

In relation to the landscape it would be recommended that this be reviewed and shown in relation to the landscape proposals of the adjacent new build flats. This should be thought of as a cohesive space as at present there would be a narrow fence sub dividing 2 drives which would not be the most productive use of the space and there may be opportunities to achieve a better landscape/ parking balance.

Recommendation – The proposals are acceptable in principle however the design and detail should be reviewed as noted above.

Amended Comments

The existing buildings are of two storeys constructed in brick with flat roofs. They appear to date from the post war period. They are of no particular interest. We would not object to their demolition.

The site is surrounded by modern housing. To the south are modern blocks of flats. To the north are two storey properties constructed in brick with pitched tiled roofs. These date from the end of the 20th century. Of interest there are a number of large mature trees forming the boundary to the north west of the site.

We note the properties to Belswains lane which have a plaque stating 16th century cottages. These are 2 storey with pitched tiled roofs and rendered to the street frontage. To the rear these are brick. These properties are not listed however they would be considered to be non-designated heritage assets. On reviewing the setting we would advise that the proposals would have a limited impact on the setting. This should be given a low weight in the balancing process as outlined in the Framework.

We would not object to the construction of new flats. The plans have been revised a number of times to reduce the height and help to break up the mass. The design and detailing have also been changed to improve the appearance.

Overall we believe that the revisions have enhanced the scheme we now believe that it would sit comfortably in the context and not detract from the wider built environment. As such we would not object to these proposals and would recommend that the external materials be conditioned.

With regards to the landscaping it is in general acceptable however ideally the fence dividing the two block of flats should be removed to allow a more cohesive space and interaction with neighbouring developments rather than the separation created.

Recommendation – The proposals have substantially improved and as such we would not object to these proposals. External materials including landscaping materials and finishes subject to approval.

Herts Fire and Rescue

We have examined the drawings and note that the access for fire appliances and provision of water supplies appears to be adequate.

Further comments will be made when we receive details of the Building Regulations application.

Your drawing is retained for our records.

Nash Mills Parish Council

This application proposes demolition of existing old industrial buildings and constructing 27 one bed flats with associated parking.

The site is triangular in shape and has three principal boundaries consisting of: -

1. Kingfisher Drive boundary, consists of predominantly two storey pitched roof residential homes in Kingfisher Drive with mature trees existing on boundary.
1. Belswains Lane boundary consists of the rear garden and cottages of two stories with pitched roofs. Some cottages display signage indicating they originated in the 16th century.
1. Croxley Road boundary which contains a recent residential development mainly of three storey flats with pitch roofs and a small number of flat roofed four storey flats.

The proposed development is a four storey flat roof block containing 27 one bed flats.

The Planning Application contains a Planning Consultants report which details and number of Dacorum planning and core policies which are contravened by the current application.

The PC report pages 9 and 10 outline DBC Core policies CS 11 and CS 12 relating to good neighbourhood design and indicate: -

A new Application should respect the typical density of nearby existing development.

Avoid visual intrusion loss of privacy and disturbance to surrounding property.

Integrate with the existing street scene character

Respect adjoining properties in respect of scale height and bulk

(None of the foregoing requirements will be met with the current proposal for a monolithic four storey flat roof block)

Should provide sufficient parking. (proposal provides 2 spaces for visitors and 0 spaces for servicing)

Retain important trees. (see NMPC later comment on Foundation design)

The current proposal does not achieve any of the foregoing requirements.

Page 13 RE policy 18, indicates the development of a range of dwellings in size and type will be encouraged. 27 one bed flats as proposed would need revision to satisfy policy 18 .

Page 14 RE Policy 111, buildings up to three stories will be permitted in the town areas to harmonise with the surrounding area so as not to damage the existing area. This is not achieved by the proposed four storey flat roof block.

PC report Page 19. Comments 4.16 and 4.17 attempt to justify a four storey building . Some buildings on the Croxley Road boundary are four storey others are three storey with pitched roofs. The houses on Kingfisher Drive and Belwains Lane boundary are two storey with pitched roofs. To transfer smoothly from four storeys to two storeys require the new transitional building to be three storeys max, preferably with the third storey being a pitched roof containing accommodation.

Considering the proposed development scale, height, and form of 27 one bed flats, lack of visitor and service parking, lack of landscaping, risk to the survival of existing mature trees, all indicate this scheme need substantial revision and as currently proposed represents over development of the site.

To satisfy DBC Planning/Core policies the new building should not exceed three stories preferably with the third floor providing accommodation within a pitched roof, and also to contain a variety of layouts to satisfy policy 18

Foundations will need careful consideration to avoid damaging nearby mature tree roots.

The drawings provided with the application show all existing buildings to a scale of 1:50 and the proposed building to a scale of the scale of 1:100. This results in the proposed buildings appearing visually to be smaller than the existing structures. This is misleading and it would be helpful to have a drawing provided of existing and proposed building drawn to the same scale which when overlain would provide a true representation of the comparative scale of existing and proposed work. This would indicate the proposed four storey building is virtually twice the height of the existing industrial buildings, and substantially wider.

Subject to the normal scrutiny of the site to determine any contamination, availability of services, soil conditions etc it appears the site is likely to be suitable for residential use. However as currently proposed the scheme degrades the local environment. What is needed is a proposal to enhance the environment for existing and future residents.

Amended Comments

Nash Mills will be strongly objecting to the revised application under the following grounds from the BRE/Planning Aid England Material Planning Considerations guidance

- Overdevelopment
- Loss of sunlight (based on BRE guidance)
- Overshadowing/loss of outlook to the detriment of residential amenity(though not loss of view as such)
- Loss/effect on trees
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Scale and dominance
- Highway safety
- Layout and density
- Concerns regarding scale of drawings not being consistent
- Concerns that boundaries drawn on map incorrectly reflect the actual land owned by the developer- giving way to an impression that the development is being placed on a site larger than it is in reality.

Crime Prevention

With regard to crime prevention & security, I would ask that not only the 9 affordable units but the entire development is built to the police minimum security standard , Secured by Design. I have undertaken a crime analysis of the area and burglary, criminal damage, arson and anti –social behaviour have been reported.

Physical Security (SBD)

Layout / Boundary

Secure boundary/ gates required at the rear of the site where the amenity / seating area is situated .

Communal door sets:

Certificated to BS PAS 24: 2016, or LPS.1175

Access Control to block of flats:

Each block has more than 25 flats off a communal entrance, the SBD standard is for the communal entrance doors to have an access control system , Audio Visual.

Tradespersons release buttons are not permitted.

Postal delivery for communal dwellings (flats):

Communal postal boxes within the communal entrances , covered by the CCTV or each flat to have post delivered to it via a letter plate fitted in each flat's door., with the local Posta Officer being given an access fob.

Individual front entrance doors of flats

Certificated to BS PAS 24:2016

Windows: Flats

Ground floor windows and those easily accessible certificated to BS PAS 24:2016 or LPS 1175 French doors for balconies:

Dwelling security lighting :

Communal entrance hall, lobby, landings, corridors and stairwells, and all entrance/exit points. (Dusk to dawn lighting).

Bin stores :

The access doors to these should be to LPS.1175, or BS PAS 24: 2016.

Car Park:

It is great to see that car parking has been allocated for this development, however I do have concerns regarding the access to the carpark and undercroft parking area. I would advise that in the absence of gates a surface treatment is used for demarcation, also signage put up to indicate that the area is *Private*. Car Park lighting - column lighting in the car park, I would ask that the undercroft area is well lit, bollard lighting is not acceptable as it is not fit for purpose, raises the fear of crime and is easily damaged.

CCTV

I would recommend CCTV in the undercroft car park area, however if CCTV was not installed this would not prevent the applicant from achieving the Secured by Design Award.

Compartmentalisation of Developments incorporating multiple flats.

Larger developments can suffer adversely from anti-social behaviour due to unrestricted access to all floors to curtail this either of the following is advised :

- **Controlled lift access**, Fire egress stairwells should also be controlled on each floor, from the stairwell into the communal corridors.
- **Dedicated door sets** on each landing preventing unauthorised access to the corridor from the stairwell and lift

Secured by Design recommends no more than 25 flats should be accessed via either of the access control methods above.

Herts Ecology

Hertfordshire Environmental Records Centre (HERC) has no records specific to the building to be demolished; however, there are records of a known bat roost less than 200m from the site. Milbor Engineering is also connected by a band of trees to the nearby Grand Union Canal, Two Waters to Nash Mills Lane Local Wildlife Site (LWS). This provides a natural corridor to the near by open countryside and further areas of high ecological value.

The building to be demolished appears from aerial photos and limited views available on Street View to be a brick built industrial unit with flat and low sloping roofs. Though not the archetypical type of building associated with roosts, bats are opportunistic in their roost choice and will use uncharacteristic buildings. Viewed from kingfisher drive, part of the building appears to be covered in ivy which could provide a potential roost opportunity. Given the close presence of other roost, the buildings connection to high quality foraging areas and the presence of ivy, I believe it is reasonable to advise that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) should request a professional bat survey is undertaken.

This should be a **Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA)** by an appropriately qualified and experienced ecologist to evaluate whether bats, or evidence of them, are present and will be affected by the proposals. Such inspection surveys can be undertaken at any time of year and should follow established best practice as described in the Bat Conservation Trust Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition, 2016.

In the event that evidence of bats or the potential for them is found, further **bat activity surveys** (dusk emergence / dawn re-entry) are likely to be required. These can only be

carried out when bats are active in the summer months (usually between May and August, or September if the weather remains warm). We are now within the optimum time of year to undertake bat activity surveys, so if further surveys are recommended in the PRA, they can be undertaken.

As bats are European Protected Species (EPS), this information is required to be submitted to the LPA ***prior to determination*** - so the LPA can sufficiently consider the impact of the proposals on bats consistent with legal obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2018.

If a roost is to be affected, an EPS licence will also be required from Natural England to enable the proposals to be implemented, and consequently this may need to be factored in to any development timescale.

Consequently, the results of the bat survey(s), together with appropriate mitigation and compensation measures to safeguard bats/roosts if necessary, should be submitted to the LPA for approval prior to determination.

Amended Comments

Hertfordshire Environmental Records Centre (HERC) has no records specific to the building to be demolished; however, there are records of a known bat roost less than 200m from the site. Milbor Engineering is also connected by a band of trees to the nearby Grand Union Canal, Two Waters to Nash Mills Lane Local Wildlife Site (LWS). This provides a natural corridor to the near by open countryside and further areas of high ecological value.

A Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was carried out by Arbtech Consulting Limited on 04/10/2018. Gaps beneath weatherboarding on building B1 were judged to indicate low potential for roosting bats. The building B2 had broken windows and gaps in brickwork, these could be utilised by crevice dwelling bats and provide moderate potential to support roosting bats. Following Bat Conservation Trust best practice guidelines, at least 1 follow-up dusk emergence / dawn re-entry surveys are recommended for building 1 and at least 2 follow-up dusk emergence / dawn re-entry surveys are recommended for building 2. These are required to further inform any use of the building by bats, and to provide appropriate mitigation to safeguard bats if present and affected. These can only be carried out when bats are active in the summer months (usually between May and August, or September if the weather remains warm). We are now within the optimum time of year to undertake bat activity surveys, so they can be undertaken now.

As bats are European Protected Species (EPS), this information is required to be submitted to the LPA ***prior to determination*** - so the LPA can sufficiently consider the impact of the proposals on bats consistent with legal obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2018.

If a roost is to be affected, an EPS licence will also be required from Natural England to enable the proposals to be implemented, and consequently this may need to be factored in to any development timescale.

Consequently, the results of the bat survey(s), together with appropriate mitigation and compensation measures to safeguard bats/roosts if necessary, should be submitted to the LPA for approval prior to determination.

The survey by Arbtech Consulting Limited also identified bird nesting sites within building 2, Nesting birds are protected under Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and

Countryside Act 1981. **If the LPA are minded after the presentation of the above necessary information to grant approval, then the following informative should also be included in any application give.**

Nesting birds

“Any demolition of buildings or vegetation clearance 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 two days in advance of the demolition or clearance by a competent Ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest.”

Trees and Woodlands

The impact of proposed development on high quality site trees is minor. Two low quality trees and two low quality tree groups are planned for removal. As ‘C’ category (BS5837) vegetation, I wouldn’t seek retention.

It is also proposed to crown lift and reduce one other tree group, enabling works to commence.

Trees on adjacent land, owned by DBC, are mentioned in the tree report. Five poplar trees will have a visual impact upon the development, both screening and shading it. Whilst it is not proposed to prune this line of trees, the report does mention that they should be reduced in height to a previous ‘topping’ point, mitigating future potential failure. ‘Topping’ is an out-of-date term that shouldn’t now be used. Regarding the poplars, it should be recognised that DBC does not prune trees to maintain levels of light or views, and so these poplars will cast shade upon new dwellings. DBC carries out pruning to address public safety as identified through regular inspection.

