

ITEM NUMBER:

4/02119/19/FUL	Demolition of existing old dairy building. Redevelopment of site to provide a site facilities building and associated Development.	
Site Address:	Land To Rear Of 25-26 Castle Street Berkhamsted	
Applicant/Agent:	Update Record	
Case Officer:	Briony Curtain	
Parish/Ward:	Berkhamsted Town Council	Berkhamsted Castle
Referral to Committee:	Contrary Views of Town Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The application site is located within the urban area of Berkhamsted wherein development is encouraged in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy 2013. The size, scale and design of the building is considered acceptable and would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the site, the street scene or this part of the Berkhamsted Conservation Area. The scheme has been amended and it is now concluded that the building would not significantly harm the residential amenities of surrounding properties. Any adverse impacts with regard to ecology, highways, archaeology, contamination and drainage can be adequately mitigated by the imposition of conditions.

The proposal complies with Policies CS4, CS11, Cs12, CS26, CS27 and CS31 of the Core Strategy 2013.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site is located to the rear of No.s 25/26 Castle Street in Berkhamsted and currently comprises a large steel framed old dairy building which is a substantial post war shed which is used for storage purposes by Berkhamsted School. Access is via a narrow carriageway between two residential properties within Castle Street which also serves the rear of the residential dwellings No's 25/26 (also within the ownership of the school). The residential properties use the rear yard for parking, drying, amenity etc. The boundary walls adjacent to the Castle Street properties date from the 19th century and are of historic interest.

The site is situated within the Berkhamsted Conservation Area, Flood Zone 3 and is an area of Archaeological Significance. No's 25/26 are locally listed buildings.

The site is entirely surrounded by residential properties with the exception of the Fire Station to the north.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 Full planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing steel framed building and the construction of a purpose built part single, part two-storey estates facility building. The new building will incorporate workshop, storage staff and office spaces.

A demolition plan and additional information has been submitted that sets out it is intended to retain the vegetation clad wall that forms the north-eastern boundary of the site but the roof and the remainder of the walls are to be demolished.

Access to the site remains unchanged and there will be two parking spaces serving the building.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications

4/01127/19/FUL - Demolition of existing old dairy building. Redevelopment of site to provide a site facilities building and associated Development.
WDN - 8th July 2019

6. CONSTRAINTS

Area of Archaeological Significance
Conservation Area
Locally Listed Buildings
Former Land Use
Source Protection Zone

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
CS27 – Conservation of the Historic Environment
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)

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 The site is located within the urban area of Berkhamsted wherein the principle of development is considered acceptable subject to compliance with other plan policies. The adopted Core Strategy 2013 seeks to optimise the use of urban land. The proposal is acceptable in principle subject to a detailed assessment of its impact.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.3 The proposal seeks to demolish the existing buildings and construct a part two storey, part single storey building for use as an 'Estates hub'. The existing buildings are of no architectural merit and their form and materials are considered to have a negative impact on and detract from the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. No objection is therefore raised to the loss of the buildings in terms of use or visual appearance, their demolition is welcomed.

9.4 The site is bounded to the side and rear by either brick stand alone or party walls. Some of these walls may date from the 19th century and appear to be the former boundary walls. These are of historic interest and are now proposed for retention which is welcomed. Whilst further structural investigations are required to ensure this is feasible, at this stage the proposal seeks to build inside the northeast and south boundary walls. The more recent boundary walls (adjacent to Bridge Street) will be removed and re-built. This approach is acceptable and a condition requiring the retention of the older walls will be imposed for the avoidance of doubt.

9.5 Turning to the replacement building, the scheme has been amended numerous times during pre-application and previous applications. The design, siting, size, and scale of the building is now considered acceptable and would successfully integrate into the site, street scene and would not harm the character, or appearance of this part of the Berkhamsted Conservation Area to comply with Policies CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy 2013.

9.6 Whilst two storey, the overall siting and width of the proposed building will remain as per the existing dairy shed which occupies the entire rear of the site and abuts each of the side and rear boundaries. The proposed building will have a regular square footprint extending closer to Castle Street in parts (central section) but there are already small outbuildings clustering the side site boundaries in this position such that the overall footprint remains similar to the existing buildings. In design terms the building will appear two storeys in height and follow a traditional form with three gables to the Castle Street street scene but will not result in a cramped or incongruous appearance. The overall height of the building has been reduced since first submission and the gables have been staggered to break up the mass and bulk at first floor level. The stagger of the units as now proposed

not only breaks up the massing but adds visual interest to the building. The Conservation Officer is of the opinion that the stagger better reflects what would have been found within traditional bur gage plot back land developments where not all roofs would be in the same building line.

9.7 Turning to the impact on the conservation area, given the additional height the building would be visible from some public vantage points. However given the concealed angled position of the site, views would be restricted. The main view would be the view across Bridge Court / Fire Station. The building as proposed is of a traditional design, and considered to be of appropriate scale. It would be set amongst buildings of a variety of designs and against the backdrop of existing development. As such, it is concluded there would be no significant harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Section 16 of the NPPF para 196 makes clear that 'where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset (the conservation area and locally listed buildings), this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal has been identified as having very little harm to heritage assets and as such the benefits of the proposal (the consolidation and upgrading of existing school facilities to optimise the use of urban land and allow for future expansion) outweigh the limited harm.

9.8 Concern has been expressed in relation to materials and detailing. The zinc roofing is of concern and it is suggested by the Conservation Officer that the use of slate or clay tiles would help the building sit more quietly within the back lands of castle Street. It is also requested that there be patterns within the bond of the brickwork or other features of interest to ensure the building is of interest. Large areas of stretched bond would appear out of keeping with the other brick buildings in the area. A condition requiring details and samples of the materials and detailing of mortar mix and brick bond will be imposed and will ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

9.9 The proposal would not adversely affect the site or the wider area, or harm the character, appearance and historic interest of this part of the Berkhamsted Conservation Area. As such the proposal complies with Policy CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy 2013 and Section 16 of the NPPF.

