

ITEM NUMBER: 5c

4/02321/19/FUL	Loft conversion and first floor extension to existing property and attached three bed dwelling and a two bed detached dwelling with parking and landscaping (amended scheme)	
Site Address:	2 Glenview Road Hemel Hempstead HP1 1TE	
Agent:	Mr R Farris	
Case Officer:	Sally Robbins	
Parish/Ward:	No Parish	Boxmoor
Referral to Committee:	Ward Cllr call-in	

1. RECOMMENDATION

1.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the suggested conditions.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The principle of residential development in this location is acceptable. The proposal comprises alterations to the existing dwelling as well as the addition of a new three-bedroom terraced dwelling and a new two-bedroom detached dwelling. The proposed development would optimise the use of available land within an urban area and the design would sit comfortably within the surrounding area. The amenity space and parking provision are considered acceptable and, whilst visible from surrounding units, the proposal will not have a significant impact on the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

2.2 The proposed development therefore complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies CS1, CS4, CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS17 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policies 10, 18, 21, 58, 99 and 100 and Appendices 3 and 5 of the Local Plan (2004), and the Hammerfield North (HCA9) Character Area Appraisal (2004).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site is currently occupied by a two-storey semi-detached dwelling and its associated side and rear garden, located on the north-western corner of the T-junction of Glenview Road and Lockers Park Lane. The existing dwelling fronts Glenview Road, however the site features a longer secondary frontage to Lockers Park Lane. The existing dwelling and other properties on the northern side of Glenview Road are served by a private track providing access to garages and open car parking to the rear of properties, accessed off Lockers Park Lane.

3.2 The street scene of Glenview Road is suburban and its fine-grain pattern of development is evident through semi-detached dwellings and short terrace rows. This differs from the spacious and verdant setting of Lockers Park Lane, with prominent mature street trees, raised grass verges and small amenity greens, which adds to the character and attractiveness of the area. Where there are areas of soft landscaping particularly along the site's frontage and further north to Pinewood Gardens, buildings have limited presence in the street scene. South of the site (beyond the junction with Glenview Road), Lockers Park Lane features two-storey dwellings set back and set down from the road frontage with chalet-style catslide front projections giving the impression of low-rise built form, despite the extent of hardstanding to their forecourts.

3.3 Dwelling styles are grouped however do vary within the vicinity. Levels fall noticeably in a western direction down Glenview Road.

3.4 Land uses in the immediate area are predominantly residential however to the east of Lockers Park Lane is Lockers Park School and playing fields (the latter further north), specifically the school's designated exit point is located opposite the application site.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the construction of an end of terrace dwelling to no. 2 Glenview Road comprising three bedrooms over three levels (including habitable loft space). Additionally a detached two-storey dwelling is proposed for the rear garden, fronting onto Lockers Park Lane and comprising two bedrooms over two levels. Private amenity space would be provided to the rear of the dwellings with off-street parking located along the existing vehicle access track. Two off street parking spaces would be provided for each dwelling (a total of six off street parking spaces). Five of the car parking spaces would be accessed from the track and one would be accessed off Lockers Park Lane.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications (If Any):

4/01976/18/FUL - Loft conversion and first floor extension. Construction of an attached 3-bed dwelling and two semidetached 3 bed dwellings with associated parking and landscaping
WDN - 8th October 2018

4/01296/92/FHA - Single storey side extension
GRA - 26th November 1992

Appeals (If Any):

6. CONSTRAINTS

A152 - 15.2m Air Dir Limit
A457 - 45.7m Air Dir Limit
ADV - Area of Special Control for Adverts
Community Infrastructure Levy - Zone 3
RESC - Residential Character Areas
SIRZ - SSSI Impact Risk Zones
TPON - Tree Preservation Order

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development
CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (2002)
Planning Obligations (2011)
Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)
Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;
The quality of design and impact on visual amenity;
The impact on residential amenity; and
The impact on highway safety and car parking.

Principle of Development

9.2 Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS1 states that Hemel Hempstead will be the focus for homes and Policy CS4 states that appropriate residential development within residential areas in the Towns and Large Villages is encouraged. Furthermore, within the Core Planning Principles outlined in the NPPF (2019) there is heavy emphasis on the planning system's responsibility to deliver more homes. Paragraph 59 of the NPPF stresses this further, seeking to boost the supply of housing and paragraph 118 promotes and supports the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively. Paragraph 68 of the NPPF states that decision makers should give great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes. Additionally, Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan (2004) seeks to optimise the use of available land within urban areas.

9.3 Taking all of the above into account, the proposal is acceptable in principle and would make a small but valuable contribution to the Borough's existing housing stock (in accordance with Policy CS17). The development would be located in a sustainable location and would seek to optimise the use of urban land. The proposal is in accordance with policies CS1, CS4 and CS17 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan (2004) and the NPPF (2019).

Density and layout

9.4 Dwelling density at 54 dwellings per hectare resulting from development of the site with two units (net increase) would be high when assessed against the guidance for Residential Character Area

HCA9 Hammerfield North, which expects density in the medium range (30 to 35) consistent with the existing character. However, numerical density in isolation does not represent ground for refusal, and is weighed against other considerations, noting in particular the above mentioned guidance in the NPPF (which supersedes the Character Area Appraisal) that encourages optimising the use of urban land. Furthermore, there are groups of higher density dwellings in the local area, for example, the area of land comprising 1-41 Glenview Road has a density of 77 dwellings per hectare and the area comprising 30-62 Glenview Road has a density of 62 dwellings per hectare. As a result of the proposed development, the area of land comprising nos. 2-28 Glenview Road would have a density of 44 dwellings per hectare (compared to the existing density of 38 dwellings per hectare).

9.5 The new dwellings would have a typical orientation with principal elevations fronting their respective streets, specifically the end-of-terrace fronting Glenview Road to align with the existing dwelling at no. 2 and the detached dwelling facing Lockers Park Lane.

9.6 The existing rear garden for no. 2 Glenview Road would be sub-divided into three separate curtilages with amenity spaces positioned to the rear of the dwellings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan states that private gardens should normally be positioned to the rear of dwellings and have an average minimum depth of 11.5m. However, a reduced rear garden depth may be acceptable for small starter homes. Saved Appendix 3 does allow some flexibility for infill developments and states that generally, all gardens should be of a width, shape and size to ensure the space is functional and compatible with the surrounding area.

9.7 The resulting gardens would measure (maximum measurements):

Existing dwelling (no.2) = 12m

New terraced dwelling = 9.7m

New detached dwelling = 10.7m

9.8 The garden depths for the new terraced and detached dwellings would fall below the threshold set out in Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan. However, it is considered that the actual area of the garden is a more appropriate way of establishing whether the space is functional and compatible with the surrounding area. The proposed gardens would measure 51 sqm (existing dwelling at no. 2), 82 sqm (new terraced dwelling) and 75 sqm (new detached dwelling). There are examples of small gardens in the vicinity, such as nos. 1-21 Glenview Road which all have garden areas below 50 sqm. Taking the above into account it is considered that the proposed amenity spaces would be functional and compatible with the surrounding area.

9.9 Five car parking spaces would be sited off the track, which has raised no concerns from a layout perspective. One car parking space would be accessed from Lockers Park Lane, noting that there is a lamp post in close proximity to the proposed extended access. The applicant has been made aware that if this needs to be moved to allow the development then this will be at the applicant's expense. In terms of layout there are no concerns regarding the location of the parking spaces.

9.10 The variation of restrictive covenants to allow use of the access for car parking serving the new units is a separate civil matter that is not dealt with through the planning application process. The suitability of the level of parking provision is considered below.

9.11 Based on the above, it is considered that the proposal would respect the typical density of the area as perceived on the ground, and complies with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) in that regard.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.12 Core Strategy 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 scale, mass, height and appearance. This guidance is supported by Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004). Furthermore, paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that permission should be refused for developments of poor design that fail to take opportunity available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. The Hammerfield North Character Area Appraisal (2004) states that infilling may be acceptable according to the Development Principles, which state that there are no special design requirements, although design should respect the characteristics and architectural themes of nearby and surrounding development. It also states that all types of dwelling are acceptable, although the resultant scale and mass of new proposals should respect that of adjoining and nearby development.

9.13 The proposed terraced dwelling would continue the existing architectural form and features seen along Glenview Road. The roof would step up from the existing dwelling by 0.3m, following the increase in levels towards the northeast, and would be hipped to match the existing roof. The corner of the proposed dwelling would be situated on the eastern boundary and the access door would be situated on the side elevation. The new terrace dwelling would match the existing dwelling at number 2 Glenview Road in terms of external materials, colour and fenestration.

9.14 The proposed detached two-storey dwelling would be set back from Lockers Park Lane by 4m as well as the ground floor being set down from the level of the highway by 0.5m. The detached dwelling would comprise a full hipped roof and be finished in multi stock facing brickwork with red stock brick contrasting brick detailing, to match the nearby materials in Lockers Park Lane. The maximum ridge height of the proposed detached dwelling would be approximately 2.4m lower than that of the new terraced dwelling.

9.15 The proposal comprises alterations to the existing dwelling at no. 2 Glenview Road, including a loft conversion, rebuilding the single storey rear extension and extending the existing flat-roofed first floor extension by 2.3m. The first floor element would be set back from the boundary with Lockers Park Lane by approximately 7.6m.