An amount of new planting (trees and shrubs) is shown on ‘Site Plan as Proposed’ Rev 6 / Jul 2018, although no detail is provided about species, planting size or maintenance. Such information should be submitted for assessment, unless I have missed the document in which this is listed.

A new tree is shown on the plan located directly adjacent to a visitor parking space; such relationships are never harmonious so species selection would be very important.

Appendix B

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

Objections

Address	Comments
24 LION COURT,CROXLEY ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9GX	I would like to object to the above application on the following grounds. 1 Loss of light 2 Overlooking/Loss of privacy 3 Visual amenity 4 Adequate parking 5 Loading turning & highway

	<p>safety 6 Traffic generation 7 Noise & disturbance 8 Hazardous Materials 9 Loss of trees 10 Layout & density 11 Landscaping 12 Road access.</p>
<p>7 BASILDON COURT,CROXLEY ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9GY</p>	<p>I understand that you are taking resident comments into consideration up until close of play today and I would be grateful if you could consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on local wildlife. Since we moved in here last year, we have seen five or six kingfishers in the surrounding area. We have also seen swans, an owl and a heron not to mention various other species. At one point, we even had kingfishers fly past our balcony which overlooks the car park of Basildon Court. As im sure you are aware, kingfishers are a protected species and so I would be interested to know what plans the developers have in place to ensure that all of these birds are protected from the vast increase in traffic that the new development will result in; the significant and inevitably negative impact that more human life will have on the canal and local wildlife area; and most importantly, the significant noise and disturbance that construction will cause to their nesting and breeding habits. I have contacted the National Trust and the RSPB in order to bring these plans to their attention. I would be grateful if you could provide information on what steps the developers and council will take to ensure that the environment and its wildlife are not disturbed please? 2. Impact on privacy. Currently the only place that basildon court is not overlooked by another residential property is from the site where the proposed 27 flats are going to be built. I, and my neighbours feel that this is going to be a significant invasion of privacy, especially given that the only windows in the flats which are at the back of Basildon Court all face into the car park. The result of this is that we will be overlooked through every single window of our properties. Not only is this hugely invasive to anyone who doesnt want to live with thier curtains closed 24/7, but also, I would argue, a security risk to all who live here, whose personal possessions are visible from every window, should they open their curtains. I feel that such a high rise block is totally unnecessary and is a huge imposition on those of us whose flats face into the car park and the proposed site. 3. Traffic - at rush hour, it is almost impossible to get into or out of the nash mills wharf development. Not only this, but loud and public arguments about parking between residents are rapidly becoming a weekly occurrence. Adding 27 flats to this is only going to worsen the problem, not to mention the impact that these flats will have on accessibility within the development given that there is already insufficient parking for the residents who already live here. I feel that 27 flats is excessive and

	unnecessary on such a small site, and it will have a negative effect upon current residents.
14 KINGFISHER DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9DD	<p>I am not opposed to a redevelopment of this site for residential use, in fact done correctly there is significant potential to enhance the local area. However any development must be appropriate to the site and proportional to the surrounding area. The proposed development does not meet those criteria and is over development of the site.</p> <p>HERITAGE</p> <p>Immediately adjacent to the site are the 16th century cottages on Belswains Lane. During the development of Nash Mills Wharf, Dacorum Borough Council oversaw the near destruction of the local heritage asset that is / was Nash Mills House. This proposed development must not be allowed to have any negative impact on the cottages.</p> <p>In the following pages I will use the abbreviations as follows to refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DAS - Planning Design & Access Statement • NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework <p>PARKING</p> <p>It is well documented that the creation of Nash Mills Wharf has had a major negative impact on the surrounding Nash Mills community as a result of the significant under provision of parking. The application form for the proposed development states that there would be 30 parking spaces for 27 apartments, this is inadequate. To make matters worse, the Site Plan contains only 29 spaces (including 2 labeled visitors). The Nash Mills Wharf situation should provide adequate precedent to prove that neither 29 nor 30 spaces are sufficient.</p> <p>The Planning Officer should visit and survey the local area at night / during a weekend to fully appreciate the situation.</p> <p>DAS 3.8 refers to the NPPF and Paragraph 105</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Local car ownership levels'. A detailed review of such local ownership levels should re-confirm that the proposed re-development proposal is inadequate. • 'The availability of and opportunities of public transport' should not become a presumption that the majority of the future owners of the developed apartments will use the Apsley rail station for commuting to negate the need for parking provision. In fact the station in itself creates a local parking impact through people using local streets to park before using the station. • 'The need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug in and ultralow emission vehicles'. The plans do not appear to detail how and where charging

points will be provided.

DAS 3.9 refers to NPPF Paragraph 109. 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residential cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'. The cumulative impact of overflow parking in surrounding roads is already severe; the proposed re-development would create a critical impact.

DAS 3.23 Policy CS12 'On each site development should.... b) Provide sufficient parking ...'. The proposed development does not meet this criteria.

DAS 3.32 Policy 51 (d) 'the design and capacity of parking areas and the implications for onstreet parking'. The on-street parking in the local area is already over utilised.

DAS 4.10 notes that in 'scheme 4/00343/15/MFA adjacent to this site, the one bed units did not provide any parking allocation...'. Inadequate provision by other developments should not be used as a precedent to perpetuate the severe impact on the surrounding community.

The correct reference is 4/00343/15/NMA and refers to the redevelopment of the whole former SAPPI site.

DAS 5.8 'Access arrangement and parking are contained within the proposals, again these on balance will be significantly reduced from the established use currently on site'. This statement needs to be justified. The current business on site does not seem to generate a significant traffic flow. There are usually a number of cars parked on site awaiting work.

ACCESS

DAS 3.32 Policy 51 '(a) the nature, capacity and use of the highway network and its ability to accommodate the traffic generated by the development'. A peak time assessment of Belswains Lane should be undertaken to assess the impact of at least 31 additional cars on the local road network that already has significant queues.

DAS 4.33 Access / Highways seeks to negate any potential impact by reference to local public transport, without substantiating the implied public transport usage by potential occupants of the proposed development.

DAS 3.9 refers to NPPF Paragraph 109. 'Development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residential cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'.

Equally DAS 3.32 Policy 51 (e) 'the environmental and safety implications of the traffic generated by the development'.

- The access to the site via Croxley Road (the Nash Mills Wharf access from Belswains Lane) is already

dangerous, both for cars exiting the site – due to low visibility of traffic from both directions on Belswains Lane - and for pedestrians in Croxley Road as the pavement has subsided and drivers regularly cut across the corner of that sunken curb, see photos.

TREES AND ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT

- The Application Form question 10 - 'Any trees or hedges on site = No' and 'Any adjacent = No' these are clearly false statements according to the other documents.
- As noted in DAS 4.21 'there are significant large trees on Kingfisher Drive' and refers to the distance between the proposed building and existing ones on Kingfisher Drive. However, it does not give specific details of the distance between those trees and the proposed development. Is this distance sufficient to guarantee in perpetuity that the trees will not be negatively impacted by the proposed development, and that the trees will not negatively impact on potential residents of the proposed development as a result of restricted light levels?
- The Arbtech Arboricultural Impact Assessment - Tree Work Schedule - notes trees groups G01 and G02 to be felled to ground level and stump removed, and pruning to G06. This contradicts the Application Form.
- Tree group G01 provides a visual and privacy shield between Basildon Court and the properties in Kingfisher Drive.
- The G06 pruning must be conditional on not impacting the long-term visual impact or viability of the trees themselves, as these trees provide a visual filter between the proposed development and the cottages. This should be a specific condition of any planning approval.
- The reports do not mention the trees already felled on the site on the North West elevation (adjacent to Kingfisher Drive), presumably during pre-application discussions with Dacorum Borough Council.
- Arbor report page 7 - Legal Status - 'detailed planning consent overrides any TPO protection'. Dacorum Borough Council has recently informed local residents that tree groups G03 and G05 cannot be subject to a TPO as the council owns them. This status must not be allowed to result in any lack of protection for those trees which are 'a valuable off site amenity group of Lombardy poplar'. The Arbtech Tree Survey Page 1 notes a 'propensity of the species to failure'. If the trees have a particular failure risk, then they should be afforded extra care.
- The Tree Work Schedule states 'Foundations should not impact...'. The word should does not have sufficient guarantee that the foundations <will not> impact.
- Arboricultural Method Statement Page 24 'Foundations design. The proposed development does not impact

upon any of the retained trees and as such will require no specialist constructions methodology'. The documentation for the proposed development does not seem to detail the foundation design. They will presumably be significant to support a building with 4 floors. The diagram on page 25 can be assumed to imply that foundations would have to be driven into the existing root structures, risking long-term harm to the Kingfisher Drive trees.

- The Arbor report page 25 (see Figure 3 and Figure 4) clearly shows that the roots of the trees in Kingfisher Drive are likely to have grown under the existing building. That building is relatively unsubstantial in terms of its construction and unlikely to have significant foundations. The application for the proposed development does not mention the depth of its foundations (likely to be deep for a four storey building) and their impact on the root structures.

DAS 3.23 Policy CS12 c) 'Avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties'.

This photo demonstrates the impact of the 4 storey Lion Court building in a North Westerly direction. The proposed development, also 4 storeys can be assumed to have a similar impact on the 16th century cottages in Belswains Lane.

This panoramic photograph demonstrates the impact of the Basildon Court building on Kingfisher Drive at 12:26 on 18th November. The addition of the proposed 4-storey development is likely to have an additional sunlight impact. A full professional assessment of the full impact should be required and considered as part of the application.

DAS elevation drawings and paragraph 4.21 refer to South-West but it is in fact North-West. This 4 storey elevation with a significant number of the proposed redevelopment's windows would directly overlook the houses in Kingfisher Drive, significantly affecting the privacy of those residents.

DAS 4.26 & 4.27 Scale - 'its scale acting as a townscape step between the verticality of the developments to the south and lower residential properties to the east and north.' It is difficult to understanding how adding a further 4-storey building can be considered as a 'step'.

DAS 4.11 'the proposed building has a smaller footprint ... to assist assimilation with its surroundings'. It is not the footprint but the 4-storey height of the proposed building compared to the 2 storey existing structure that should be the primary consideration when assessing the likely impact on the surroundings.

The proposed development would lead to a significant loss of privacy for the houses in Kingfisher Drive, and

potentially some of the houses in Swan Mead as 15 apartments would overlook them. Equally 6 apartments would overlook the gardens of the Belswains Lane cottages.

DAS 4.15 'The design of the proposal has evolved and responded to the current established character of the neighboring developments'. Whilst the design can be considered to mirror Nash Mills Wharf, it does not give any consideration the settled community in The Willows (Kingfisher Drive, Swan Mead etc.), or indeed the historic Belswains Lane cottages.

DAS 4.25 'Amenity... The proposal... incorporates a number of amenity areas within the landscaping'. The seating shown on the plans is so close to the existing large trees and their leaf fall etc. that it is unlikely to be a hospitable area that the residents could enjoy.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

DAS 3.26 - CS19 affordable housing contribution. Reference is made to legal precedents regarding developments of 10 units or less. Since the proposed development is of 27 units, the argument provided would seem to be irrelevant and the developer should not be allowed to escape their responsibilities.

The Planning Portal / Supplementary information template refers to 16 flats of Market Housing and 9 flats of Social, Affordable or Intermediate Rent. Firstly the total of 25 does not total to the proposed 27 units, and secondly the DAS 3.26 seeks to override.

OTHER

Fencing

It should be conditional to any approval for the site that a permanent fence is erected along the boundary to Kingfisher Drive that prevents access to the proposed development, otherwise there is a significant risk that Kingfisher Drive will become the primary overflow parking location and indeed an additional pedestrian access.

Landscaping

The majority of the landscaping shown on the plans is to the north west which would be in the shadow of both the established large trees, and the proposed building, thus it is unlikely that grass will grow there.

Refuse

Do the plans provide sufficient space for refuse vehicles to access the site? In particular access to the bin store to the north west of the site should be verified, There are 6 large bins in the almost fully-enclosed under-croft parking area at the north east end of the building – 3 adjacent to the door to the corridor and the stairwell, plus 5 large bins in the enclosed car park area to the north west – again adjacent to the door into the corridor - with two in a separate small bin store. There is a strong risk that these will be unhygienic with smells particularly in summer, and

	attract rats into the building (given the proximity of the canal).
284 BELSWAINS LANE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9XE	<p>As an immediate neighbour to the Milbor Property I object most strongly to the construction of yet another block of flats.</p> <p>My main concerns are as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Privacy Loss of Light Impact of Construction work – effect of pile drivers on 16th Century Properties Parking situation – I appreciate that the plans include allocated parking but I believe that a high percentage of the flats will own two cars, one of which will be looking to park in an already overcrowded area Further traffic on already congested roads (some of which is caused by road / pavement parking) Inadequate infrastructure notably sewerage system Impact on resources – doctors, hospitals etc. Additional noise and possible disturbance. <p>Whilst writing I would like to ask what materials are being considered for the boundary fence from the site to my property.</p>
14 LION COURT,CROXLEY ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9GX	<p>I strongly object to these plans.</p> <p>I have lived here since my building was occupied and there has always been problems with parking because there is not enough spaces for residents as it is now. You just have to try and drive down Red Lion Lane and any time of day to see what a massive problem there is.</p> <p>I actually pay for my parking space and even then have problems with accessing the road into it because of people parking at any part of the road possible even if it means making the road almost blocked. they also park in our parking spaces so prevent us from using our paid for spaces.</p> <p>I rarely have visitors because there is no where for them to park and have quiet a distance to walk if they can find some where to park that is ok.</p> <p>To have more people living in this area would make the parking and the traffic in the area impossible.</p>
10 KINGFISHER	1. Loss of light or overshadowing

<p>DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9DD</p>	<p>A four story building will reduce light and overshadow all properties on Kingfisher Drive.</p> <p>2. Adequate parking / turning The provision of 30 car parking spaces for 27 flats assumes a 1 to 1.12 ratio. The average ratio in the South East has risen from 1.3 to 1.34 since 2003. The planned ratio is already inadequate and makes no provision for future trends. This compounds the already deficient number car parking spaces in the development resulting in over-spill Red Lion lane. Pedestrian access and safety is already compromised. Access to Belswains Land is already compromised with inadequate mini-roundabout and may compromise pedestrian safety.</p> <p>3. Visual intrusion A four story building will be visually intrusive.</p>
<p>2 KINGFISHER DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9DD</p>	<p>I strongly oppose these plans in their current form.</p> <p>Having previously lived in one of the flats in the Linden Homes development "The Embankment" I can see these plans have been proposed based on the logic that those flats have been a success to the local area.</p> <p>Parking As more and more people moved into that development the parking situation locally got steadily and significantly worse. The overflow car park for that development became constantly full with the result being the parking all the way along Red Lion Lane. As a result, I have witnessed heavy-duty vehicles (including the Council's rubbish collection vehicles) having to drive on the wrong side of the road, as they could not pass the central reservation island on the correct side. Due no doubt to the quantity of unattended vehicles at night, in the 2 years I lived on that development I have seen more than 10 cars having their windows smashed in overnight which must have caused significant distress to their owners. An increase in more flats with only a single space will no doubt further increase these problems.</p> <p>We are not located in a city centre or within reasonable walking distance of one. Most couples occupying these flats will have 2 cars they will need to park not just one and there is no suggestion in the plans as to where visitors should park.</p> <p>It is too late to hold Linden Homes/Crest accountable for</p>

	<p>this on their development but lessons need to be learnt on applications such as this one.</p> <p>Roads There is no safe place to cross Belswains Lane near the entrance to Croxley Road; in fact my wife's Grandfather was knocked over this past year as he attempted this. A further increase in the number of flats could lead to further instances of this happening and not everyone will be as lucky as he was.</p> <p>Kingfisher Drive The above points are before I move on to the detriment that these flats will have on my current property. The 4-storey block will reduce the natural light in the morning for most of the properties on this road. The top floors of the flats will have a direct line of sight into my garden and the developers don't appear to have proposed any new planting of trees between the development and Kingfisher Drive to make it more aesthetically pleasing.</p> <p>Whilst I agree that the local area would benefit from the existing site being developed, the current plans will add to the issues prevalent in the local area more than the development of the existing buildings will improve it.</p>
<p>6 BASILDON COURT,CROXLEY ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9GY</p>	<p>6 Basildon Court, Croxley Road</p> <p>As a resident of Basildon Court, our property directly overlooks the proposed development. While we are not opposed to a new development of homes, we do object to a number of elements of this particular proposal.</p> <p>1. Parking. It is unrealistic of the developers to provide only one parking space per unit. I can only see provision of 2 visitor spaces. The impact this will have on surrounding residential areas will be severely detrimental to what is already a significant problem. This development will require at least two spaces per unit with visitor parking for it to be viable.</p> <p>2. Belswains Lane and Red Lion Lane access roads. These roads can barely support the traffic and parking issues as they are. By factoring in construction machinery, construction workers vehicles and other traffic created as a direct result of the construction of a 27 unit building, will only make a very bad situation worse. Already, emergency vehicles cannot access Croxley road at certain times due to parking problems and have problems using Red Lion Lane, so construction vehicles simply will not be able to access the site as it is</p>

	<p>without causing major traffic issues.</p> <p>3. Light. A four storey building in front of our property will block all remaining light to our North-East facing property.</p> <p>4. Privacy. We will lose any privacy we currently have. These flats will be able to see directly into our home.</p> <p>Less units, not four storeys and more parking provisions need to be considered for us to support this proposal.</p>
<p>280 BELSWAINS LANE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9XE</p>	<p>I must object to this proposal in the strongest terms. 27 dwellings with 30 parking spaces is ludicrous. There is already a major parking problem in this area with issues on Red Lion Lane, Belswains Lane, Mill Close, Nash Green, Kingfisher Drive and throughout the Crest Ncholsen Developement as a DIRECT result of inadequate parking provision allowed in the previous re-Developement of the former Sappi site.</p> <p>This already inhibits emergency vehicular access and waste disposal vehicles.</p> <p>Dacorum is already fully aware of the major traffic pronglems in this area with pinch points on RedLion Lane and Belswains Lane and has so far made no attempt to resolve this issue.</p> <p>The proposed dwellings will almost certainly be occupied by couples, requiring parking space for the cars they will need to get to their place of work in light of the potential loss of Kings Langley and Apsley railway stations.</p> <p>The current traffic problem Is having a potentially devastating effect on safety and pollution levels- especially for children trying to walk to and from the schools in the area. All routes to the M1,A41and M25 are regularly at a standstill,.</p> <p>Running along one side of the proposed Developement is a row of Historic 16th century Cottages that will be completely overshadowed and overlooked by this- as will the residents of Kingfisher Drive.</p> <p>A four storey building is completely inappropriate for this site and will result in a loss of natural light for ALL surrounding dwellings-including the Crest Nicholsen estate-at a time when we are all trying to consider our carbon footprint,this is somewhat ironic.</p> <p>This is an ill conceived and thoughtless proposal which gives absolutely no consideration to its impact on the existing wider community..</p>
<p>2 BASILDON COURT,CROXLEY ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9GY</p>	<p>It is already difficult to park or get through people who are turning in this area. There is not enough space for 30 more cars to be entering and exiting this area, as the 'dirveway' towards Basildon is incredibly narrow - we are</p>

	<p>already struggling getting past the Lion Court traffic, so to add an extra layer to this would be ridiculous.</p>
<p>290 BELSWAINS LANE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9XE</p>	<p>My objections are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overdevelopment The proposed new building's volume is approximately 7,300 cubic metres on a site just 80m x 47m x 68m (18 hectares) It is approximately 12 metres high (4 storeys in height) and 39 metres in length and 17 metres wide, almost filling the site. The existing building on the site is mostly 2 storeys, set back from the site boundaries. Its volume is approximately 4,000 cubic metres. 2, Loss of light and overshadowing The proposed building at approximately 12 metres high, within 1 metre of the boundary at the back of our row of cottages will cause a major loss of light, blocking out the daylight from the south west, blocking our view of the sky, overshadowing our houses and making us feel blocked in. This will also be the case for residents of Kingfisher Drive and Basildon Court. 3. Overlooking and loss of privacy The proposed new building would have the hall corridor windows for the flats and the kitchen windows of first, second and third floor flats (the kitchens of 6 dwellings) overlooking the rear of our cottage. The occupants will have a full view of our bedroom windows on the level and from above. This will cause a total lack of bedroom privacy and a loss of amenity in our home. Our garden will be overlooked by windows on the north east and south east elevations of the proposed new block, we will have no privacy. 4.Inadequate parking On the site plan as proposed, the proposed 27 flats have been provided with 27 residents' parking spaces and two visitors' spaces. The flats all have double bedrooms, so it is likely that many of them will require more than just one parking space apiece. In an area where parking is already desperately short, so that residents of the area are forced to park in all the surrounding streets, sometimes in a dangerous or obstructive fashion, this seems likely to cause even more problems. 5 Traffic The proposed 27 flats will add to the congestion leading out of the bottleneck junction of Butterfly Crescent, Lion Court and Croxley road onto Belswains Lane. there is a danger to pedestrians especially children heading to the local schools. The access road exit which runs parallel to Lion Court is likely to be an accident blackspot, given the

massive increase of people moving around the area.

6. Noise and disturbance resulting from use

The occupants of 27 one bedroom flats are likely to produce traffic noise and domestic noise in close proximity to our bedrooms. Light pollution from the proposed flats at the rear of our cottages will affect our privacy and disrupt our sleep.

7. Noise and disturbance resulting from construction

The construction of a 4 storey building at this close proximity will be hugely disruptive and noisy. Our cottages are over 400 years old and of fragile construction. Piling and excavation is likely to break our houses.

8. Visual intrusion, design , appearance and landscaping

The proposed building is 4 storeys high in an area where 2 storey buildings are in the majority (see diagram 1), The proposed block will tower over houses and flats in Belswains Lane, Kingfisher Drive and Croxley road and will dwarf the flats in Basildon Court. It is proposed to replace a part one storey and part two storey building with a monolithic four storey block.

The square form, the linear shape, the ugly proportion, the disproportionate small windows and the yellow colour of the brick shown on the elevations are completely out of keeping with the Nash Mills area and will turn an opportunity to improve the area into a blot on the landscape. The landscaping indicated on the site plan as proposed is woefully inadequate and I have concerns about existing trees in the immediate vicinity.

9. Treatment of Boundaries

I am concerned about the treatment of the boundaries as this has not been addressed on the drawings. Further overlooking is likely if the boundary to the cottages in Belswains Lane is not appropriately dealt with. Traffic accidents are likely to happen if the boundary to Lion court is not carefully considered to enable drivers and pedestrians to see each other.

10. Local services

The dustbin provision on the proposed drawings is inadequate and will lead to problems for the residents of the proposed flats and for Dacorum Council refuse collectors. Up to 54 additional residents in the proposed new block will cause further loading on local doctors surgeries and hospitals. In addition, the local foul and surface sewerage system will be overloaded. Here in Belswains Lane, we experience blockage of the sewers on a regular basis. More effluent from the proposed large

	<p>number of flats is sure to add to the problem.</p> <p>11. Local history matters 280 - 290 Belswains Lane are characterful cottages with considerable history. The proposed development will compromise the appearance and setting of these homes which have value to the local area. The sheer bulk of the block with straight unremitting 4 storey façade looming over our cottage and overlooking our garden will ruin our enjoyment of our cottage and spoil its appearance for others interested in the few remaining elements of local history in the area.</p>
<p>14 KINGFISHER DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9DD</p>	<p>I am not opposed to a redevelopment of this site for residential use, in fact done correctly there is significant potential to enhance the local area. However any development must be appropriate to the site and proportional to the surrounding area. The proposed development does not meet those criteria.</p> <p>HERITAGE Immediately adjacent to the site are the 16th century cottages on Belswains Lane. This proposed development must not be allowed to have any negative impact on the cottages.</p> <p>PARKING The proposed development proposes only 30 parking spaces for 27 apartments. The Nash Mills Wharf situation should provide adequate precedent to prove that this is inadequate. A detailed review of local car ownership levels should re-confirm that the proposed re-development proposal is inadequate. The cumulative impact of overflow parking in surrounding roads is already severe, the proposed re-development would be likely to create a critical impact.</p> <p>ACCESS The access to the site via Croxley Road (the Nash Mills Wharf access from Belswains Lane) is already dangerous, both for cars exiting the site (low visibility of traffic from both directions on Belswains Lane).</p> <p>The application seeks to negate any potential impact by reference to local public transport, without substantiating the expected public transport usage by potential occupants of the proposed development</p> <p>A peak time assessment of Belswains Lane should be undertaken to assess the impact of at least 31 cars</p>