9.16 It is considered that the layout and architectural style and built form of the proposed dwelling would not result in a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore complies with Saved Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), the NPPF (2019) and the Hammerfield North Character Area Appraisal (2004).

Impact on Residential Amenity

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

9.18 There are no side facing windows proposed on the side elevations of the new detached dwelling. The side elevation of the detached dwelling would be situated 11.5 from the first floor rear elevation of the proposed terraced dwelling. There are no policy requirements for side-to rear elevation separation distances. Nonetheless, the relatively close separation distance is mitigated by the fact that the detached dwelling is set down in relation to the terraced dwelling. The eaves of the detached dwelling would be 1.5m lower than the eaves of the terraced dwelling and the ridge would be set down by 2.4m.

9.19 Turning to the impact of the proposed development on the living conditions of the existing property at no. 2 Glenview Road, the proposed detached dwelling would be visible but would not be

within the direct line of sight of no.2. Added to the fact that no side facing windows are proposed for the detached dwelling, it is not considered that there would be any significant loss of privacy or overlooking.

9.20 The north flank elevation of the proposed detached dwelling would be 28m from the rear elevation of 1 Pinewood Gardens, which is situated to the northwest of the application site. The proposed development would not be in the direct line of sight of the rear elevation of 1 Pinewood Gardens and it is not considered overlooking from the oblique angle would occur to an unsatisfactory degree.

9.21 Addressing 4 Glenview Road, the proposed detached dwelling would be visible but at an oblique angle. As such, there are no concerns regarding loss of privacy, loss of light or being visually overbearing.

9.22 Views from the front elevation of the proposed detached dwelling would be of the exit point for Lockers Park School. Views from the rear elevation would overlook the outbuildings situated to the rear of properties along Glenview Road and Sunnyhill Road.

9.23 It is considered that the proposal would be acceptable with respect to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.24 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF (2019) states that when 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 the overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles. Policy 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.

9.25 The parking requirement for the proposed development, according to Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004), is 6 spaces (1.5 spaces for the 2-bedroom detached dwelling and 2.25 spaces for each of the 3-bedroom terraced dwellings). The development proposes 6 off-street car parking spaces (2 spaces per dwelling), which meets the requirements set out in Saved Appendix 5.

9.26 In terms of highways safety, the Highways Authority were consulted and made the following comments:

“There is a service road giving access to five of the proposed parking spaces. The sixth requires the extension of the access to enable a car to park without bumping across the kerb and grass verge. I notice that there is a lamp post in close proximity to the proposed extended access. The applicant is made aware that if this needs to be moved to allow the development then this will be at the applicant's expense. The access is located on Lockers Park Lane, which is an unclassified local access road with a 30mph speed limit. Vehicles are therefore not required to enter and leave the highway in forward gear. There have been no accidents involving personal injury in the vicinity of the site in the last 5 years.”

9.27 The Highway Authority raised no objection and considers that the proposal would not have a severe residual impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways, subject to conditions and informative notes.

9.28 The proposed development will not result in a detrimental impact on local parking provision, nor will it have a severe impact to the safety and operation of the adjacent highway. Thus, the

proposal meets the requirements of Policy CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004).

Other Material Planning Considerations

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.29 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.

9.30 There are several area Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) within and surrounding the site. Most notably, there are 3 Cedar trees within the area TPO situated along Lockers Park Lane. Within the site 3 trees would be removed, including an Apple tree and a Laurel, to facilitate the development.

9.31 The applicant provided an Arboricultural Impact Assessment in support of the application. In summary, some basic tree protection measures and working methodology (in accordance with BS 5837:2012) will ensure the remaining and third-party trees are not detrimentally affected during construction. The report states that the relationship between the proposal and retained / third-party trees is sustainable and will not result in any unreasonable pressure to carry out inappropriate tree works.

9.32 The Council's Trees & Woodlands Officer has been consulted and raised no objection to the proposal subject to the proposal being implemented in accordance with the recommendations laid out in the arboricultural report.

9.33 The proposed scheme has the potential to provide soft and hard landscaping on site, as well as appropriate screening. Should planning permission be granted a condition would be recommended requesting details of hard surfacing materials, proposed boundary treatment and screening and other soft landscaping details.

9.34 Subject to the proposal being carried out in accordance with the submitted arboricultural report (secured by condition) and the above landscaping condition, the proposal is considered to accord with Saved Policies 99 and 100 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013).

Ecology

9.35 Core Strategy Policy CS26 states that development and management action will contribute towards the conservation and restoration of habitats and species; and the strengthening of biodiversity corridors.

9.36 Paragraph 170 of the NPPF (2019) states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. Paragraph 175 states that planning permission should be refused if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for.

9.37 An ecological survey was carried out by AA Environmental Limited and additional information was provided by the environmental consultant during the course of the application due to neighbour concerns. Local residents raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on species and habitats within and surrounding the site. Hertfordshire County Council's Ecologist was consulted on the application and some local residents have been in direct contact with the County

Ecologist, prompting a further response. The concerns raised by local residents have been taken into account by the County Ecologist and, in summary, there is no objection to the proposed development, subject to the inclusion of informative notes.

9.38 With respect to bats, the County Ecologist acknowledges that bats are commonly observed in the vicinity, and that the cedar trees represent a potential roost location, however confirmed that the original advice given is sound. Additionally, the ecological survey, which included an examination of the cavity within the apple tree in the rear garden of no.2, was sufficient to confirm the likely absence of a roost from the buildings and trees directly affected.

9.39 Taking into account the ecological survey, additional ecological information provided, comments from local residents and the response from the County Ecologist, it is considered that the proposed development will not cause significant harm to biodiversity and the Council has satisfied its legal obligation with respect to assessing bats. The proposal therefore accords with the requirements of Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS26 and the NPPF (2019) subject to the inclusion of informative notes.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.40 These points have been addressed above, other than concerns raised regarding the Human Rights Act. Case law has established that there must be a fair balance between the rights of the individual property owners and the rights of the community. In the case of *Huang v. Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2007], the House of Lords stated that the overarching approach is: "the need to balance the interests of society with those of individuals and groups. This is indeed an aspect which should never be overlooked or discounted."

Article 1 (Protection of Property) and Article 8 (Right to respect of a Private and Family Life) of the Human Rights act 1998 are relevant to this application. The rights of the objectors (and wider community) have been balanced with the rights of the developer and land owner, as required by Articles 1 and 8. Human rights issues form part of the planning assessment above.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.41 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. This application is CIL Liable.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 The proposed development through layout, design and scale will not adversely impact upon the visual amenity of the immediate street scene or the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendixes 3 and 5 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS4, CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS17 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2019).

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the suggested conditions:-.

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

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

2. No development (excluding demolition/ground investigations) shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Please do not send materials to the Council offices. Materials should be kept on site and arrangements made with the Planning Officer for inspection.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the area in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

3. No construction of the superstructure shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:
 - o all external hard surfaces within the site
 - o other surfacing materials
 - o means of enclosure
 - o soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs.

The planting must be carried out within one planting season of completing the development.

Any tree or shrub, which forms part of the approved landscaping scheme, which within a period of 5 years from planting fails to become established, becomes seriously damaged or diseased, dies or for any reason is removed shall be replaced in the next planting season by a tree or shrub of a species, size and maturity.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the development and its contribution to biodiversity and the local environment, as required by saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 (e) of the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2013).

4. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted the vehicular access shall be provided and thereafter retained at the position shown on the approved plan drawing number PL01 rev N. Arrangement shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory access into the site and avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS8.

5. The development shall not be brought into use until the new access has been constructed to the current specification of the Highway Authority and to the Local Planning Authority's satisfaction.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and amenity and to ensure the development makes adequate provision for on-site parking and manoeuvring of vehicles likely to be associated with its use, in accordance with Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS8.

6. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment Method Statement & Tree Protection Plan (to BS:5837 2012) by Trevor Heaps Arboricultural Consultancy Ltd (dated 2nd August 2019) and the following approved drawing:

Drawing No: TH/A3/2072B/TPP (Tree Protection Plan)

Reason: In order to ensure that damage does not occur to trees during building operations in accordance with saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

7. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:

Drawing Number P-01 Rev O (Location & Site Plan)

Drawing Number P-02 Rev N (Floor Plans and Elevations)

Drawing Number P-03 Rev M (Street Elevations)

Drawing Number P-04 Rev M (Street Elevations and Site Sections)

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

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through early engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage, which lead 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.
2. It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website: <http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.
3. It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047
4. The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land, which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible,

authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-andpavements/business-and-developer-information/business-anddeveloper-information.aspx>

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

6. In the event of bats or evidence of them being found, work must stop immediately and advice taken on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England.

7. Nesting birds are protected under Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

Any vegetation 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 vegetation clearance by a competent Ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest.

Any excavations left open overnight should be covered or have mammal ramps (reinforced plywood board >60cm wide set at an angle of no greater than 30 degrees to the base of the pit) to ensure that any animals that enter can safely escape. Any open pipework with an outside diameter of greater than 120mm must be covered at the end of each working day to prevent animals entering / becoming trapped.

8. To avoid killing or injuring of hedgehogs it is best practice for any brash piles to be cleared by hand. Any trenches on site should also be covered at night or have ramps to prevent and avoid hedgehogs being trapped during construction. It is also possible to provide enhancements for hedgehogs by making small holes within any boundary fencing. This allows foraging hedgehogs to be able to pass freely throughout a site.