	<p>additional cars on the local road network which already has significant queues.</p> <p>TREES</p> <p>The proposal does not give specific details of the distance between the significant trees on Kingfisher Drive and the proposed development. Is this distance sufficient to guarantee in perpetuity that the trees will not be negatively impacted by the proposed development, and that the trees will not negatively impact on potential residents of the proposed development as a result of restricted light levels?</p> <p>The Arbtech Tree Survey notes that these Lombardy poplar have a propensity of the species to failure. If the trees have a particular failure risk, then they should be afforded extra care.</p> <p>The Tree Work Schedule states "Foundations should not impact...". The word should does not have sufficient guarantee that the foundations impact.</p> <p>The Arbor report clearly shows that the roots of the trees in Kingfisher Drive are likely to have grown under the existing building. That building is relatively unsubstantial in terms of its construction and unlikely to have significant foundations. The application for the proposed development does not mention the depth of its foundations (likely to be deep for a four storey building) and their impact on the root structures.</p> <p>SCALE</p> <p>The proposed development, can be assumed to have a significant negative impact on both the 16th century cottages in Belswains Lane, and the houses in Kingfisher Drive.</p> <p>The elevation drawings are wrong. South West is in fact North West.</p>
<p>1 KINGFISHER DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9DD</p>	<p>This application is a very, very bad idea for so very many reasons both generally for the area and specifically for my young family and I, immeasurably and negatively impacting on some of the reasons we chose this as a place to live 7 or so years ago. This development will immediately cause a loss of privacy both in and out of my home. I have children aged 5 and 3, we were drawn to this house by the lack of oversight. Currently the rear of our property & back garden area is not directly overlooked by the neighbouring houses. There are no</p>

houses located directly next to our back garden. The development proposal will significantly change this and therefore is of huge concern to us. Occupants of these flats will have a direct view into my garden where my children play and down into my house on both levels. It may also lead to further loss of privacy from being overlooked by the flats which have already been erected in the area - the current position of the existing building has prevented this from being an issue. The construction of an additional block of flats on what is already a highly developed site will have an adverse impact to us. This development will mean that we lose the light that we currently enjoy and the building, being higher than what is currently there will cause overshadowing of my garden and presumably at least the downstairs of my property. We will be impacted considerably by noise and disturbance. It goes without saying this will occur during any works but will continue forever when occupants are there. Having so many new properties within such a short distance is going to cause a noise nuisance. I am told there are no balconies in the current plans though I'm told they were provisioned previously and have since been removed. This is of small comfort. As an aside, the documentation in relation to this is practically incomprehensible. How anyone can charge for plans as incompetent as those in this documentation, I have no idea, amateurish comes to mind. The documentation specifically references a small number of houses as being affected but it omits mine, amongst many others. How can mine be omitted? My property boundary is perhaps the closest to the development! Please don't dumb down the impact you intend to create, that is offensive. Now turning to the increased traffic this is going to generate. The situation on Red Lion Lane is a Council caused disgrace. You know very well the issues there yet you entertain applications which are going to add to it. The parking provisioned is inadequate. You and I know each flat is going to bring at least 2 cars and there is nowhere for them all to go. If they can't spread to red lion lane, they will increase the traffic on our estate, they will increase the traffic both parked and travelling on Belswains Lane and cause danger, particularly to the many children attending Nash Mills Primary School where there have already been several near misses (at least one of which I have witnessed for myself). There is a big risk of a severe accident already and that will only grow with this illogical development. I am sure development will occur on this site and frankly, I am not opposed to that per se but you must go back to the drawing board based on this application. I expect you will receive many comments along these lines and I can only hope you listen and amend drastically

8 KINGFISHER
DRIVE,HEMEL
HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9DD

I strongly oppose this development for the following reasons.

1. Overdevelopment: These plans will exacerbate the existing overdevelopment of the adjoining Nash Mills residential area. The lack of existing parking already causes cars to block pavements on the entire length of Red Lion Lane and Kingfisher Drive, forcing pedestrians, wheelchair users and push chairs to use the road to pass a parked vehicle. The Council needs to take action to alleviate the problem. This development would further aggravate the parking issues for everyone.

2. Height and not in keeping: The proposals replace a 2 story factory with a 4 story block of flats which is not in keeping with the housing on Belswains Lane and Kingfisher Drive (which are 2 story and of more traditional style) that overlook the development. 4 stories are far too high and the appearance of this block of flats does not blend in well with the surrounding dwellings.

3. Loss of Light (Overshadowing): The existing factory is about 7.5 meters at its highest point on the ridge of the pitched roof- the current plans add at least 5 metres to that reaching almost 13 metres at the highest point. Due to the close proximity to the houses on Kingfisher Drive, the height of this proposed development will completely block the morning sun (when in the east and south) and for properties in Kingfisher Drive.

4. Overcrowding and lack of social space: The development has minimal outdoor social spaces for residents - one seating area is squeezed in to the corner of the car park! The plans clearly show that the suggested use of this area is overcrowded.

5. Parking: The suggested 27 owner with 2 visitor car parking spaces are not adequate for the size of the development. In addition, the 'under croft' spaces numbered 11 and 17 will be particularly difficult to access due to their proximity to a wall, unless drivers are prepared to reverse all the way in to these spaces. The turning areas for cars are also tight.

6. Trees: It is highly unlikely that this development can be built without severely damaging the roots and branches of the offsite trees. A four storey building requires deep foundations that will impact the root systems. Note that the tree survey states that the Lombardy Poplar trees in area G03 (T04, T05, T06, T07 and T08) have roots 'historically damaged by installation of the housing development and associated roads and parking.' This is

unlikely as the Kingfisher Drive development was built in 1996 and the trees are estimated to be 10 to 20 years old. Unknown persons have already thinned the offsite trees in the G03 and G05 areas and also reduced the canopies of trees in these areas. Was approval sought from the Council for this or is the developer attempting to show that these trees will not encroach on the proposed development?

7. External windows: The external windows in the proposed flats that overlook Kingfisher Drive are far too close to the offsite existing large trees in areas G03 and G05. These would substantially block daylight and outlook that these North-West facing flats may have. Note that the existing structure has frosted windows - changing these to clear windows will also impact on the privacy of residents in Kingfisher Drive. Any windows that are currently frosted should remain frosted.

8. Badgers and Hedgehogs: During the summer of 2018, badgers were frequently seen at night on Kingfisher Drive. The wooden fence and wire mesh fence on the boundary of the development adjacent to Kingfisher Drive were taken down by the developers (to enable the felling of 3 large trees and additional bushes on the site). The wood and wire mesh fencing has been left spread out flat on the ground. Since this happened, I haven't seen any badgers. (Note the fence does not belong to the developers and needs to be reinstated.) Hedgehogs are also hibernating close to the perimeter fence just offsite. Hedgehogs are protected animals and these may come to harm as a result of this proposal.

9. Flood Risk

As the proposed development is in flood zones 2 and 3, expanding the existing buildings, roads and paths could impact the surface water runoff, increasing the risk of flooding for surrounding properties.

10. Future Covenants: A restrictive covenant should be placed on any future subletting of properties built on this site to ensure that parking spaces have to be included with the sublet. I hear that many landlords in the existing Nash Mills development rent their car parking spaces separately from the property, making the parking problems worse.

11. Winners and Losers: The only winners from this development will be profits for the developers who are trying to squeeze far too many dwellings in a small area. More thought needs to be given to improve the social and environmental aspects during redevelopment to

	<p>prevent any further deterioration in the quality of life for local residents.</p>
<p>294 BELSWAINS LANE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9XE</p>	<p>I object to this planning application, for the following reasons:</p> <p>Overdevelopment In the last 8 years the redevelopment of the previous industrial Sappi site has created some 364 units of accommodation. Although this has improved the area and Nash Mills Wharf is a pleasant place to live, the introduction of such a large number of units has had a detrimental impact on some aspects of the local infrastructure, such as drainage and sewerage, motor traffic and parking. These are ongoing problems distressing to residents, who have appealed to both Borough and Parish Council, so far without success. If this planning application is approved, the resulting increase in population density will inevitably exacerbate our existing problems. The site in question has been industrial for many decades, but is now an unsightly island surrounded by residential accommodation. Change to residential use would be welcome, but only if managed sympathetically so that the impact on the immediate area is mitigated.</p> <p>Visual Intrusion The current workshops are a mix of one- and two-storey buildings. The proposed 4-storey block would impose a significant and unwelcome change to our skyline, would reduce our afternoon light, and would constitute an unwelcome reduction in amenity.</p> <p>Parking The Sappi site redevelopment included seriously inadequate provision for parking. This has been both vexatious for residents in Nash Mills Wharf and neighbouring streets and difficult for the Council to manage. The problem has not yet been resolved and continues to cause inconvenience and risk to pedestrians and motorists alike. The current application again proposes woefully inadequate parking, which would only add to existing problems.</p> <p>Traffic The proposal provides that vehicle access should be via Croxley Road from Belswains Lane. This junction is the only access point to the western segment of Nash Mills Wharf, and the traffic using it, particularly during the rush hour, is already considerable, resulting in queues of vehicles waiting for a gap in traffic on Belswains Lane. 27</p>

	<p>units seem likely to add approximately 50 vehicles to this traffic, exacerbating existing problems and related risk.</p> <p>Social / environmental Nash Mills Wharf introduced a great deal of residential accommodation but neglected the potential for detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure. As proposed, this application seems likely to benefit no one but the developer. Far too often we see the interests of the private citizen subordinated to the relentless drive of Mammon. I appeal to the Council to take seriously the needs of existing residents and treat this application with justice, fairness and humanity.</p>
<p>227 BELSWAINS LANE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9XE</p>	<p>I strongly object to these proposals.</p> <p>Road Safety</p> <p>As a resident on Belswains Lane, directly opposite the entrance/exit road of the Nash Mills Wharf development, I already experience extreme difficulty in exiting my property in my car in rush hour times onto Belswains Lane so the increase of cars coming from the development will only make matters even worse. It's only a matter of time before an accident will occur here.</p> <p>Parking</p> <p>Since Nash Mills Wharf development has been fully occupied the parking in the surrounding areas is just out of control, Mill Close, Red Lion Lane to name just two roads. The only reason people don't park on Belswains Lane is because we have recently got double yellow lines but believe me before this happened cars from the development were parking along this road also. Even now a car / van (from the development) is always parked on the double yellow lines in Mill Close most evenings/mornings and nothing is ever done about this! When we were consulted about the new development parking was a major issue for current residents and we were assured that adequate parking would be provided, clearly this was not enough and the fact that the development has parking restrictions on it is ridiculous as the people living there should be parking there and not in the surrounding roads, this restriction should be lifted to ease congestion on connecting roads and letting people who live in those roads/near those roads to park easily as it was before the development.</p> <p>Creating even more residential flats will only make matters even worse and I'm not sure the roads around this area can take much more, I feel that 30 spaces for</p>

	<p>27 flats is just not adequate as from the experience of Nash Mills Wharf we all know that there will be more than one car per flat this will only add to the chaos that we already live with on a daily basis.</p> <p>Schools</p> <p>The local schools are full to capacity, the school my children attend is now having to go from one form entry to two form entry to meet the current demand changing the entire feel of the school which no doubt will make it a completely different school experience. The school was always known as a small school within the area and for those children starting the new school experience it was a good introduction as classes were small and the environment was very homely. Now with the changes it will be very different. But even with the extra classes I'm not sure how long this will support the growing population of this area of Hemel Hempstead.</p>
<p>6 KINGFISHER DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9DD</p>	<p>Kingfisher Drive</p> <p>The above points are before I move on to the detriment that these flats will have on my current property. The 4-storey block will reduce the natural light in the morning for most of the properties on this road. The top floors of the flats will have a direct line of sight into my garden and the developers don't appear to have proposed any new planting of trees between the development and Kingfisher Drive to make it more aesthetically pleasing.</p> <p>Loss of Light (Overshadowing): The existing factory is about 7.5 meters at its highest point on the ridge of the pitched roof- the current plans add at least 5 metres to that reaching almost 13 metres at the highest point. Due to the close proximity to the houses on Kingfisher Drive, the height of this proposed development will completely block the morning sun (when in the east and south) and for properties in Kingfisher Drive</p> <p>PARKING</p> <p>The proposed development proposes only 30 parking spaces for 27 apartments. The Nash Mills Wharf situation should provide adequate precedent to prove that this is inadequate. A detailed review of local car ownership levels should re-confirm that the proposed re-development proposal is inadequate. The cumulative impact of overflow parking in surrounding roads is already severe, the proposed re-development would be likely to create a critical impact.</p>

12 KINGFISHER
DRIVE,HEMEL
HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9DD

I strongly object to the proposed development in it's current form for the following reasons;

The proposed development is too large for the site and not in keeping with existing surrounding properties in Kingfisher Drive and Belswains Lane, particularly the adjoining historic 16th century cottages. Replacing a two storey building with a four storey one that's almost twice the volume will mean the site is overdeveloped and this will negatively impact the local residents and infrastructure.

There are 27 proposed new dwellings with only 27 parking spaces plus 2 visitor places. As the flats are all double bedroomed and at least some have an extra "study" which could be used as a bedroom, I believe there will be at least double the amount of cars to spaces available. Parking is already a serious issue locally, as the council are well aware, with cars dangerously parked on all surrounding roads especially Kingfisher Drive, Mill Close, Belswains Lane and Red Lion Lane. Already at times it is impossible for emergency vehicles to access certain roads and so many extra cars will only add to that problem.