9. The loss of any young or semi-mature trees should be compensated for with replacement trees on a one -for-one basis and the loss of any mature trees on a two-for-one basis. Ideally, replacement trees should be native species, or fruit/nut trees, which will provide benefit for local wildlife.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Trees & Woodlands	To confirm our earlier chat, I've no problem with tree damage mitigation proposals that are suggested for this app.

	<p>The tree consultant has suggested acceptable protection measures, shown on the tree protection plan, that will minimise the impact of works on retained trees.</p> <p>Trees for removal aren't of high amenity value.</p>
<p>Hertfordshire Ecology</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Ecology on the above application, I have made comments for a previous similar application at this property ref 4/01976/18/FUL, recommending the need for a bat survey. The current application includes an ecological report by AA Environmental Limited (report date February 2019) detailing a survey in January 2019.</p> <p>The report included an assessment of house and trees for their potential as a bat roosts. This found no evidence of bats and negligible potential. I have no reason to doubt this. Some evidence of the use by the garden by terrestrial mammals; fox and badger, was found in the form of mammal trails and signs and local information. The garden landscape would be also be suitable habitat for hedgehogs. Hedgehogs are protected under Schedule 6 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (WCA) 1981, which prohibits killing and trapping by certain methods. A cherry Laurel and apple tree are required to be removed as part of the proposal. Consequently I recommend the following:</p> <p>No further surveys for bats are required, however I would advise the inclusion of the following Informatives with any consent granted:</p> <p>Bats</p> <p>"In the event of bats or evidence of them being found, work must stop immediately and advice taken on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England."</p> <p>Nesting birds</p> <p>Nesting birds are protected under Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</p> <p>"Any vegetation 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 vegetation clearance by a competent Ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest."</p> <p>"Any excavations left open overnight should be covered or have mammal ramps (reinforced plywood board >60cm wide set at an angle of no greater than 30 degrees to the base of the pit) to ensure that any animals that enter can safely escape. Any open pipework with an outside diameter of greater than 120mm must be covered at the end of each working day to prevent animals entering / becoming trapped."</p> <p>Hedgehogs</p>

"To avoid killing or injuring of hedgehogs it is best practice for any brash piles to be cleared by hand. Any trenches on site should also be covered at night or have ramps to prevent and avoid hedgehogs being trapped during construction. It is also possible to provide enhancements for hedgehogs by making small holes within any boundary fencing. This allows foraging hedgehogs to be able to pass freely throughout a site."

Trees

"The loss of any young or semi-mature trees should be compensated for with replacement trees on a one -for-one basis and the loss of any mature trees trees on a two-for-one basis. Ideally replacement trees should be native species, or fruit/nut trees, which will provide benefit for local wildlife."

Further to the above I am not aware of any other ecological constraints with regards the site and the application can be determined accordingly.

Further comments received on 20/12/2019 (in response to neighbour comments):

Hertfordshire Ecology has been contacted directly by a member of the public raising concerns about the above application and its impacts on the local ecology. These concerns have also been made to DBC. . Having taken into account the concerns raised, re-examined the ecology and arboricultural reports, and my original response, I have the following comments.

1. As previously stated, there are records of bats in close proximity to the application site and its position is such that it is well connected to suitable foraging and commuting habitat. Based on this and the characteristics of the building I requested that a preliminary roost assessment be carried out. I am satisfied that the survey carried out AAE consultants in January 2019 which included an examination of the cavity within the apple tree, was sufficient to confirm the likely absence of a roost from the buildings and trees directly affected. The presence of bats in an area does not automatically mean a roost is present nearby. Many if not most activity surveys record bat foraging or commuting use of an area but observe no emergence from surveyed buildings or trees.

2. Whilst the photos do demonstrate that the trees adjacent to the development do have some features that could be potential locations for a bat roost, there is presently no evidence to demonstrate they are used as a roost. Whilst they may represent potential roost sites, in any event these trees are outside the application site and are not being directly affected by the development. Without evidence that a bat roost within these trees is likely to be both present and affected by the

development, no offence would be committed and there is no justification for the LPA to require further surveys.

3. Consequently, whilst I do not dispute that bats are commonly observed in the location, and that the cedar trees represent a potential roost location, I have no reason to change my original advice regarding bats, which I believe to be sound.

4. The longer-term impact of the development on the Cedars is an arboricultural matter, as are the technical arguments raised relating to the method used to calculate the root protection area. In any case, in terms of the impact on bats the decline of the trees health does not automatically prevent any existing or continued use as a roost, nor does the presence of a roost necessarily preclude a tree's removal providing it is done under the auspices of an appropriate licence from Natural England. If this was the case, compensatory roost sites would be needed.

5. Notwithstanding this, bats and there roosts remain fully protected by law and appropriate advice should be sought if they are discovered during any works.

6. The local wildlife reported to use the property are relatively common species and their use of the site is unlikely to outweigh the proposals for development in the current climate.

7. It is claimed that the apple tree to be removed is part of an old traditional orchard which are priority habitats. Hertfordshire Ecology has been supplied with a copy of a 1927 map of the old mansion grounds to demonstrate this. Whilst this orchard is not shown on either the 1890s or 1930s OS 6" maps, the map supplied clearly shows that an orchard was formerly part of the mansion grounds. However a comparison of this map with the location of the application site, shows the present house and gardens occupies the area described as a paddock on the 1927 map and is outside of the area shown as an orchard. Consequently the tree is not in the location of an old orchard. Furthermore, one fruit tree does not meet the definition of a traditional orchard in terms of a Priority Habitat, which requires at least five in close proximity to each other.

8. The tree is described in the arboricultural report as early mature with a 20 year life expectancy. This life expectancy is likely to be a significant underestimation and there is good reason to believe that with appropriate management it would last considerably longer. From the photo supplied by a neighbour, the tree looks to be in good condition, with recent pruning and abundant young regrowth in the form of water shoots in the upper canopy. There is nothing visible that I would

	<p>consider suggested there was a high likelihood of a bat roost being present in this tree, given the lack of bark decay or significant splitting, trunk hollowing and relatively small size of branches etc. There is no other reason to justify an objection to the loss of this tree, which even if a bat roost were present, could be removed under an appropriate licence. Whilst the tree loss is regrettable, it does nevertheless represent a loss of biodiversity from the site and should be compensated for.</p> <p>9. In summary, whilst I fully acknowledge the points raised are of concern, I do not consider they provide any additional evidence or reason to alter my previous advice.</p>
<p>Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)</p>	<p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>CONDITIONS:</p> <p>1. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted the vehicular access shall be provided and thereafter retained at the position shown on the approved plan drawing number PL01 rev N. Arrangement shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway. Reason: To ensure satisfactory access into the site and avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway.</p> <p>2. The development shall not be brought into use until the new access has been constructed to the current specification of the Highway Authority and to the Local Planning Authority's satisfaction. Reason: In the interest of highway safety and amenity and to ensure the development makes adequate provision for on-site parking and manoeuvring of vehicles likely to be associated with its use. The Highway Authority would ask that the following note to the applicant be appended to any consent issued by the local planning authority:-</p> <p>INFORMATIVES:</p> <p>1. Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website: http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/ or by telephoning 0300 1234047.</p>

2. Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website <http://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047

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

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

COMMENTS

This application is for: Loft conversion and first floor extension to existing property and attached three bed dwelling and a two bed detached dwelling with parking and landscaping (amended scheme)

This amendment submits drawing no PL01 rev P showing access for the second parking space for 38.

ACCESS

There is a service road giving access to five of the proposed parking spaces. The sixth requires the extension of the access to enable a car to park without bumping across the kerb and grass verge. I notice that there is a lamp post in close proximity to the proposed extended access. The applicant is made aware that if this needs to be moved to allow the development then this will be at the applicant's expense. The access is located on Lockers Park Lane, which is an unclassified local access

	<p>road with a 30mph speed limit. Vehicles are therefore not required to enter and leave the highway in forward gear. There have been no accidents involving personal injury in the vicinity of the site in the last 5 years.</p> <p>PARKING</p> <p>A total of six parking spaces are proposed on land to the rear of the three proposed properties.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority considers the proposal would not have a severe residual impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways, subject to the conditions and informative notes above.</p>
Natural England	<p>Natural England has no comments to make on this application.</p> <p>Natural England has not assessed this application for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published Standing Advice which you can use to assess impacts on protected species or you may wish to consult your own ecology services for advice.</p> <p>Natural England and the Forestry Commission have also published standing advice on ancient woodland and veteran trees which you can use to assess any impacts on ancient woodland.</p> <p>The lack of comment from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. It is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not this application is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to provide information and advice on the environmental value of this site and the impacts of the proposal to assist the decision making process. We advise LPAs to obtain specialist ecological or other environmental advice when determining the environmental impacts of development.</p> <p>We recommend referring to our SSSI Impact Risk Zones (available on Magic and as a downloadable dataset) prior to consultation with Natural England. Further guidance on when to consult Natural England on planning and development proposals is available on gov.uk at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-planning-authorities-get-environmental-advice</p>

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
10	15	1	9	5

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
40 Lockers Park Lane Hemel Hempstead HP1 1TJ	<p>I spoke to you a few days ago re planning application 4/02321/19/FUL 2 Glenview Road.</p> <p>I still cannot access your website to make my objection.</p> <p>You advised I email. I objected to the application made in 2018 which you said you were aware of and are taking into consideration all previous comments.</p> <p>I object again for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o even with an allocated parking space for the three new properties, inevitably the residents/guests will seek to park on Lockers Park Lane and Glenview which is already congested. o if residents park outside my house at the end of Lockers Park Lane this will create a risk to my children when trying to cross the road outside our property. o concern for access but Lockers Park school. Please contact them again because I can imagine no one has been able to leave a comment on your website and they had many objections in 2018. Please consider their objections from last year. o concern that the development would mean that we are overlooked and our privacy will be affected. o Concern for the trees in the immediate vicinity <p>Please acknowledge this email and can I have reassurance that last year's comments are taken into account given that no one has been able to make a comment on your site which is an unfair process. As I noted last year, many residents are elderly and one is blind and they are much less likely to comment although I know they object. Even those who can access websites couldn't have been able to in this case anyway!</p>
4 Glenview Road Hemel Hempstead HP1 1TE	<p>We wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections to the proposed development of 2 additional houses in the garden of 2 Glenview Road. As an immediate neighbour, whose property is adjoined to number 2, we are of the view that the intended development will have a serious impact on our standard of living.</p> <p>We also consider that the proposed development does not comply with policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019, the Adopted Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted 25th. September 20143)</p>

nor those of the Hammerfield North (HCA9) Character Area policies (Area Based Policies Supplementary Planning Guidance May 2004).

NPPF Policy 11 explains that decision making should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that development proposals which accord with an up to date development plan should be approved without delay - which is not considered to be the case with this planning application.

NPPF Policy 70 sets out that development plans should consider setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, e.g. where development would cause harm to the local area.

NPPF Policy 175c) states that Local Planning Authorities should refuse development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats such as veteran trees (the historic apple tree to be removed) unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists. There are not considered to be exceptional reasons or suitable compensation proposed.

Core Strategy Policy CS4 (The Towns and Villages) supports appropriate residential development in the settlements, but the proposed development is not regarded as appropriate.

Core Strategy CS10 (Quality of Settlement Design) states that design of new development should follow the (3 Step Approach to Successful Design which is included in Figure 13 of the Core Strategy).

Core Strategy Policy CS11 (Quality of Neighbourhood Design) states that development should respect the typical density intended in an area, preserve attractive streetscapes and protect or enhance views within character areas, none of which the proposed development would do.

Core Strategy Policy CS12 (Quality of Site Design) lists the following requirements and it is not considered that the proposed development complies with any of them:

"On each site development should:

- a) Provide a safe and satisfactory means of access for all users;
- b) Provide sufficient parking and sufficient space for servicing
- c) Avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties;
- d) Retain important trees or replace them with suitable species if their loss is justified;
- e) Plant trees and shrubs to help assimilate development and softly screen settlement edges;
- f) Integrate with the streetscape character; and
- g) Respect adjoining properties in terms of : i. layout; ii. Security; iii. Site coverage; iv. scale; v. height; vi. Bulk; vii. Materials; and viii. Landscaping and amenity space."

The Hammerfield North Development Principles state that the resultant scale and mass of new proposals should respect that of adjoining and nearby development (page 120)

Our objections are as follows:-

Development of number 2 and new build 38 Lockers Park Lane

The proposed development will turn a pair of iconic 1930's semidetached houses into a terrace, which would be out of keeping with the other properties of a similar style in the same area. All the other properties on the road have the same features and roof line.

The proposed loft extension of no 2 requires the raising and enlargement of the roof and the addition of velux windows, especially on the road side would alter the streetscape and overlook the residents of Lockers Park lane and deprive them of there privacy, no other houses in this section of Glenview Road have velux windows overlooking the street. All previous applications to extend into the loft space have been vigorously resisted by Dacorum Borough Council.

The proposed addition of an extra house on the side of no. 2 (38 Lockers Park Lane) would be even higher than no. 2 and completely dominate the adjacent properties. A [previous application to add an additional house to the other end of our section of Glenview Road (number 28) had also been rejected by Dacorum Borough Council.

The following have been refused or dismissed in the past:

4 Glenview Road

4/00948/95/4 - loft conversion (appeal dismissed)

4/00430/95/4 - loft conversion and rear dormer (refused)

26 Glenview Road

4/00752/94/4 - First floor extension (refused)

28 Glenview Road (adj.)

4/00188/91/4 - two storey side extension to create a new dwelling (refused)

It should be noted that although the application for a new dwelling at no. 28 Glenview Road was some time ago, it is considered that the following reason for its refusal is relevant to this current application:

"The development, by reason of its prominence, mass and design would seriously detract from the visual amenity of the street scene and existing dwelling house."

There is already a problem with the overloading of the existing sewage system for this section of Glenview Road, the main sewer runs along the back of the houses and in some cases underneath rear extensions. The addition of 2 extra houses to this system would further overload it, it is already in crisis.

The addition of 2 extra houses at the top of Glenview Road is only going to add to what is already a difficult and dangerous junction. The junction of Lockers Park Lane and Glenview Road is a very busy one, and is on a curve in Lockers Park Lane. Glenview Road has become a local "Rat Run" , the junction being made busier as the exit for Lockers Park School is diagonally opposite and the service road from the garages of Glenview Road and Sunny Hill Road exit at the other end of the garden of number 2. adding to the congestion. Due to the existing parking problems Glenview Road has effectively become a Single Track Road, as a result cars coming up the hill are effectively on the wrong side of the road so those wanting to go down have to wait at the junction. At peak periods, such as School Run times and the rush hour this can be very dangerous. Also one has te bear in mind that at pre and after school times there are many children walking to and from school either alone or with parents. The proposed construction of 38 Lockers park

lane, the corner of which comes up to the boundary is going to further restrict visibility at the intersection.

Proposed construction of 36 Lockers Park Lane

This area of Hemel Hempstead enjoys many historic features dating back to the period when this area was part of Lockers Park, especially the historic trees along Lockers Park Lane and Pinewood Gardens. There are 2 historic Cedar Trees along the border with Lockers Park Lane and another Cedar plus a substantial Lime tree on the other side of the service road at the rear. These trees are covered by tree preservation orders and as such need to be protected. There is also in the rear garden an old and historic apple tree which dates back to when this area was part of the orchard for Lockers Park, unfortunately this tree falls between 2 TPO areas and is not protected and will be removed.

The ground in this area is clay on chalk. The foundation of no 36 will have to go down to a depth of 1 - 2 meters to reach the chalk level. The site plan and arboricultural report show the calculated area of the roots come up to the foundation line of the proposed new building. These trees still have another 100 years of life if protected and there appears to be no provision for future growth which could destabilise these trees and put them at risk. Does this mean that at a later date the council will come under pressure to remove the trees?

The construction of these houses would constitute a considerable loss of privacy for us and our neighbours. Our gardens will be overlooked by the height of the 3rd. floor of nos. 38 and 2 and also from no 36. The argument put forward that by canting the house a few degrees will solve this problem we find completely unsatisfactory

The exit for Lockers Park School is in front of this house, there are a large number of vehicles exiting the school especially at peak times plus all deliveries to the school enter through this gate which includes large lorries and vans which can have difficulty turning adding to the congestion. The Council in Core Strategy Policies CS8 (Sustainable Transport) and CS9 (Management of Roads) are committed to reducing the number of private cars by encouraging the use of buses bicycles and walking. There is a limited bus service from Warners End Road which goes via a roundabout root between the station and the town centre (nos. 3 & 4) or the H 10 from Beechfield Road. All these services are infrequent (bus maps enclosed). Due to the location of this development in one of the highest areas of Hemel Hempstead one would have to be very fit to ride a bike from the town or station and walking as I know from my own experience is a long hard climb.

We also have grave concerns as to the loss of security, we have already been burgled twice in the last 10 years as was the previous owner of no. 2, and that was with locked gates and a 1.8 meter fence along the boundary. If the proposed development is carried out, the rear of our property is going to be exposed especially to opportunistic crime.

The environment

The gardens of nos. 2 & 4 Glenview Road are a very important wildlife resource for a large number of birds, animals and other creatures.

Two main strategic wildlife corridors run through Hemel Hempstead, One runs down the River Bulbourn and the Grand Union Canal and the other along the River Gade through Gadebridge Park The Watergardens to join up with the Bulbourn at Two Waters. (maps enclosed). The gardens of nos. 2 & 4 are the start of a green chain

which runs from the wooded area of Pinewood Gardens, the grounds of Lockers Park School and the adjacent fields and woods, behind the Collette School to Gadebridge Park to the River Gade Strategic Wildlife Corridor.

Dacorum Borough Council through its Core Strategy Green Infrastructure Policy CS 26 is committed to the protection of the Green Infrastructure Network, the Conservation and Restoration of Habitats and Species and the strengthening of Biodiversity corridors. The Council as part of its Biodiversity Policy acknowledges that the increase in the fragmentation of habitat needs to be addressed. These Policies are being put at risk by this garden development.

The gardens of nos.2 & 4 are wildlife havens for many animals and invertebrates. They are regularly visited by foxes badgers squirrels hedgehogs plus there are the usual field mice etc, the common frog and toads are also to be found. There is also an abundance of birds and bats, the mature gardens and shrubs giving ample feeding and nesting opportunities, in no. 4 the blue tits often use the nest box on the end of my garage and the collar doves have nested many times in my bay tree. Herts and Middlesex Wild Life Trust encourage us to have a Living Landscape with Wildlife Friendly Gardens. This development will remove this by the removal of all the shrubs forming the boundary of the garden with its natural supply of fruits, seeds and nesting opportunities. Once this has gone so will a good proportion of the wildlife.