The new building is extremely close to the border with Kingfisher Drive where there are several large mature trees along the boundary including several Lombardy poplars. The roots of these trees will almost certainly be damaged by such close and extensive development. The Arbtech tree survey submitted with the plans states that "The foundation of the existing two storey structure is assumed to be of a depth suitable to act as a barrier to root development for off site trees on Kingfisher Drive" and yet the root span of the trees is clearly shown under the new development. The existing two storey building almost certainly has very little in the way of deep foundations and so it is in fact very likely that the roots currently extend into the area to be developed. As the proposed new building is four storeys high and has undercroft parking, it's foundations will need to be significantly deeper in the area of the tree roots. As Lombardy poplars have a propensity to failure as also stated in the survey, then damage to the roots should be avoided at all costs. These trees are undoubtedly helping to keep this area free from water logging and flooding, being in such close proximity to the canal. They are also home to nesting birds and the surrounding area to badgers and hibernating hedgehogs. Should the tree roots be damaged and the trees fail, then all surrounding properties, including the new development, are significantly at risk.

	<p>Apartments four storeys high will completely block all the morning and early afternoon sunlight for the houses along Kingfisher Drive. The plans have North in the wrong direction which does not show the true extent of the movement of the sun. In addition flats that high will look straight into our houses and gardens leading to a loss of privacy.</p>
<p>10 KINGFISHER DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9DD</p>	<p>In relation to the proposed demolition of existing building and construction of 27 one-bed flats. Our property is immediately adjacent to the Application Site.</p> <p>My Property would be directly and adversely affected by the development proposed at the Application Site, in the event the Council is minded to grant planning permission and the proposed development goes ahead.</p> <p>Below I outline reasons why in my view, the Application should be refused.</p> <p>I do not object, in principle, to the building and construction of the proposed flats, however, I have great concern with the proposals as they currently stand.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 4 stories in the proposed plans will have an adverse affect on daylight/sunlight, blocking much of the sky seen to the south of our property. In your plans you show north and south the wrong way around. I would ask that the Council check Policy CS12 of the Council's Core Strategy 2013 which requires that new development should (point c) avoid loss of sunlight and daylight. A story or 2 stories off the proposed plans would be more appropriate. 2. The Application states there are no trees adjacent to the proposed property. This is blatantly wrong! There is concern for the roots and whether they would be disturbed during demolition and construction. 3. For such a large building, there is concern that all the pile driving will cause structural damage to our house. 4. 30 car parking spaces is not enough for 27 apartments. Most apartments (even being 1 bedroom (although the plans show a study, which many people will turn into a bedroom)) will have more than 1 car. Where will these people park? Red Lion Lane and the surrounding streets are already full of cars parked dangerously.

<p>290 BELSWAINS LANE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9XE</p>	<p>My objections are as follows:</p> <p>1. Overdevelopment</p> <p>The proposed new building's volume is approximately 7,300 cubic metres on a site just 80m x 47m x 68m (18 hectares) It is more than 11 metres high (4 storeys in height) and 39 metres in length and 17 metres wide, almost filling the site. The existing building on the site is mostly 2 storeys, set back from the site boundaries. Its volume is approximately 4,000 cubic metres.</p> <p>2, Loss of light and overshadowing</p> <p>The proposed building at approximately 12 metres high, at a distance of .lefrom the back of our row of cottages will cause a major loss of light, blocking out the daylight from the south west, blocking our view of the sky, overshadowing our houses and making us feel blocked in. This will also be the case for residents of Kingfisher Drive and Basildon Court.</p> <p>3. Overlooking and loss of privacy</p> <p>The proposed new building would have the hall corridor windows for the flats and the kitchen windows of first second and third floor flats (the kitchens of 6 dwellings) overlooking the rear of our cottage. The occupants will have a full view of our bedroom windows on the level and from above. this will cause a total lack of bedroom privacy and a loss of amenity in our home.</p> <p>4.Inadequate parking</p> <p>On the site plan as proposed, the proposed 27 flats have been provided with27 residents' parking spaces and two visitors' spaces. The flats all have double bedrooms, so it is likely that may of them will require more than just one</p>

parking space apiece. In an area where parking is already desperately short, so that resident of the area are forced to park in all the surrounding streets, sometimes in a dangerous or obstructive fashion, this seems likely to cause even more problems.

5 traffic

The proposed 27 flats will add to the congestion leading out of the bottleneck junction of Butterfly Crescent, Lion Court and Croxley road onto Belswains Lane. there is a danger to pedestrians especially children heading to the local schools. The access road exit which runs parallel to Lion Court is likely to be an accident blackspot, given the massive increase of people moving around the area.

6. Noise and disturbance resulting from use

The occupants of 27 one bedroom flats are likely to produce traffic noise and domestic noise in close proximity to our bedrooms. Light pollution from the proposed flats at the rear of our cottages will affect our privacy and disrupt our sleep

7. Noise and disturbance resulting from construction

The construction of a 4 storey building at this close proximity will be hugely disruptive and noisy. Our cottages are over 400 years old and of fragile construction. Piling and excavation is likely to break our houses.

8. Visual intrusion, design , appearance and landscaping

The proposed building is 4 storeys high in an area where 2 storey buildings are in the majority (see diagram 1), The proposed block will tower over houses are flats in Belswains Lane, Kingfisher Drive and Croxley road and will dwarf the flats in Basildon Court.

The square form, the linear shape, the ugly proportion, the disproportionate small windows and the yellow colour of the brick shown on the elevations are completely out of keeping with the Nash Mills area and will turn an opportunity to improve the area into a blot on the landscape. The landscaping indicated on the site plan as proposed is woefully inadequate and I have concerns about existing trees in the immediate vicinity.

9. Treatment of Boundaries

I am concerned about the treatment of the boundaries as this has not been addressed on the drawings. Further overlooking is likely if the boundary to the cottages in Belswains Lane is not appropriately dealt with. Traffic accidents are likely to happen if the boundary to Lion court is not carefully considered to enable drivers and pedestrians to see each other.

10. Local services

The dustbin provision on the proposed drawings is inadequate and will lead to problems for the residents of the proposed flats and for Dacorum Council refuse collectors. The additional 27 - 57 residents in the proposed new block will cause further loading on local doctors surgeries and hospitals. In addition, the local foul and surface sewerage system will be overloaded. Here in Belswains Lane, we experience blockage of the sewers on a regular basis. More effluent from the proposed large number of flats is sure to add to the problem.

11. Local history matters

280 - 290 Belswains Lane are characterful cottages with considerable history. The proposed development will compromise the appearance and setting of these homes which have value to the local area.

<p>290 BELSWAINS LANE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9XE</p>	<p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over development Overcrowding Overlooking Loss of privacy Traffic problems Noise Visual intrusion <p>I strongly believe that a 4 storey block of flats in this position would be inappropriate and I hope you will refuse it</p>
<p>11 SWAN MEAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9DQ</p>	<p>Over Development</p> <p>The volume of the proposed new building is 7,300 m³.</p>

The footprint of the site is 18 hectares, and that space is almost entirely soaked up by the size of the building: 11 M in height (4 storeys) / X 39 M L x 17M W. This is in stark contrast to the displacement of the current site at 2 storeys, and which is considerably contained within the plot.

Local Heritage

The Cottages at 280 - 290 Belswains Lane are circa 400 years old. These buildings should be celebrated, respected and protected as buildings which provide a tangible sense of history and meaning for the parish. The construction of, together with the day to day use of, a development on this scale will have a serious negative impact on the existence of this Heritage.

Provision of Local Services

There will be a considerable negative impact by way of the burden on existing services for Schools (Nurseries, Primary and Senior), Local NHS services including provision of General Practitioners and Social Services and Waste Collection. Sewerage and water run off is already acute and overloaded and not able to bear additional load.

Parking

The current plan clearly does not provide for sufficient parking. 27 flats with 27 resident parking and 2 visitors spaces is clearly absurd. The proposed design of the 27 flats are with double bedrooms which quite clearly implies occupation by >1 person, and we should hold an expectation that 2 people in current times will equal 2 cars. At that calculation alone we arrive at a total of 54 vehicles, and even then that would be conservative. It is certainly not a stretch of the imagination that the 'study' as it is so deemed in the plans will quickly be turned into bedroom #2 by many residents, and from that a further increase in the number of vehicles attached to the development. The surrounding area is already blighted by pavement parking, double parking and inconsiderate parking and is borne out by the day to day picture on Belswains Lane, Kingfisher Drive, Teal Way & Heron Close, Mill Close and Red Lion lane.

Motor Vehicle Traffic

A development of the size proposed will hugely impact the already congested local roads network

	<p>The access road exit which runs parallel to Lion Court is likely to be an accident black spot, given the massive increase of people moving around the area.</p>
<p>5 FRANCES MEWS,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9GR</p>	<p>The area is suffering from terrible parking congestion around Nash Mills Wharf and this will only make the problem even worse. The entrance to Croxley Road is already very dangerous due to the amount of traffic entering the development. The area is home to many families with young children and the increasing level of traffic and cars parked on pavements is going to lead to an accident. I have already had several near misses walking with my children and something must be done. The situation cannot be allowed to get worse.</p>
<p>12 Kingfisher Drive,Hemel Hempstead,,,HP3 (DD</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed development in it's current form for the following reasons;</p> <p>The proposed development is too large for the site and not in keeping with existing surrounding properties in Kingfisher Drive and Belswains Lane, particularly the adjoining historic 16th century cottages. Replacing a two storey building with a four storey one that's almost twice the volume will mean the site is overdeveloped and this will negatively impact the local residents and infrastructure.</p> <p>There are 27 proposed new dwellings with only 27 parking spaces plus 2 visitor places. As the flats are all double bed roomed and at least some have an extra "study" which could be used as a bedroom, I believe there will be at least double the amount of cars to spaces available. Parking is already a serious issue locally, as the council are well aware, with cars dangerously parked on all surrounding roads especially Kingfisher Drive, Mill Close, Belswains Lane and Red Lion Lane. Already at times it is impossible for emergency vehicles to access certain roads and so many extra cars will only add to that problem.</p> <p>The new building is extremely close to the border with Kingfisher Drive where there are several large mature trees along the boundary including several Lombardy poplars. The roots of these trees will almost certainly be damaged by such close and extensive development. The Arbtech tree survey submitted with the plans states that "The foundation of the existing two storey structure is assumed to be of a depth suitable to act as a barrier to root development for off site trees on Kingfisher Drive" and yet the root span of the trees is clearly shown under the new development. The existing two storey building almost certainly has very little in the way of deep foundations and so it is in fact very likely that the roots</p>

	<p>currently extend into the area to be developed. As the proposed new building is four storeys high and has undercroft parking, it's foundations will need to be significantly deeper in the area of the tree roots. As Lombardy poplars have a propensity to failure as also stated in the survey, then damage to the roots should be avoided at all costs. These trees are undoubtedly helping to keep this area free from water logging and flooding, being in such close proximity to the canal. They are also home to nesting birds and the surrounding area to badgers and hibernating hedgehogs. Should the tree roots be damaged and the trees fail, then all surrounding properties, including the new development, are significantly at risk.</p> <p>Apartments four storeys high will completely block all the morning and early afternoon sunlight for the houses along Kingfisher Drive. The plans have North in the wrong direction which does not show the true extent of the movement of the sun. In addition flats that high will look straight into our houses and gardens leading to a loss of privacy.</p>
<p>12 SWAN MEAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9DG</p>	<p>The development will add to the</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parking problems on the site 2. The current horrible traffic congestion on the London Road, Belswains lane, Lower road, Red Lion-lane, and the adjoining areas. <p>This development should not be allowed to proceed ahead. If anything we need a <u>green area</u> in this place.</p>
<p>18 Kingfishers Drive,Hemel Hempstead,Hertfordshire ,,HP3 9DD</p>	<p>I am a resident on Kingfisher Drive and I have been speaking to other residents local to me about the planned build of a 3-storey block of flats opposite no 16 Kingfisher Drive.</p> <p>I would like to communicate my concerns over this potential eyesore that would spring up across the road to me and spoil the relatively scenic views. There are also current parking issues that face the residents of Kingfisher Drive where the designed spaces that were intended for residents are already being take up my residents of the Croxley Papermill site.</p> <p>The intended flats are as I understand it only coming with one parking space so I am at a loss as to where the second car associated to these planned flats are to park.</p>
<p>1 KINGFISHER DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9DD</p>	<p>This looks like the classic case of go in ridiclously big knowing people will object. Then make a couple of minor concessions (which you already had up your sleeve) and look like you're a listening entity (when you're anything but!). Let's hope you don't pull the wool over anyone</p>