Dacorum Borough Council recognises in Core Strategy Policy CS 10 that not all gardens are suitable for development and this development is a case in point.

We urge the Council to consider their responsibility under the Human Rights Act in particular Protocol 1 Article 1 which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of their possessions which include their home and other land. We believe this development would have a dominating impact on us and our right to the quiet enjoyment of our property. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. In the case of Briton vs SOS the courts reappraised the purpose of the law and concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also its surroundings.

Yours faithfully

P S we reserve the right to add additional objections at a later date.

Additional documents included
Additional documents

Further comments received 5th December 2019:

I have studied the revised plans to alter the access road serving the rear of Glenview Road and Sunnyhill Road.

The proposed widening of the entrance access from 3 to 6 meters aprox is misconceived. There is an existing lamp post in the middle of the proposed widening, this is a valuable asset to the residents of Glenview Road and Sunnyhill Road using this road during the hours of darkness and also providing additional light for the parents and staff exiting from Lockers Park School.

The proposal to lay "grasscrete" in the widened area requires that the curb is lowered and the ground level lowered, including the pavement causing potential damage to the root systems of the protected trees.

The widening of the entrance is going to encourage vehicles including HGV's to cut the corner driving over the "grasscrete" which is not designed to carry such levels of traffic.

Our objections of the 22nd. Of October 2019 still apply.

Further comments received on 12 January 2020 (copy of letter to County Ecologist from neighbour):

Dear Mr Richards

With reference to your letter of the 20th. Dec to Sally Robbins I would like to make the following comments without prejudice.

We moved into number 4 Glenview Road in January 1978, the houses had been built in the mid 30's Numbers 2 & 4 being built first for the use of the original builders and the rest of the houses were then build in phases going down to Sunny Hill Road and then along the top of Sunny Hill until outbreak of the 2nd. World War brought development to a halt.

When I moved into number 4, 6 months after the previous owners of number 2, there were 3 mature apple trees in the garden of number 2 and 1 mature pear tree in our garden. These trees were of considerable size and were considerably older than 45 years or so that the house had been built. Regrettably 3 of these have now been lost due to old age, disease and deterioration. I was privileged to meet a couple of the original owners in the past and it was always understood that the houses were built on the site of an old orchard. As in the past it was common practice that a site where fruit trees were planted was also used for grazing animals the use of the description Paddock is understandable. If required I am able to mark the position of these trees on the sitemap for your reference.

As you are aware Hammerfield North is located between 2 Strategic Wildlife corridors. 1 which runs along the Bulbourne River and Grand Union Canal and 2 the River Gade and the Gade Valey meeting at Waters End. The site in question is part of a Green link between Gadebride Park crossing Warners End Road, Bury Hill and the playing fields of Lockers Park School to Pinewood Gardens, Glen View Road and on through the school grounds to the Cemetery. This wonderful area of integrated wildlife habitat is home to a large number of animals from Badgers and Foxes down to hedgehogs small rodents and a great number of insects. It is also a valuable source of food for many species of Birdlife due to the large variety of Trees Bushes and Shrubs which also provide safe nesting sites.

With regard to the ecological survey carried by AAE Consultants obviously in January it would be unlikely to detect any bat activity as they will be hibernating at that time of the year. Also a visual inspection of the loft area of number 2 would be inconclusive as the loft has been fully lined with hardboard. I do not profess to be an expert on bats but I do know that they are in the area and as such need to be considered.

We understand that Councils are under pressure from Central Government to build new houses, but this should not be at the expense

of our valuable historic integrated environment and a balance needs to be struck.

Yours Sincerely

Further comments received (21/01/2020):

We have studied Hertfordshire Highways report of the 9/1/2020 and would like to make the following comments.

Hertfordshire Highways are responsible for road safety in the County but in this case have failed to take into account the serious concerns that all the residents and the School have. The fact that it is a 30mph. road and the fact that they have no records of anyone being killed or injured in the last 5 years, therefor by implication the road is safe completely irresponsible. This is a very busy and complex junction with the T junction of Lockers Park Lane and Glenview Road, the exit and entrance to Lockers Park School and the service road to houses in Glenview Road and Sunny Hill Road in close proximity.

It would appear that this has been a paperwork exercise and there has been no physical inspection by Hertfordshire Highways.

Yours sincerely

Further comments received (28/01/2020):

I would like to submit comments / objections to the revised plans submitted by the developers of the above to be in addition to my previous objections.

Proposed loft extension to 2 Glenview Road.

The revised plans show that the developer proposes to raise the roof line by approximately 1 meter with the resultant roof apex being moved back towards the rear. The new base of the proposed rear roof is shown as extending back 1 meter past the existing roof line to terminate 1/3 rd. of the way along my flat roof. This new roofline with its velux windows overlooking the road is completely out of character with the existing streetscape with a resultant loss of privacy and dominance over the existing properties. Dacorum Borough Council have vigorously resisted such loft extensions in the past on the grounds that they were out of character with the existing houses.

4 Glenview Road

4/00948/95/4 loft extension (appeal dismissed)

4/00430/95/4 loft conversion and rear dormer (refused)

Proposed new property 38 Lockers Park Lane.

The revised plans for the construction of an end of terrace house adjoining to number 2 with its entrance onto Lockers Park Lane will spoil the character of a pair of iconic 1930's semidetached houses and turn them into a terrace. The new house where it faces Glenview Road would go up to the land boundary with Lockers Park Lane going right over the natural building line of all the other houses in Lockers Park Lane and restricting visibility at the road junction. The roof line of the new house will be higher than the proposed roof of number 2 and the building will completely dominate the all the other surrounding houses taking away their privacy. A similar proposal by 28 Glenview Road 4/00188/91/4 a two story side extension to create a new dwelling was refused for the following reason:-

"The development, by reason of its prominence, mass and design would seriously detract from the visual amenity of the street scene and existing dwelling houses."

This reason for its refusal in my opinion is fully relevant to this application now.

Proposed new property 36 Lockers Park Lane.

The proposed location of number 36 in the existing garden of number 2 is based on the Arboricultural Impact Assessment produced by Trevor Heaps dated the 2nd. August 2019. His report is based on BS 5837 2012 in which the root protection area for a tree is calculated by the circumference of the tree at 1.5 meters above ground level multiplied by 12 which gives the following results for the root protection areas.

Tree diameter meters	Root protection area meters
T1 0.530	6.36
T2 0.650	7.80
T3 0.710	8.52
T4 0.650	7.80

There are also 2 other approved methods of calculating the root protection area and they are half the height of the tree or canopy spread plus 1 meter.

These produce the following results using Trevor Heaps figures :-

Tree area (½ height) meters	Height in meters	Root protection
T1	20 meters	10
T2	25 meters	12.5 meters
T3	25 meters	12.5 meters
T4	25 meters	12.5 meters

Tree area plus 1 meter)	Canopy spread	Root protection (Canopy spread
T1	6.5 meters	7.5 meters
T2	6.5 meters	7.5 meters
T3	6.5 meters	7.5 meters
T4	5.0 meters	6.0 meters

BS 5837 is a minimum root protection area but is not a one system fits all as there is much variation between species of tree as to height, trunk girth, and canopy spread and is a guide only Best practice for the trees health and well being would be to take the greater distance of all the calculations.

Leeds City Council produced "Guideline Distances from Development to Trees" (which has been forwarded to Sally Robbins by Mr D. Carvell). In their "Dimensions Table Recommended Minimum Distances of Build Development to Trees" for a "cedrus deodara" (T1, T2 and T3) for a tree of 18 meters in height the recommended distance from a building is 14 meters (1/2 height).

Best practice for the health and safety of the trees would indicate that the root protection area should be calculated on ½ the height of the tree, therefore the root protection area would cover a good part of footprint of the building.

Rear access road for Glenview Road and Sunny Hill Road

Tree roots within the root protection area are mainly located in the top 15 to 25 centimetres (6 to 10 inches) of the soil. The proposed widening of the rear access road to provide entry to the parking area would require the excavation and lowering of a considerable area of the root protection areas of T2, T3 and T4 causing damage to the root systems of those trees and should not be permitted to protect the health of those trees. I have concerns that the proposed use of "grasscrete" to provide a road surface would be unsuitable for the level of traffic entering and leaving the access road and get churned up causing further damage to the trees root systems.

It is also proposed to use this product in the parking areas. As the ground level in this area of the garden is higher than the roadway it would involve the lowering of the ground which are in the root protection areas of T3 and T4 putting their root systems at high risk of damage

Best practice for the health of the protected trees should be to protect the root systems of these valuable and historic trees to ensure their continued health and wellbeing.

Ecology

We are very concerned that Hertfordshire Ecology appears to imply that the wildlife using the gardens of numbers 2 and 4 are relatively common and their use of the site is unlikely to outweigh the proposals for development "in the current climate". Does this mean that our local wildlife is unimportant and Central Government pressure to build houses on every single piece of land over rides the concerns of all the residents who have to live with the consequences of such a development.

Hertfordshire Ecology admit that there are bats in the location, under guidelines published by the "Bat conservation Trust" when there are bats in the area there should be a stage 2 investigation which can only be carried out during periods of activity ie. April to September, this has not been mentioned.

Road Safety

All the residents including the school are gravely concerned with the affect that this development is going to have on the safety of the roads in the area. Hertfordshire Highways conclusion that as nobody has been killed or injured in the last 5 years and that as there is a 30 MPH speed limit in place the road is by inference safe, ironic.

The site at 2 Glenview Road is located at the junction of Glenview Road and Lockers Park Lane. Diagonally opposite the junction is the exit / entrance to Lockers Park School and diagonally opposite that is the service road for the garages of Glenview Road and Sunny Hill Road and then in a short distance you have the entrance / exit to Pinewood

	<p>Gardens. The road curves from Pinewood Gardens to past the junction with Glenview Road and as such has restricted visibility. Glenview Road is a well used rat run with high volumes of traffic at peak times which when combined with the traffic from Lockers Park School, the garages in Glenview Road / Sunny Hill Road, Pinewood Gardens and the through traffic along Lockers Park Lane makes for a very busy section of road which combined with children on the pavements is potentially dangerous.</p> <p>Conclusions This proposed development has been vigorously opposed by the local residents, 61 of them have signed a petition objecting to it, which has been delivered to Sally Robbins at the planning office. This development is not suitable for this area because of the above reasons and should be rejected. Yours sincerely</p>
<p>6 SUNNYHILL ROAD HEMEL HEMPSTEAD HP1 1SZ</p>	<p>I strongly oppose this application for the following reasons. The site is currently a garden and as such development of it is contrary to our council's manifesto. The site is on a dangerous junction between Glenview Rd and Lockers Park Lane. The parking on Glenview Rd is currently very difficult, Cars on parked on the corner cause limited view when exiting, and can only be exasperated by this scheme. The entrance/exit for Lockers Park School, which is directly opposite the proposed dwellings, is constantly in use by staff, parents and delivery lorries. The entrance is situated on a blind bend, on a busy road(especially at the start and end of the day for numerous schools in the area) The delivery lorries often have to block the road whilst manouvering to reverse into the school grounds. The building works would further compromise the safety of all concerned. There is the presence of various types of wildlife on the site such as foxes, badgers and bats. On wildlife access is obvious beneath the fence which would have to be removed to become the front of a detached dwelling. There are lots of very old trees along the front of the site which would have their roots disturbed. These points taken together are surely an indication that this is an unsuitable site for development.</p>
<p>16 GLENVIEW ROAD HEMEL HEMPSTEAD HP1 1TE</p>	<p>We object to this planning proposal on the following grounds. Disruption to local (already congested) area, car parking access at back of house for residents, traffic constraints in the area, not in keeping with other properties in the area. There is not enough parking for the residents at the moment so this would add more disruption and danger to the children in the area. Parking is a big problem in this area and cars getting up and down a very congested road is now becoming dangerous to children walking to school. Removal of trees and wildlife in the area for drainage access. Disruption to the local schools because of building work and traffic and parking problems.</p>
<p>117 Beechfield Road Hemel Hempstead</p>	<p>Dear Sirs</p>

<p>Hertfordshire HP1 1PH</p>	<p>We note with interest this application for Two new dwellings at Glenview Road. We wish to register our support and would ask you to approve this application. It provides a great opportunity for two well designed and good sized houses to be built close to Hemel Hempstead town centre.</p> <p>We know houses are in so much demand and it is refreshing to see 2 new houses being built within the town that maintain the nature and character of the existing housing and located perfectly to use the nearby schools, sports and shopping facilities within walking or cycling distances without having to need cars all of the time.</p> <p>It has our full support</p>
<p>Cllr William Allen</p>	<p>In the event of the application to develop 2 Glenview Road being successful, I would like to call it in for consideration by committee on the basis of concerns that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The three storey nature of the two properties on Glenview, introducing the first velux windows to the front of the houses and creating a small terrace will have a negative impact on the street scene of a row of two storey semi-detached 1930s houses. b) Wildlife and tree preservation issues would be adversely affected by the new detached property and the proposed extensive parking arrangements c) The intensification of traffic so close to the exit of a school on a notorious local rat run is undesirable given that at the start and end of the school day this junction is already very busy with both cars and pedestrians
<p>Lockers Park School Lockers Park Lane Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1TL</p>	<p>Lockers Park School continues to object to this application. Our objection is to the erection of two additional properties, squeezed into a small plot on a very busy corner.</p> <p>It should be noted that for safety reasons the School is unable to allow vehicles to exit via the front entrance (opposite Heath Lane) therefore all vehicles using our School must use the rear driveway to exit all parts of our site.</p> <p>The proposed new dwellings are directly opposite this rear entrance/exit on Lockers Park Lane which is a heavily congested junction, situated on a blind bend in the road, making it difficult to see approaching vehicles from both directions. Any additional dwellings will aggravate the traffic situation, especially early in the morning when there is increased flow. All large deliveries and staff vehicles enter and exit through this rear driveway. The delivery lorries are required to reverse in to the school grounds from Lockers Park Lane and the drivers require the whole width of the road to make this manoeuvre.</p> <p>The School has already taken significant measures to reduce the risk of collision when vehicles are both entering and exiting the school via this point. We also have 'walk to school' pupils who use this entrance and their safety has been taken into consideration and must remain a high priority.</p>

	<p>Based on the plans we believe there is insufficient parking for the new dwellings. It is noted there is a significant distance between the rear parking allocations and the entrances to the properties. Residents will want to park as close as possible to their homes and will try and park outside on Glenview Road, or even on Lockers Park Lane. Visitors will be forced to do the same. Glenview Road is already oversubscribed for residential parking. Even now, there is decreased visibility at the intersection as residents are continually parking right up to the corner of the junction. Often vehicles are forced to reverse back up Glenview Road into oncoming traffic on Lockers Park Lane and there have already been accidents at this location.</p> <p>We believe the additional congestion which would be caused by this new development would overload the roadways and carries the risk of a serious accident taking place; involving vehicles and/or pedestrians.</p> <p>We therefore ask that the Planning Committee reject this application.</p>
<p>8 Glenview Road Hemel Hempstead HP1 1TE</p>	<p>WITHOUT PREJUDICE 18/10/19</p> <p>8 Glenview Road HP11TE</p> <p>Dacorum Borough Council Marlowes HP1 1DN</p> <p>For Attention of Ms S Robbins case officer</p> <p>Dear Madam</p> <p>Reference Application Ref.No 4/02321/19/FUL</p> <p>Special Regard</p> <p>i write in conection with the above planning application, i object, its not based on Best Advice, wishing to draw the councils attention to the inaccuracy of Alan Beaumont ,Ecological Survey and Trevor Heaps,Arboricultural Impact Statement, both of which understate the negitive effects.</p> <p>Having lived at 8Glenview Road for over 30 years ive taken a keen interest all aspects of the local environment ,ie wildlife , Trees ,Preservation of North Hammerfield as per HCA9,Appraisal . which is being contradicted by this application which you intend to allow.</p> <p>Having been a local authority enviromental officer myself covering ,Tree Preservation Orders ,wildlife preservation, pollution etc , dealing direct with the public,i have a keen interest in the manner and degree of cooperation the staff of the council exhibit .That also dealing with enviromental matters as a site manager, for a major london development company,site in Hampstead , project value £ 100,000000,Kew Gardens also requesting my services ,examples of a 55 year career in Horticulture.</p>

AA Environment Report

Noted that this report is very limited ,being based on only one visit at a time of year when wild life is not so conspicuous ,bats particularly being usually dormant .

Bats

Can confirm that with my bat detector , bats flying in August, feeding at dusk , seen and sound detected , area of lockers park lane , the green.

Some other more notable wild life seen by myself

Badgers ,Red Kite, Collar Dove , Green Grass Snake, Sparrow Hawk.

Large Owls

Foxes,Blue,white Tit,Crows, Jackdaw, Magpie,Hedgehog.

As you may note there are many apex predators in this list which means a large wildlife food source,ie mice, voles,pigeons,

That since the council have cutback on grass cutting common areas are more of a meadow environment, good for insects, in summer in lockers park glenview area.

without prejudice

Conclusion

That Bats are present , the large cedars next to no2 glenview road, after being inspected are perfect winter roosts for Bats,photos available

This is a high value ecological wildlife area particularly bearing in mind that indicator species ,Grass snakes, move away from areas under habitat pressure .

That the owls roost high up in the Cedars next to no2 during the day,binoculars needed

Badger habitat in the garden of no2 will be lost period.

That any development of No2 will cause disturbance due to extra light, human movement, car movement, loss garden habitat, availability of food, pollution.

Several of the above species and their habitat are subject to legislation, which is being broken clearly by any development.

This is a very brief summary of this matter ,

Aboriginal Impact Assessment by Trevor

Heaps

This report relies to a great degree on BS 5837, and so is generic largely in nature, that there is a raft of other legislation, regulations with in these bodies, enable best practice according to the law. That it is the duty of Decorum council and its named employees to make themselves aware of all such legislation in relation, possible negligence.

That the position on the plot of the detached house falls almost completely within the root protection area of cedars T2,T3,T4, half of T1 ,cedar, that the method of calculation used by said report is based on lower one of two methods, this is mistaken in this case , in that if the height of a tree divided by 2 gives a greater diameter to calculate the RPA it should be used , note drawing

That these trees stand on the crest of a chiltern ridge 404 ft above sea level being exposed to the uk prevailing wind of ssw-sw, and are heavily stressed during windy weather as seen myself ,not uncommon for branches to break off, scars on trees ,which is a danger to life.