	<p>important who's going to make the decision - you clearly don't think the neighbours are important. Everyone on here has made numerous valid concerns and I don't see that you have adequately addressed any, and many you have not addressed at all. Our original objections still stand and we are no less strong in our objections than when this extremely bad idea first came to our attention. What more can we say?!?!</p>
<p>1 BASILDON COURT,CROXLEY ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9GY</p>	<p>As a resident of Basildon court I am very concerned about the proposed application development. My objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parking - parking has been a nightmare since we moved here 3 years ago around Basildon and Lion court. Cars are blocking other cars in , parking in my reserved space that I have to pay extra for and blocking the underground car park - this all causes a lot of distress on a daily basis. There is no visitors spaces and outside is a lot of double yellow lines now - Red Lion road is also a nightmare on a daily basis. So an extra 27 flats would only cause more issues as 1 space per flat would not be enough. 2. Access to Basildon Court and Nash Mills Wharf - this again is becoming a daily issue as cars are parking on Croxley road restricting access to Basildon court , this is a major safety issue too as there should be room for fire engines and ambulances at all times. To get onto Belswains Lane is also a problem especially during rush hour, so again another potential 27 cars will only cause further traffic issues. 3. Noise - the construction noise throughout the day will cause extreme anxiety for myself and newborn child, also having a minimum of 27 new neighbours will make noise levels in the residential area worst and a noisier place to live. 4. Wildlife - living by the canal we have a lot of lovely wildlife - swans , ducks, birds and squirrels along with trees. A new large construction could destroy their habitat and the pollution could affect the animals. 5. Privacy - a four story building will affect Basildon Court and Lion Court , and over shadow any privacy we currently have. <p>Based on the above factors we will be objecting this application. Surely there is land else where in Hemel Hempstead to put new Council flats rather than squeezing them into a new build estate where there is</p>

<p>290 BELSWAINS LANE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9XE</p>	<p>already so many issues and limited space.</p> <p>I attach comments on the amended proposal. I object to the proposal as follows: I am writing in response to the planning application 4/02781/18/MFA DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF 21 ONE-BED FLATS MILBOR ENGINEERING HEMEL HEMPSTEAD LTD, BELSWAINS LANE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 9XE</p> <p>I have no objection in principle to the development of this site for residential use. Appropriately done, this would enhance the character and amenity of the area. However, development in the proposed form is greedy and inconsiderate.</p> <p>The documents in the application as it stands at present are confusing. The title of the document states that the proposal is for CONSTRUCTION OF 21 ONE-BED FLATS and the drawings dated 24th January show 21 units; 3 on the ground floor, 8 first, 8 second and 2 on third floor, however, the application form states Demolition of building and erection of new building forming 27 residential units.</p> <p>Overdevelopment In this location, on a site approx. 1700m², a building with a footprint of approx. 752m² (volume approx 1,808m³) is overdevelopment.</p> <p>Lack of Amenity There is very little useable space left around the proposed building, landscaping is sparse with a single isolated tree at the front of the proposed building and a narrow strip of green at the rear. This narrow strip on the north west side of the 12m high proposed building will be a dank, dark corridor and will not be useful or attractive to residents or neighbours. This does not constitute adequate amenity space for 21 dwellings housing up to 42 people. Planning recommendations suggest the planting of trees and shrubs to help assimilate development and softly screen settlement edges. This has not been done in this proposal.</p> <p>No additional shops, accessible post office, cafes convenience stores etc have been provided to cater for additional residents of the area.</p> <p>Access for traffic and pedestrians Access has not been adequately considered, the additional traffic on an already overused junction will be a</p>
---	---

problem. There seems to be no provision for pedestrians. Given the increased traffic at the entrance to the site and at the junction with Belswains Lane, pedestrians, including school children will be at risk.

Service access

Service access has not been fully considered. The proposed bin store is undersized and the overflow of bins has been shown distributed in amongst the covered parking. Already evident as a problem on the plans, in reality this will be a cause of difficulty for potential residents and the council operatives who deal with their waste.

Parking

Parking is inadequate. The proposed 21 flats are likely to have up to 42 residents. Parking for 13 cars around the block and 15 cars at ground floor level is inadequate for the likely number of vehicles. The planning statement (para 4.9), refers to underground parking, but the only parking shown on the drawings is at ground floor level. The planning statement "...the proposal has been amended to provide 12 spaces enclosed at ground floor and a further 3 no spaces undercroft with a further 15 spaces externally." is misleading. There are already almost daily conflicts about parking in the area, and this will only be made worse is the proposed plans.

Waste

The sewerage system in the immediate locality is already at breaking point. Thames water (and their subcontractors) are being called out several times a year to clear blockages. This will be worsened by the additional loading from this number of proposed flats.

Size

The existing building on the site is maximum 7.5 m high at the top of the highest part of the ridge. The proposed new building is approximately 9m high at the lowest and approximately 12 metres high at the highest. This is a massive increase in size, height and bulk

Overshadowing

The height and location of the proposed building will block essential south, southeast and southwest sunlight and daylight to the small 16th century cottages in Belswains Lane. This will have a major impact on the amenity and enjoyment of our much loved homes and gardens.

Overlooking and loss of privacy

Dwellings in Basildon court would be overlooked by balconies and windows of 5 flats at a distance of 8 to 12 metres. Dwellings in Lion court would be overlooked by balconies and windows of 10 flats at a distance of approx.12 metres. Houses in Kingfisher Drive would be overlooked by the windows of 12 flats. The historic cottages in Belswains Lane will have their bedrooms and kitchens overlooked by the windows of 4 flats and the hallways of all the flats. This is a massive loss of privacy and will make life miserable and embarrassing for existing residents

Disturbance

The cottages in Belswains Lane date back to the 16th century. They have no foundations and are quite fragile. Residents are very concerned about damage to the cottages.

Retention of trees

There is a row of mature poplars just outside the north west boundary of the site. Not only do these have a benefit to environment and wildlife, but they also take up a lot of surface water, which is beneficial. There are a number of specimen trees of various ages and sizes along the boundary with the rear of 276-290 Belswains Lane. I trust that these will be treated with care.

Boundaries

The artists impression 44829500 is misleading as it shows the private drive at the rear of 276 -290 Belswains Lane as if it were part of the site (bottom right of image). This is a private drive. A boundary fence or wall will be required. Drawing 44824186 (Arbtech tree protection plan) indicates that hoardings will be erected during building works, which is essential to maintain health and safety standards on and around the proposed building site. A permanent solution to the boundary protection needs to be provided.

Streetscape and adjoining properties

The planning statement makes extensive mention of neighbouring Lion Court, but glosses over the relationship with the cottages in Belswains Lane and the houses in Kingfisher Drive and Croxley Road. These are all small and domestic in size and character. In particular the cottages at 280 - 290 Belswains Lane date back to the 16th Century and are the original "Nash Mill". The proposal pays no attention to the historic character, materials or scale of the neighbourhood. The mill cottages (280 - 290), backing originally onto the river, are the remaining substance of the early industry on which the wealth and character of this area was built. The sheer

	<p>face of a three to four storey block looming over the cottages does not respect the character or appearance of these cottages. I fear that the same disregard will be shown to the cottages as has been shown to historic Nash House in the middle of the Nash Mills Wharf development.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that this proposal will not get permission.</p>
<p>290 BELSWAINS LANE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9XE</p>	<p>planning application 4/02781/18/MFA DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF 21 ONE-BED FLATS MILBOR ENGINEERING HEMEL HEMPSTEAD LTD, BELSWAINS LANE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 9XE</p> <p>I object to the amended proposal for the following reasons:</p> <p>Overdevelopment The building is too big for the site</p> <p>Traffic and pedestrians There will be an increase of traffic and the road layout has not been thought out</p> <p>Parking There is not enough parking provided for this number of residents</p> <p>Waste Existing problems with the sewers will be made much worse by the additional output from this number of proposed flats.</p> <p>Size The Milbor building is 7.5 m high the highest part. The proposed new building is approximately 9m high at the lowest and approximately 12 metres high at the highest. This is a massive increase in size and height</p> <p>Overshadowing The proposed building will block sunlight and daylight from south, southeast and southwest to cottages in Belswains Lane. This will have a major impact on the amenity and enjoyment of residents & will also be detrimental to Solar PV and Solar Gain.</p> <p>Light Pollution We already suffer light pollution from the brightly lit staircase of Lion Court and surrounding</p>

	<p>Buildings, (there is no chance of regular darkness throughout the night even after the local street lighting goes off in the late evening),the proposed new build will only add to this</p> <p>Overlooking and loss of privacy The proposed flats will overlook rear windows and gardens of cottages in Belswains Lane. This is a massive loss of privacy.</p> <p>Disturbance We are very concerned about damage to the cottages during building work.</p> <p>Retention of trees The mature Poplars just outside the north west boundary of the site and the specimen trees of various ages and sizes along the boundary with the rear of 276-290 Belswains Lane need to be treated with care.</p> <p>Boundaries The private drive at the rear of 276 -290 Belswains Lane is not part of the site. This is a private drive and will require a boundary fence or wall.. A permanent solution to the boundary protection must be provided.</p> <p>Streetscape and adjoining properties The proposal pays no attention to the historic character, materials or scale of the neighbourhood. The mill cottages, It looks as though the same disregard will be shown to the cottages as has been shown to historic Nash House in the middle of the Nash Mills Wharf development.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that this proposal will not get permission.</p>
<p>3 CROXLEY ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9GU</p>	<p>Yet more dwellings squeezed into a small space, next to an already over sized development. There will be no further improvement in terms of access to the estate. Traffic and parking are now a huge problem. More people, more cars, more traffic and pollution and even less space to park. Whilst each flat is afforded a single parking space, most occupant couples will own two cars, or a car and a work van. Please refer to the current DIRE situation on Red Lion Lane. The traffic and parking situation is now an accident waiting to happen. I urge the planning committee to reject this application and put the site to better use. There simply isn't space or infrastructure to safely incorporate such a large development on a tiny plot.</p>
<p>292 BELSWAINS</p>	<p>It is a big concern to have another set of flats on this plot.</p>

<p>LANE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9XE</p>	<p>The cottages will have no natural light, given that they are 16th Century building they might be under risk if any drill down or further construction happens. there is no bus service in this area, if you have 1 bed room flats where is the parking space, Nash mills warft residents have no parking space and it is an big issue.</p> <p>let the council sort the parking space, bus facilities, traffic.</p> <p>i would suggest if you can come up with more hospitals/surgerys help they community with more good schools as we are lacking these right now. we do not any more flats blocking us.</p>
<p>14 LION COURT,CROXLEY ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9GX</p>	<p>This change in planning will not make any difference this will cause more problems with the parking and the access to and from existing properties. As it is we all have problems getting into our reserved parking spaces that we pay for be it people parking in them or parking blocking you in or even park so that it is nearly impossible to get into spaces. There are people parking in Red Lion Road and this is going to cause a bad accident soon and goodness knows how emergency vehicles will do going down that road. It is also a worry that emergency vehicles would have problems accessing the properties as it is, in fact the collection of the rubbish from the bins has had to be not done because of the places some people have parked. I object for the above reasons and because there are to many flats here already.</p>
<p>1 Nash Green,Hemel Hempstead,Hertfordshire ,,HP3 8AA</p>	<p>I can't believe this planned development could be going ahead if it is approved which I will object to like our councillor as well. After all the parking issues we have had in the area over the last 2 years especially in my road Nash Green which I have complained about many times by email, to now think of building 21 flats with only 29 parking spaces which we all know is not enough ,everyone has two cars these days plus many people also have work vans and trucks which you know from my previous emails always park down our road ,the only road I might add that doesn't have parking restrictions so it's used as a car park for the local estate's residents.I know there is a shortage of flats,houses and social houses but this very much a short sighted view from Dacroum Council when they know full well of the major problems we have in area regarding traffic,parking a hospital that every year part of it goes.</p>
<p>6 BASILDON</p>	<p>It is quite clear from the amended plans that the</p>

<p>COURT,CROXLEY ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9GY</p>	<p>developers have not listened to nor taken action on the residents' concerns. 21 flats and 29 parking spaces IS STILL NOT ADEQUATE. The building is still TOO LARGE. Everybody is aware that there will be some kind of development on Milbor engineering and largely (from reading the comments) do not seem opposed to that per se. What the residents justified concerns are, relate to those of safety and privacy. This application has only highlighted the fact that residents concerns about parking in Nash Mills and surrounding areas has not been addresses in any way. Our flat will still be overlooked (as well as the residents in Kingfisher Drive and the cottages on Belswains Lane) and access to our property largely impinged by dangerous parking - we have genuine concerns regarding emergency vehicle access to Basildon Court, not to mention noise nuisance when parking spaces (that we pay nearly £700 annually for) are blocked by thoughtless drivers resulting in the use of car horns to get attention at any given hour. This development, as it currently stands in it's present planning stage, has not addressed this in any way. Furthermore, what is also alarming is the amount of trees that have disappeared on the new plans from the original proposal. The threat this poses not only to the active wildlife they house and sustain, but to the potential of flooding cannot possibly be ignored. The new plans are simply apathetic and insulting in their lack of consideration of the objections made so far.</p>
<p>280 BELSWAINS LANE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9XE</p>	<p>How very disappointing this new revised application is. Yet again the application shows NO consideration or understanding of ANY of the very real worries,concerns and objections already raised by the surrounding residents of this proposed re-Development,all of whom will be adversely affected from the start. With a proposal of 4 storeys in such close proximity to Basildon Court,Lion Court,Kingfisher Drive and the historic Mill Cottages on Belswains Lane,ALL aspects of privacy and natural daylight for current and potential new residents will be lost. This particularly affects the Mill Cottages,which currently have a 2 storey wall (the Milbor engineering building) on the other side of their boundary. 4 storeys will completely overshadow them,removing their garden and rear aspect privacy completely. Suggesting that a reduction from 27 dwellings to 21 as a solution is insulting and arrogant. The developers have completely failed to acknowledge the importance of suitable parking provision. They must not be permitted to</p>

	<p>make the same mistakes as the Crest Nicholsons development, whose woeful under-estimation of parking requirements (despite concerns and warnings issued by residents at the time to CN and Dacorum Planning at the time) continues to have a detrimental impact on all the surrounding highways- in particular Nash Green and Red Lion Lane.</p> <p>It must be assumed that each dwelling will require 2 parking spaces- it is irresponsible and totally unreasonable to ignore potential overflow parking- there so NO available parking space left nearby!</p> <p>As I write this, the bins are being collected on Belswains Lane. Provision for the storage of another 63 bins (green, black and blue top for 21 dwellings..) is already an issue at planning stage, as overflow from the designated bin storage area is proposed to be distributed among the parking spaces. REALLY???! </p> <p>And where are these bins supposed to be located on collection day?</p> <p>The artists drawings are inaccurate and misleading. The PRIVATE driveway of 274-290 Belswains Lane is portrayed as part of the site- it is not. A boundary wall will be required .</p> <p>Local Services and Amenities are at breaking point, with huge developments along the canal towpath into Apsley and another vast Development on the hillside above Hemel and Shendish. What provision has Dacorum made for the inevitable strain on these services that new housing will create?</p> <p>21 dwellings is too many in this site.</p>
<p>1 BUNKERS LANE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 8AX</p>	<p>I would like to object to this development. Whilst not affected by the actual building itself I STRONGLY OBJECT to the development based on the woefully inadequate lack of parking. The existing development on the old papermill site is a joke in terms of parking with dangerous parking (and I don't blame the residents for this) on Red Lion Lane with cars blocking the footpath and blocking the crossing place at times making it difficult to drive down the road. In addition we often find cars blocking the footpath on Bunkers Lane, which is removed from the development, often seeing people with pushchairs and my own wife who is in a wheelchair, having to take to the road to pass them - yes, my wife comes out with us when we walk the dogs so I apologise that a wheelchair user should have the temerity to want to use the footpath. This actually led to us having to pay the council for a double dropped kerb so I guess is a nice little money earner for you.</p> <p>The parking in this area and the fact people are having to resort to dangerous parking is something the council has</p>

	<p>still done nothing about (remind me why I pay council tax again) and here we have yet another development of 21 flats with 29 spaces. Potentially, 21 x 2 people = 42 cars !!!!</p> <p>Will the planning committee please wake up and smell the coffee as the inadequate parking facilities in this areas are a joke that YOU must take responsibility for.</p>
<p>16 MILL CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 8AD</p>	<p>I have real concern about the possibility of there not being enough parking spaces, as every day we have cars parking in Mill Close, which is opposite MILBOR, from Nash Mills Wharf and Belswains Lane, which is causing many problems for the residents in Mill Close, East Green and Nash Green. Personally I would like to see permit parking for local residents, which I believe in time will be inevitable as cars park in the most ridiculous places, i.e. the bends of the road and often on the double yellow lines from a Belswains Lane, which as we speak need to be extended to make it safer, as we have several cars parking every night on these bends and large vehicles also are parking on these bends.</p>
<p>14 KINGFISHER DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9DD</p>	<p>Although an attempt has been made to reduce the impact of the proposed building, the additional documents supplied by the developer dated 24th January 2019 do not mitigate the OVER-DEVELOPMENT of the site. It is still over-development in terms of scale, i.e. height, footprint and content, together with the lack of adequate parking facilities.</p> <p>Regarding the compass points used on plans, drawings etc., might I suggest the architects revisit the positions/directions i.e. which way the front, back, sides of the building would face, there a number of errors.</p> <p>The added drawings/artistic impressions (not numbered) of the proposed building give a false idea of scale and how it would fit in with the existing built environment, particularly in relation to Kingfisher Drive and the 16th Century cottages on Belswains Lane.</p> <p>The comments in my previous submissions dated December 2018 remain applicable.</p> <p>It is worthwhile to re-state that the parking provision at the current Nash Mills Wharf development is wholly inadequate and puts unbearable strain on the local community and leads to regular conflicts between its residents both with the estate and in the wider area. This scale of this proposed development would only exacerbate that problem.</p>

A. *HEIGHT*. The application makes much of the comparison to the footprint of the current building, but does not address the proposal to double the height. There are no drawings showing the impact of sunlight on properties in Kingfisher Drive that would be blocked in the early mornings. There are privacy implications for all surrounding properties.

B. *PHOTO IMAGES*. The photo-like images falsely represent what would be the actual situation. They give the impression that the private drive at the rear of the Belswains Lane cottages would be part of the development, when in fact there is and would have to remain to be a fence along the proposed development's boundary line. Similarly there is a tall fence between Basildon Court / Lion Court, so the images give a false impression of open space. No such image has been provided for the view from Kingfisher Drive.

C. *PEDESTRIAN ACCESS*. There is no dedicated pedestrian pavement to the site. Pedestrians approaching the site from Belswains Lane north (the direction of the shops, schools, railway station, bus stops etc) would need to cross Croxley Road to the south side (already a perilous crossing), then cross once again to the site where there is no proposed pavement representing a DANGER HERE AT ALL TIMES but particularly when vehicles at 'rushing to work time' and CHILDREN WALKING to and returning home from school.

D. *CYCLING*. The application quotes Dacorum policy 51 regarding cycle routes and gives weight to them, but the plans make no provision for the storage of cycles (or indeed motor cycles) within the development. The Dacorum Borough Council cycle parking standards for residential land uses state that: "one long-term space should be provided for each unit if no garage or shed is provided." ** Are residents expected to carry their cycles up the stairs and store them in their apartments? **

E. *SEWERS*. There are known capacity issues for the sewerage network in the local area. ANY approved development should be approved in advance by Thames Water to ensure that it will not have a further negative impact on the current network.

F. *EMERGENCY VEHICLES*. Current residents of Basildon Court / Lion Court have expressed concern about accessibility for emergency vehicles, especially in light of over parking. Have Hertfordshire Fire & Rescue approved the accessibility of the whole site in case of fire

and other emergencies? In particular manoeuvrability on and off the proposed site as it would be developed and access to adequate water supply. Are they confident and accept there is enough space for fire engines (plural) to be safely onsite that would be needed in case of fire at such a large building?

G. ***WASTE COLLECTION***. The proposed development does not appear to meet the Dacorum Planning Requirements: "It should be demonstrated that a Refuse Vehicle and a personal vehicle can safely pass each other within the site". "Suitable turning heads should be provided to allow the refuse vehicle to enter the site in a forward gear and manoeuvre within to depart in a forward gear".

H. ***AMENITY SPACE***. The plans provide little or no realistic amenity space for the new development. The seating shown would be underneath and overshadowed by tall trees and their associated debris, thus in practice unlikely to be useable.

I. ***STRUCTURAL IMPACT***. The plans do not include an analysis of the potential structural impact on surrounding properties of the demolition and construction processes, and they gloss over the potential impact on current trees. Piling is likely to be needed for new foundations, and the 16th century historic cottages in particular are unlikely to have foreseen such an effect when they were built.

J. ***CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN***. Dacorum Borough Council will need to ENSURE that, for ANY approved plan, a robust construction management plan is put in place and that is ENFORCED. There are a number of concerns which need to be addressed in accordance with Dacorum's planning policies:

- Is the entrance to the site wide enough to take very large lorries?
- There is a large industrial building on a small site in this location which is totally surrounded by residential properties. During demolition and construction, how would it be possible for very large lorries to enter and exit in forward motion** as required by regulation?
- How would residential properties in close proximity - which include 16th century cottages in Belswains Lane, houses on Kingfisher Drive and apartments in Basildon Court / Lion Court - be protected, and also parked cars, from dust and debris?
- How would Croxley Drive and Belswains Lane be protected from potential soil, debris and damage to the surface by the large number of lorry journeys that would be necessary for this development? Positioning and

	<p>details of wheel-washing facilities. (The site would seem to be too small to provide wheel-washing facilities).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If water spray was used for damp-down, how would the run-off be dealt with? How would consequent/resultant mud be prevented from transfer to Croxley Drive and Belswains Lane? - Whilst work was in progress would there be space for adequate parking provision at all times for all vehicles connected with the development, including construction workers and anyone connected with the development or visiting, i.e. Council employees, architects, developer personnel etc. so that: "development does not prejudice or cause obstruction to pedestrians or vehicular traffic or cause harm to the residential and visual amenities of the area ... " including Kingfisher Drive and the cottages? "Thus preventing on-street conflict and impact to highway safety." As previously stated, there is no available parking in the immediate area (day or night) so all such traffic would need to be accommodated on site, and the access to and from Belswains Lane can already be dangerous.
<p>12 SWAN MEAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9DG</p>	<p>No significant change to the plans. This still mean that there will be shortage of residents parking, almost no visitor parking and NO CONSIDERATION to the amount of traffic this will add to the area. Belswains lane, lower road, bunker lane , red lion lane and even London road are in such bad shape due to the traffic!! This can't be approved unless the plan makes amends for parking and the council and National Highway make consideration of pushing so much traffic into the congested junctions without making any amends to the infrastructure!! This is getting crazy!!</p>
<p>7 MILL CLOSE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 8AD</p>	<p>Although not in the immediate vicinity of this development, I live about 100 yards away, my neighbours and I are in the 'fall-out' area in that in an already over developed area we experience the effects of any new development, particularly the parking congestion. Over recent years dwellings in Nash Mills have doubled or trebled without any increase in infrastructure and I believe it's time to stop any more development.</p>
<p>14 KINGFISHER DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9DD</p>	<p>I note that since my previous comments, document 44829826.pdf has been added - a Site Location Plan with a loaded date 29/01/2019 (though the document itself is dated July 2018).</p> <p>The red lines on the Location Plan element (bottom left) ** INACCURATELY IMPLIES ** that the Milbor site includes the access to the rear of Basildon Court / Lion Court, and the vehicular access from Nash Mills Wharf to</p>

	<p>Belswains Lane!</p> <p>This document gives another false perspective, it should be withdrawn and an accurate version submitted.</p>
<p>8 KINGFISHER DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9DD</p>	<p>I strongly oppose the amended plans for this development. The ploy of submitting plans that are utterly inappropriate for this site, only to quickly amend the plans in an attempt to appease opponents, does not hide the fact that these plans are still completely inappropriate for this site. Developments that consist of flat roofed rectangular blocks of flats belong in the 1960s - the architects need to design something much more aesthetically pleasing that we can all appreciate and be proud of for many years to come.</p> <p>Major error in planning documents</p> <p>The elevation drawing shown as southwest is in reality northwest; the elevation drawing shown as northwest is actually southwest. All Kingfisher Drive properties look directly onto the northwest elevation which is currently shown as the southwest. Confused? So am I, so no meaningful decision can be made on these plans as they currently stand.</p> <p>Overdevelopment</p> <p>These plans will exacerbate the existing overdevelopment of the adjoining Nash Mills residential area. The lack of existing parking already causes cars to block pavements on the entire length of Red Lion Lane and Kingfisher Drive, forcing pedestrians, wheelchair users and push chairs to use the road to pass a parked vehicle. The Council needs to take action to alleviate the problem. This development would further aggravate the parking issues for everyone.</p> <p>Not in keeping</p> <p>The proposals replace a 2 story factory with a 3/4 story block of flats which is not in keeping with the housing on Belswains Lane and Kingfisher Drive (which are 2 story and of more traditional style) that overlook the development. 4 stories for any part of the development are far too high and the bland box appearance of this block does not blend in well with the surrounding dwellings.</p> <p>Loss of Light (Overshadowing)</p> <p>The existing factory is about 7.5 metres at its highest point - the current plans reach almost 13 metres at the highest point and approximately 12 metres for the 4th story. Due to the close proximity to the houses on Kingfisher Drive, the height of this proposed development will block most of the morning sun from properties in Kingfisher Drive. I note that the flood risk assessment and drainage strategy (section 5.2) recommends raising the ground floor flats by 300 mm - has this amendment</p>

been added to the plans? If not, the excessive height of the development will be increased even further. Any ground floor plans could be parking only to help to reduce the overall height and offer a more sensible development for a high flood risk area.

Overcrowding and lack of social space

The development has minimal outdoor social spaces for residents - one seating area is squeezed in to the corner of the car park! The plans clearly show that the suggested use of this area is overcrowded.

Parking

The suggested 21 owner with additional 8 car parking spaces are not adequate for the size of the development. In addition, the 'undercroft' spaces numbered 11 and 17 will be difficult to access due to their proximity to a wall, unless drivers are prepared to reverse in to the car park. Outside car parking spaces 2 and 3 may also block each other in, unless the cars parked are quite small. The turning areas for cars on the whole development are also tight.