Asymmetrical root system.,

That due to the greatly compromised root system to the east side of cedar T1, T2 due to the lower set tarmac road, which is dismissed in the report,a aysemetic root system has formed, the trees will have developed a root system that places a much greater reliance on the roots in the garden of no2 ,able to do this as undisturbed garden since 1935.

that any damage to this root area in no2 garden will seriously de stabilise the trees during storms, possible major loss of life if tree falls on house, in the mean time crown dieback would occur, as per oak tree outside 44 lockers park road,due to the allowed house, this tree has also been crown thinned and reduced due to house.

without prejudice

Furthermore, even more damage will be inflicted on root system by

The new parking permeable area cannot be installed as they will be too high to connect to track, fossel fuel runoff will contaminate ground water unless a trap is installed.

no reduction of present levels is allowed within RPA

That all needed services cannot cross RPA including the sewer, connection of this needs to be made

to lockers park lane this being limited by theTree RPA ,and the trees the other side of the road, which also prevent such service excavations , due to over capacity requested Thames Water not to allow any new connections to their sewer run ,which this application relies on, copy pertition enclosed to Thames Water.

The present garage and concrete parking area at rear of no2 glenview has reduced the cedars rooting area ,furthermore with the loss of rooting area under new house ,and the need for such roots due to aysemmetric system ,die back ,instability,will occur.

No paving ie patio,paths etc have been shown on landscape drawing , which reduces again root area, that furthermore the suggested tree planting locations may cause root damage to no 4 glenview roads foundations ,

That no allowance has been made for future increase in size ,as required in bsi5837

I have carried out a soil profile borehole to30inches 17 meters from tree t2, the result in no way reflects the assumptions made (a deep and thick profile easily dug to 1metre in the report)

Result 8 inches topsoil, then clay subsoil to 17 inches then clay with flints, 30 inch chalk.

this result means that these trees are sitting on pan of chalk that stops any deeprooting, the clay nature soil is subject to compaction, bad for trees, and low water levels for the trees during dry periods, this properly explains why for their age they are not bigger, the cedars still have a life of over 100 years and are key trees, that's why in 1954 orders were placed on them!!.

Under the relevant acts the trees must be taken into consideration, that all these trees have a considerable period 100 years plus to live that they will not grow much taller, but will become much broader, as they become fully mature.

the cedars in particular will land up being lopped back in time, spreading over house, totally destroying the wonderful graceful nature of this himalayan tree, damaging one of the best collections of rare mature trees in Dacorum

Conclusions

if constructed the new detached house without doubt will have a very detrimental effect on trees as outlined, crown dieback would occur, with dangerous destabilisation.

these are large trees and need to be shown the respect and the law fully applied to protect, for further generations to enjoy these new houses is just one step too far.

This being a brief outline

Further comment received:

Without Prejudice
2/11/19

Dacorum Planning case officer
Sally Robbins

Dear Ms Robbins,

Thank you for your visit on 22/10/19 at 2.15 pm, kindly attending for 45 mins, you confirmed that report sent had not been read, by yourself, which I had hoped to discuss? Natural England and the councils Arboriculture Dept., were mentioned as your points of reference for you to reach a discussion.

I contacted Natural England, they confirmed by email, that you had consulted them and also what their reply to you was.

Having given NE all my information, and several most helpful phone calls to them and talking to other residents effected directly and their concerns.

That as stated and several residents will confirm by affidavit, if necessary, there is a long record of bats living in this area,

That the three Cedars, one lime, and oak tree, on the drawings, are Bat roost sites of the highest category.gov.uk bats:surveys and mitigation for development projects, further more this area is connected to a wildlife planning highway.

As bats are a European protected species The Council are by law required to take appropriate steps to prevent any damage to roosts,

potential roosts, including the area around roosts, this includes such matters as lighting, human activity ,habitat such as large gardens ,which this garden is

Clearly, the building of these two houses will directly affect the Bats which are presently in decline.

Natural England further more are most interested as no License has been issued by them regarding this matter and its effect on the bats ,that also any works of any form also need a license as Grass Snakes which are present .

That The Apple Tree in the garden which is at lest 100years old is covered by bat conservation.

Natural England have requested that I contact the police, if any action is taken by any person effecting the Bat Roost in any way .contacting the Hertford Constabulary they confirmed to me ,that they have a special team to deal with such criminal action ,that if convicted a heavy fine and or imprisonment will follow ,and this illegal work irrespective of planning permission will desist immediately.

The above is a summary of the information I have ,that other, Establishment Bodies have also been contacted , regarding this vexatious matter as a whole .

Please do not ignore the above

Respectfully

Further comments received on 12 January 2020:

Further to your revised report being placed on the Dacorum planning portal , my concerns it tries to address have been increased ,That a,360 , best advice, opinion is not evident, sadly.

The Statement that there is no reason why bats will not continue to use the garden after development , is not true ,because.

The plot will be divided in 3, so moving from semi rural to heavily urbanised, each plot being well below all other garden size on Glenview and sunny hill road plots backing onto the rear track

Heavily disturbed, human movement ,pets particularly cats which can heavily predate on bats .

Very large increase in artificial light from 1 enlarged house 2 new houses which cannot be mitigated to any degree a worded condition is totally unrealistic.

Increased movement, noise , pollution , air and ground, by cars due to on site proposed parking

Affecting the humidity of the area which is within 5to 10 metres of a potential bat roost.

Directly removing the apple tree ,which clearly demonstrates being a possible roost ,check picture above , which shows a bat in knot hole, which the apple tree has several.

Disturbance of a flight lines

Your statement ,Cedars have no obvious potential as roost

The Cedars are significant mature trees being well over 100 years old over 60 feet , protection order placed on them back in 1953 historical importance there is also a mature lime tree .
Lime tree has ivy growing on trunk
Lime lost its crown and now hollow topped
Lime has knot holes
1 cedar struck by lightning
All Cedars damaged due to wind
Cedars and lime have complex growth form
Cedars have vertical abutted branches
All the above are to be found and are formal recognised by BCT for roosting that's why when a phase one survey was undertaken by a professionally competent person, trees classified as moderate to high as roost potential .
On this basis the council is required under the guidelines BCT Under Natural England to request a phase two survey.
As you know Bats have complex roosting habits through out the year, not just in the winter ,which was not pointed out by yourselves.
Pipistrellus common widespread ,
It is correct to say that since 1999 the above species due protection has stabilised and increased ,but this bats roosts has declined by 58.9% I believe the above bat from my sound detector is present , you should support any possible roost investigation .information in above pdf,

Does not provide suitable habitat for grass snakes.
When walking down the track to the rear of the site, several years ago as I started to pass the raised bank to my right I noticed, a snake on the bank , in the wild grass ,not moving any closer the snake remained still, I new it wasn't an adder as I had seen them before

On this basis your statement is incorrect regarding habitat on this site.

Low ecological value of habits present

I am pleased to stay that the residents observation's ,mine being over the last 35 year says other wise

Red Kite

That we can confirm that a red kite has been roosting in one of the cedars ,that there is a close by source of food it has found .

That I noticed last year from my bedroom window two pairs of kites in courtship fly play .

A protected bird I have contacted the Chiltern red Kite Group Who Are Most Interested ,and that any sign of nesting in the Cedars , will aggressively try to suppress disturbance .

I trust this is of interest.

Further comments received (20/01/2020):

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Dear Ms Robbins,

The HCC,
is incorrect on several points ,that if one of their officers had visited the site ,spoken to residents would have been apparent.

That there have been several accidents at the Glenview Road Lockers Park Junction I am quite sure insurance claims have been made for personal injury ,even if the police did not attend .

The school exit is almost directly opposite the track ,and has the relevant parking restrictions .
this is not the case the other side of road next to proposed work,
its not unreasonable to say that if built the new residents will park outside their new houses
so Large Hgv Lorries every week will not be able to exit the school ,as they need the full width of road to leave .

That excavations for such works as drainage pipework for track widening ,relocated street lights,
redirecting of services found during works ,will come within the TREE ROOT PROTECTIO ZONE, WHICH WILLBE EXCEEDED ALREADY BY THE OTHER WORKS.

Herts Highways is required to take other elements such as footpaths into consideration which they have not.
As stated previously by myself a step in footpath level of around 225mm will occur, between path and track .
Under health and safety regulations this is not expectable and leaves the council open to claims if someone falls etc.
As the path is directly under the protected trees ,the path cannot be graded into the track due to tree root damage .

HH also mentions details which are not subject to planning apart from the fact that there is no storage area on site due to tree roots and their protection and the works themselves,no right of way past no 2 boundary line down the track .
a road permit would lightly not be given for storage.

Respectfully

Further comments received (28/01/2020):

Dear Ms Robbins,
The location plan on the latest amended drawing is incorrect being changed from previous location plan.

That the area within the red line is incorrect .
that according to the Land Registry the boundary for the property ends where the present close board fence is .
they do not own either the track or the ground the other side of the track up to the brick wall.
this area has at no time been attended to by no2 Glenview Road and is presently covered in ivy .
This application is false , therefore is invalid and should be rejected by the Council according to the planning red line attach

The owner has very limited rights over the track which do not include any access to any party that does not have a Glenview Road , as per legal case .

Respectfully

Further comments received (28/01/2020):

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Dear Ms Robbins

These drawings show further damage to the trees root protection zones, by widening the track ,

As stated numerous times according to the 2 council reports and 2 other documents attached the whole of these works fall well within the root protection zones .