Trees

It is highly unlikely that this development can be built without severely damaging the roots, trunks and branches of the offsite trees. A four storey building requires deep foundations that will impact the root systems. Note that the tree survey states that the Lombardy poplar trees in area G03 (T04, T05, T06, T07 and T08) have roots 'historically damaged by installation of the housing development and associated roads and parking.' This is unlikely as the Kingfisher Drive development was built in 1996 and the trees are estimated to be 10 to 20 years old.

External windows

The external windows in the proposed flats that overlook Kingfisher Drive are far too close to the offsite existing large trees in areas G03 and G05. These would substantially block daylight and outlook that these North-West facing flats may have (NB: incorrectly shown as south-west facing on the plans). The existing structure has frosted windows - changing these to clear windows will also impact on the privacy of residents in Kingfisher Drive. Any windows that are currently frosted should remain frosted or the plans should be changed to make sure that the windows overlooking Kingfisher Drive are bathroom or hall windows.

Badgers and Hedgehogs

During the summer of 2018, badgers were frequently seen at night on Kingfisher Drive. The wooden fence and wire mesh fence on the boundary of the development adjacent to Kingfisher Drive were taken down by the developers (to enable the felling of 3 large trees on the site (removed in October/November 2019)). The wood

	<p>and wire mesh fencing has been left spread out flat on the ground. Since this happened, I haven't seen any badgers. (Note the fence does not belong to the developers and needs to be reinstated.) Hedgehogs are also hibernating close to the perimeter fence just offsite. Hedgehogs are protected animals and these may come to harm as a result of this proposal.</p> <p>Flooding As the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy confirms, the proposed development is in flood zones 2 and 3, which could impact the surface water runoff and emerging groundwater, increasing the risk of flooding for all surrounding properties. The assessment shows that the flood risk is increasing as time goes by. Residents of any ground floor properties will struggle to obtain a mortgage due to the flood risk. All residents will struggle to get full house insurance due the flood risk and the close proximity of the trees offsite.</p> <p>Future Covenants A restrictive covenant should be placed on any future subletting of properties built on this site to ensure that parking spaces have to be included with the sublet. I hear that many landlords in the existing Nash Mills development rent their car parking spaces separately from the property, making the parking problems worse.</p> <p>Winners and Losers The only winners from this amended development continue to be the profits for the developers who are still trying to squeeze too many dwellings in a small area that would greatly impact the surrounding properties. More thought needs to be given to improve the aesthetic, social and environmental aspects during the redevelopment to prevent any further deterioration in the quality of life for local residents.</p>
<p>294 BELSWAINS LANE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9XE</p>	<p>I object again to this amended planning application, for the following reasons:</p> <p>Overdevelopment Change to residential use would be welcome, but only if managed sympathetically. The immediate area is already overdeveloped. The further impact of current proposals would be considerable, and must be mitigated. The introduction of a large number of units of residential accommodation on the former Sappi site (now called Nash Mills Wharf) has had a detrimental impact on the local infrastructure, including drainage and sewerage, motor traffic and parking. Residents need the Council's help in relieving these problems and are not receiving it.</p>

	<p>Visual Intrusion The current workshops are a mix of one- and two-storey buildings. The revised application still describes a block of 4 storeys, which would impose a significant and unwelcome change to our skyline, would reduce our afternoon light, and would constitute an unwelcome reduction in amenity.</p> <p>Parking The area has a serious shortage of parking, which already causes friction between residents in Nash Mills Wharf and neighbouring streets. If approved this development will only make things worse, since 21 flats are likely to need at least 42 spaces, even without addressing the needs of visitors.</p> <p>Traffic The proposal provides that vehicle access should be via Croxley Road from Belswains Lane. This junction is the only access point to the western segment of Nash Mills Wharf, and the traffic using it, particularly during the rush hour, is already considerable, resulting in queues of vehicles waiting for a gap in traffic on Belswains Lane. Increasing the residential density of this area will increase traffic, exacerbate existing problems and related risk.</p> <p>Social / environmental Nash Mills Wharf introduced a great deal of residential accommodation but neglected the potential for detrimental impact on the environment and infrastructure. As amended, this application still seems likely to benefit no one but the developers. I appeal to the Council to ask the developers to moderate their greed, introduce a sense of proportion, and take seriously the needs of existing residents. If the developers will not do this, I sincerely hope the application will be rejected.</p>
<p>284 BELSWAINS LANE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9XE</p>	<p>Having strongly objected to the first set of plans submitted I can see nothing in the revised plans that have alleviated my concerns. The slight reduction in the number of flats will do nothing to ease traffic congestion, parking situation, intrusion of privacy etc. etc. I also note that on the new plans there is no clear boundary shown from the new development to the PRIVATE road which runs behind 274 - 290 Belswains Lane</p>
<p>1 CROXLEY ROAD,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9GU</p>	<p>We strongly object to this proposed development on several grounds Increase in pollution and traffic congestion as a result of</p>

	<p>the development</p> <p>Risk of accidents and harm to pedestrians, young families as well as residents of the care home from the increased demand for limited parking spaces causing people to park in the road in hazardous areas. One space per flat is insufficient given they are expected to be inhabited by two people - two inhabitants means there is a need for two cars or a car and a van, meaning an additional 15 extra cars to add to the overcrowded local roads</p> <p>There is currently a strain on the sewage system, adding further dwellings would exacerbate the situation. There is a similar issue with drainage</p> <p>According to the plans there does not seem to be adequate space for waste disposal and collection, failing to meet the Dacorum planning requirements</p> <p>There area is already overdeveloped</p> <p>Current proposal is not in keeping with the local asthetic, the bland box design would be with us for a long time and would not fit in</p> <p>Insufficient pedestrian access to the building</p> <p>I urge the planning committee to reject this application</p>
<p>14 KINGFISHER DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,HP3 9DD</p>	<p>++TREES AND SHADING++</p> <p>The Planning Officer requested: "Please may you also carry out a shade analysis on the North West facing flats so that I can gain an understanding of sunlight/daylight levels received to these units and therefore pressure which may result in the future to fell the adjacent trees". The applicants' response is not satisfactory.</p> <p>The "tree shading elevation" diagram shows that the sun rises in the east and sets in the west, but does not assess the seasonal impact of the height of the proposed building blocking the sun at certain times of day (for which I have photographic evidence).</p> <p>The text of the applicant's response states that the trees in Kingfisher Drive ON PUBLIC LAND would need to be topped to meet their expectations of shade impact on the proposed building.</p> <p>The various reports speculate on the impact of the Kingfisher Drive development on the trees, but I have photographic evidence that those trees were already</p>

substantial in 1997 and they have suffered no apparent negative impact since that time.

Dacorum should get an independent assessment of the health of the trees and act accordingly, rather than relying on a consultant funded by the developer - especially as they arranged the felling of some trees pre-application. I am sure that any work on these trees would attract a high level of local objection, particularly if it were not fully justified by such an independent assessment

++VIABILITY STATEMENT++

The applicants own Viability Statement proves that this proposed development is NOT viable and includes numerous factual discrepancies.

Some highlights: .

1.0 Kingfisher Drive is not a cul-de-sac

2.0 Grand Union Canal is not visible

9.1 The site is NOT located next to the Grand Union Canal

Quote: "The build costs adopted are considered to be the minimum possible for a scheme of this type. In the assessor's opinion there is a possibility that construction costs will exceed the figures provided. ."

There is no Contingency figure. The inevitable increased costs could possibly lead to 'cutting corners'.

Quote: "As a general comment, no contingency has been included on build cost, however, given the scheme type and ground conditions one is recommended. "

Demolition: Although there is provision for the removal of asbestos this cost could increase considerably bearing in mind the age of the property.

The proposed Plans show lifts but none are included in Construction Costs. Surely these are a necessary part of such a scheme. Inclusion of the lifts as shown would **CONSIDERABLY INCREASE CONSTRUCTION COSTS.**

The Report suggests selling off the car parking spaces to increase profitability. Evidence from such a scheme in the adjacent development shows this does not work, does not guarantee use/availability of that space for the purchaser. Upgrading 9 parking spaces £45,000; Sale of 6 surplus undercroft spaces £60,000 = Total £105,000. I assume that this figure needed to help the nudge the site towards viability - and balance the books!?. **

	<p>Secure boundary fencing, which should be a necessary part of the development and planning application, is shown on drawings produced BUT NONE IS INCLUDED IN CONSTRUCTION COSTS.</p> <p>Great emphasis is placed on the provision of Amenity Space: The only such space as shown/available is the 2.5mtr strip between the building and the Kingfisher Drive boundary. This area would (a) always be in deep shade and (b) be immediately outside the living accommodation of the ground floor flats. There is a tiny amount shown in the western corner.</p> <p>Premium prices for the properties on higher floors for the "far-reaching views" into the living accommodation of the flats opposite. Balcony Allowance £5,000 - £10,000 - depending on level.</p> <p>Query : Would the developer have adequate increased insurance cover to satisfy claims for potential /likely damage) to: - properties in very close proximity to the site as the result of the piling required in this instance for foundations, (particularly anticipated in the case of the 16th Century cottages with minimal foundations) - potential damage to the established trees which need to be retained and preserved</p> <p>The much-needed Affordable Housing!: Once again figures are produced to prove the developer can't make enough profit to satisfy investors. The significant profit motive should not be satisfactory to bypass these obligations.</p> <p>**The number of parking spaces to be provided is 29 - 27 for the apartments and 2 for visitors. Those figures do not meet the accepted ratio standard and taking evidence from the adjacent developments too few spaces have already been provided there resulting in very unsafe parking. In this instance the access road is too narrow for accommodating the additional vehicles with the result that more will be parked in unsafe and inappropriate places in the surrounding area.</p>
237 BELSWAINS LANE,HEMEL	The problem with this development is that it has spaces. Full stop.

HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9XE	<p>Belswains lane/Redlion Lane.....we already have traffic backed up from the Red lion pub all the way to Apsley lock (over half a kilometre) every day, standstill traffic, past two schools, one childs nursery and an old peoples home, not to mentions hundreds of residents. Pollution levels on this stretch exceed min standards every single day. And we want to throw another 30 cars a day into the mix, plus the other development opposite apsley lock, plus eberns road....etc.</p> <p>We keep replacing businesses with housing, leaving no where to work? And the only option to drive to another work place!</p> <p>It will go through because they want an extra 21 council taxes payments....but the best thing for the area (if it cant be a business) is houses, 3-4 tops.</p> <p>Also what nutcase suggested closing the station! Dear god, they want more cars on the road?</p>
14 KINGFISHER DRIVE,HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,,,HP3 9DD	<p>I refer to the Arboricultural Method Statement for Hobbs Developments Ltd. 276 - 292 Belswains Lane, Hemel Hempstead HP3 9XE dated 1 November 2018.</p> <p>In the event that approval were to be granted for this development despite the numerous legitimate objections put forward, I believe that the following comments / observations MUST be taken into account to give as much protection as possible and to avoid irreversible damage to all the trees on the perimeter of this site, in particular those that are OUTSIDE its boundary.</p> <p>I have taken advice from an independent arboricultural expert who has highlighted that there are numerous references to "should" in the report that ought to be replaced by "must" as there is a significant risk that Dacorum's building control team cannot enforce "should" since this could be argued to be a recommendation not a mandatory and legally enforceable requirement. The occurrences of "should" are detailed below.</p> <p>Dictionary definition: MUST represents more of an obligation while SHOULD represents only a probability or recommendation.</p> <p>Also, the independent expert stated that in order to fully protect the trees the recommended temporary fence type detailed in this report on Page 19 and also on the Tree Protection Plan drawing MUST be of the "Default Specification" (2.4m wooden site hoarding) not the</p>

"Secondary Specification" (2m tall welded mesh panels) .

The report presents too many assumptions rather than factual evidence. For example on pages 4 and 9 "The foundation of the existing two-storey structure is ASSUMED to be of a depth suitable to act as a barrier to root development for off-site trees on Kingfisher Drive. Its installation SHOULD not, therefore, impact upon the roots of these trees". So it is just ASSUMED that piling for foundations of the proposed new building will not damage the tree roots - what if that assumption proves to be incorrect? These trees belong to Dacorum Borough Council which must obtain a long-term indemnity for remedial measures if the development damages these trees.

Occurrences of "should":

Page 10 - "...protective measures should be in accordance..."

Page 16 - "It is essential that allowance should be made..."

Page 19 - "Booms, hoists and rigs should be kept as far away..."

Page 19 - "Protective barrier fencing should be appropriate..."

Page 20 - "Signage... should be fixed..."

Page 21 - "New temporary ground protection should be capable..."

Page 25 - "Edge supports... should be set above ground level and should be secured..."

Page 27 - "All kerb edging should be situated...."

Page 29 - "Final positions of any proposed services should be verified and approved..."

Page 30 - "Excavations should be limited..."

Page 32 - "Where trees have been identified.... there should be an auditable system..."

Page 32 - "... to be supervised by project arboriculturist, who should be retained..."