That The Bs 5837, Trees in relation to construction, is a crude guide ONLY to doubtful minimum RPZ , and is presently being revised to give a more accurate evaluation system according to the tree species .

I trust that Dacorum will approach this matter as a best advice view ,for the trees ,

That I have no doubt in any way that irrevocable damage will be done by this development, to these trees

The report unwittingly by Mr Heaps supports the 2 councils views that tall trees RPZ should be taken from the greatest figure given by the two different calculation methods .

If need be a very strong and a clear case will and can be made ,to fully protect these most valued trees under the law

Respectfully

Further comments received (03/02/2020):

Please find my comments regarding the above internal report ,regarding trees woodland, posted on portal .

Although these remarks are made outside the consolation period ,they could be relevant in the future in proving certain legal points .

That this report indicates yet again that the plans have not been studied, and further more the support for Mr Heaps report shows a limited knowledge of the required root protection methods now required by many local authorities and deemed to be best practice.

I know this as I have as a site manager been required to do just this on a site in London by Barnet council .

The pasted BS details in Mr Heaps report are totally inadequate ,,that in effect the whole of this site would have to be covered by a false floor method ,which is expensive ,but would protect the limited remaining tree roots .

The mitigating tree planting along the boundary line with no4 Glenview , will result in subsidence of no4 garage,

	<p>the other proposed trees roots will migrate into the 1935 sewer that runs near it ,as this age of sewer has porous joints sealed with lime putty.</p> <p>also a tree was remove near this proposed tree position due to effect on no 4 foundations .</p> <p>whatever small species of tree that maybe suggested like malus or sorbus, this damage will occur .That these proposed new trees roots and aerial parts will invade no4 garden and be cut back to the boundary line so half the aerial part of tree , will be missing and if the roots are cut accordingly the tree will fall over .</p>
<p>118 Chambersbury Lane</p> <p>Hemel Hempstead</p> <p>HP3 8BD</p>	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>We note with interest this application for three new dwellings at 2 Glenview Road.</p> <p>We wish to register our support and would ask you to approve this application.</p> <p>It provides a great opportunity for three well designed and good sized houses to be built close to be Hemel Hempstead town centre.</p> <p>We know houses are in so much demand and it is refreshing to see 2 new houses being built within the town that maintain the nature and character of the existing housing and located perfectly to use the nearby schools, sports and shopping facilities within walking or cycling distances without having to need cars all of the time.</p> <p>There should be many more new houses approved in the town area by making better use of surplus land on larger plots like this</p> <p>The design provides well spaced, low level housing which will blend in well and improve this street corner without compromising on the existing landscaping.</p> <p>This application reduces the pressure to develop and build new houses in our green spaces and on precious green belt areas outside of our town</p> <p>This part of the town has a mixture of housing and many house conversions to flats which are tall, densely populated and cluster the street with cars so it is nice to see the car spaces have been provided on plot to reduce the parking pressure from the development and the use of cycle storage areas is an absolute bonus that should also be mandatory in many, many other schemes.</p> <p>The street scene had been extended respectfully and this thoughtful better use of the space should be encouraged more in the Borough so we can have better placed, family homes to maintain the core of the town for many years and generations to come.</p> <p>Further comments received:</p> <p>I would like to register my support, for planning application at 2 Glenview Road, for 2 new dwellings.</p>

	<p>This proposal provides much needed accommodation near to the town centre, at a time when the area is desperate for new housing.</p> <p>I fully support it.</p>
<p>12 Glenview Road Boxmoor Hertfordshire HP1 1TE</p>	<p>Dear Madam,</p> <p>I am writing to let you know about my concerns regarding the proposed development at No. 2 Glenview Road, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notwithstanding the disruption that construction will cause to junction of Glenview Road and Lockers Park Lane, this development would bring considerable disruption to the entrance/exit of the school which is always busy with children going in and out. There are also lots of deliveries there as I understand the entrance to the kitchen is at that end and so an already difficult entrance to navigate for the lorries will be made worse. The development will also bring more danger to the pedestrians walking around that area. - The sewage system in this area is very old (from 1930 I've been told) and is already overtaxes and blocks frequently. My next door neighbour at no. 10 told me that he recently had to have a blocked drain cleared because of it. The proposed development would definitely place more strain on this system resulting in more blockages. - Parking in Glenview Road is already difficult as there are too many cars for the road. This proposed development would bring more cars which would mean existing residents wouldn't be able to find a space to park on the street. - The existing houses built along Lockers Park Lane and Glenview Road have been unchanged in appearance since they were first built. The proposed development is out of character with this existing streetscape and would therefore cause an eyesore especially the proposed no. 38 Lockers Park Lane, the location of which would encroach on the pavement. In addition the proposed Velux windows of the new development overlooking Glenview Road would be completely out of character with the existing windows and would enable the neighbouring gardens to be overlooked, removing the existing privacy. I believe this would significantly impact the enjoyment of neighbours sitting in their garden as they would be painfully aware of this fact. - I have also been made aware of the fact that the existing garden of no. 2 Glenview Road is now the home to a large wildlife population including many birds, badgers, foxes and bats to name but a few. If this proposed development was to go ahead I'm sure this significant population would be negatively impacted, a consequence which should be prevented from occurring. <p>Yours Faithfully,</p>
<p>6 Sunnyhill Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1SZ</p>	<p>I have studied the amended plans and am still of the opinion that this is a totally unacceptable development.</p> <p>The comments from the Highways Department are horrendous. Just because no one has been killed or injured around the proposed development does not change the fact that the site is dangerous to both drivers and pedestrians. I have very recently witnessed a very close miss between two cars on the blind bend. A car was exiting the grounds</p>

	<p>of Lockers Park School and a car speeding around the corner had to do an emergency stop, skidding towards the pavements where there was a mother with two young children, a mother with a toddler and baby in a pram, and several children making their way to school. I stood horrified and getting ready for the car to mount the pavement. This is not a one off occasion, I have witnessed this senerio many times. If the house is built in the garden of number 2 Glenview Road, I fully expect visitors to park outside the house making the road even more dangerous. Why wait for a person to be killed or injured, the site is unsuitable.</p> <p>Also the plan shows alterations to the access road. This is unacceptable, it is private property.</p> <p>The building is going to be higher than any of the existing houses so out of character with the neighbourhood. Also privacy is compromised.</p> <p>These objections make these plans unacceptable.</p>
<p>3 Frances House London Road Apsley Hemel Hempstead HP3 9GF</p>	<p>Letters of support Dear Sirs, I would like to register my support for planning application at 2 Glenview Road for 2 new dwellings</p> <p>I know houses are in so much demand and it is refreshing to see 2 new houses being built within the town that maintain the nature and character of the existing housing and located perfectly to use the nearby schools, sports and shopping facilities within walking or cycling distances without having to need cars all of the time.</p> <p>There should be many more new houses approved in the town area by making better use of surplus land on larger plots like this</p> <p>The design provides well spaced, low level housing which will blend in well and improve this street corner without compromising on the existing landscaping.</p>
<p>35 Crofts Path Hemel Hempstead Herts HP3 8HB</p>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I would like to express my full support for planning application, at 2 Glenview Road. For 2 new dwellings.</p> <p>This proposal provides much needed accommodation, near to the town centre at a time when the area is desperate for new housing.</p> <p>I fully support this proposal.</p>
<p>18 Hales Park Close Hemel Hempstead Hertfordhsire HP2 4TJ</p>	<p>I would like to register my support for planning application at 2 Glenview Road for 2 new dwellings.</p> <p>This proposal provides much needed accommodation near to the town centre at a time when the area is desperate for new Housing.</p> <p>This application looks to have been well thought out and planned without impacting on surroundings, also its refreshing to see provision has been made for parking for each dwelling.</p>

	<p>It has my full support the planning application, I would also like to add that I feel the proposal will fit in well with existing buildings in terms of its layout, security, scale, height and adjoining properties, it will also help to bring families close to nearby schools and academies in a more than sustainable location</p> <p>We know houses are in so much demand and it is refreshing to see 2 new houses being built within the town that maintain the nature and character of the existing housing and located perfectly to use the nearby schools, sports and shopping facilities within walking or cycling distances without having to need cars all of the time.</p> <p>The design provides well spaced, low level housing which will blend in well and improve this street corner without compromising on the existing landscaping.</p> <p>This application reduces the pressure to develop and build new houses in our green spaces and on precious green belt areas outside of our town</p> <p>This part of the town has a mixture of housing and many house conversions to flats which are tall, densely populated and cluster the street with cars so it is nice to see the car spaces have been provided on plot to reduce the parking pressure from the development and the use of cycle storage areas is an absolute bonus that should also be mandatory in many, many other schemes.</p> <p>The street scene had been extended respectfully and this thoughtful better use of the space should be encouraged more in the Borough so we can have better placed, family homes to maintain the core of the town for many years and generations to come.</p>
<p>Lockers Park School Lockers Park Lane Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1TL</p>	<p>The building is directly next to a school and its exit. The building and the work required will cause huge inconvenience to traffic trying to exit and I wonder about the safety implications with so much work happening in the proximity to so many young children and cars coming through the school each morning and evening. Also, the rear exit which will be compromised also serves as the entrance for all large deliveries. The volume of traffic in a piece of road which has a blind corner as you exit the school, has a junction directly opposite and cars coming through regularly is just too much. Just look at the configuration of roads and buildings, there is too much happening, it can't be safe.</p>