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.10 Given its height and location the proposed building will have an impact on the residential amenities of adjacent properties in terms of light, privacy and visual intrusion but not to such a degree as to warrant a refusal.

9.11 The scheme has been amended significantly since original submission (4/01127/19/FUL). The building has been reduced in overall height (two storey and flat roof sections), the first floor footprint has been reduced and set away from the common boundaries with certain adjacent properties, and the gables have been stepped to reduce the massing and scale of the building. Section/street scene plans were requested illustrating the existing and proposed buildings to demonstrate the impact of the proposal on the surrounding roads (Castle Street, Bridge Street and Chapel Street). These have been submitted and demonstrate that given the separation distances, the design and configuration of the building, and the already built up context within which the site is set, the proposed building, whilst taller would not have a significantly harmful adverse impact, especially when compared to the existing circumstances. The impact of the proposal on each of the surrounding streets will be explored below.

9.12 Looking first at Bridge Street to the rear, whilst the proposed building extends to the back edge of the access alley with these properties of Bridge Street so too does the existing building. The overall relationship between the buildings would thus remain as existing. The proposed building is staggered and the first floor element of the building is set between 19.5m (at its closest

point) and 24m (at its further point) from the rear elevations and rear facing habitable bedroom windows of the properties of Bridge Street. The roof and eaves line of the proposed building have been lowered and at this distance, whilst the building will clearly be visible it would not appear unduly prominent or intrusive to the detriment of residential amenity. Given the orientation, again whilst taller at two storeys, the building would not have a significant adverse impact in terms of light levels or overshadowing. Turning to privacy it is proposed to have first floor rear facing windows which would overlook the properties of Bridge Street. Saved Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan deals with layout of new residential development and requires a minimum 23m back to back separation distance between buildings to ensure no adverse privacy/overlooking implications. Whilst the proposal is not residential in use, the windows of the first floor offices proposed would overlook residential properties and as such it is considered weight should be attached to this requirement. Given the proposal falls slightly short of the 23m distance required it is considered necessary and reasonable to condition the first floor windows and doors of the eastern elevations be obscured glazed and non-opening to a height of 1.7 above floor level.

9.13 Moving to Chapel Street to the south, again it is concluded that given the separation distances provided and the staggered form of the building, the building would not appear unduly oppressive to the detriment of residential amenity. The existing shed is single storey and whilst only slightly lower than the proposed building it is not overly dominant as the roof slopes away from the common boundary with the Chapel Street properties. Whilst higher, the replacement building has been amended to ensure the closest wing does not extend across these properties. The furthest two wings would project across the rear and thus be in direct views but these would be set away from the common boundary which would lessen their impact. Whilst closer in places than the existing shed, the building would continue to be viewed against the backdrop of existing buildings and structures. It is also important to note the existing heavily built up context of these properties which are flanked and surrounding by a range of imposing buildings including the MOT centre. When compared to existing levels the harm caused would not be significant. Given the orientation of the proposed building (due north) the impact on light levels would be minimal. It is not proposed to have any windows to the southern elevation at first floor and as such there would be no privacy or overlooking issues.

9.14 Finally assessing Castle Street, other than 25/26 which are owned and occupied by the school, any direct impacts would largely be confined to No's 24 and 27 either side of the application site. The application site boundary is irregular in that it extends partially over the rear of No. 27. The northern most gable would extend directly in front of the rear facing windows of No. 27 (kitchen/diner on ground floor and bedrooms on first/ roof level). This part of the proposal has thus been amended. The gable has been set back 18.5 to provide more relief and avoid it appearing unduly oppressive. The remainder of the building would extend closer but be viewed from an oblique angle thereby reducing its overall impact.

9.15 Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed building would be highly visible from the rear of the properties of Castle Street (No's 24 and 27) it would not appear unduly dominant or oppressive and it is concluded a refusal could not be sustained. The front facing stairwell window provides a direct view to the rear of No. 27 and will be conditioned to be of obscured glazing. The windows further to the south would provide oblique views to the rear of No. 24 and as such it is not considered necessary or reasonable to condition these. Daylight and Sunlight assessments have been submitted and demonstrate that the building would not cause a significant loss of light or overshadow surrounding properties, the proposal will result in a loss of light to the rear of No. 27 but given the existing high boundary walls which enclose the site, the loss would not be at such a level as to warrant to refusal.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.16 The site access arrangements would not alter as a result of the proposal. The design and access / Planning statements submitted set out the size / type and frequency of vehicles servicing

the proposed building and it is concluded that there would be no significant additional trips as a result of the proposal. It is important to note that the building proposed would continue to operate as part of the much larger wider school campus i.e. staff parking requirements for the proposed building will be met within the existing parking arrangements for staff at the School. The existing parking spaces for the residential units would remain unaltered.

9.17 The proposal is not considered to give rise to concerns in relation to parking or highway safety. Herts County Council Highways have been consulted and do not wish to restrict the grant of planning permission. They recommend conditions and informative which will be included. Given the concealed, constrained position of the site and its restricted access it is considered necessary and reasonable to condition the submission of a Construction management Plan.

9.18 The building will be serviced by small van movements and there is considered enough manoeuvre space in front of the proposed building. A vehicle access plan provides swept path analysis and demonstrates that vehicles including flatbed vans are able to enter and leave in a forward motion.

Other Material Planning Considerations

9.19 Ecology - The application is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (EPA) and an additional Ecology Statement that set out the impact of the development on biodiversity and protected species. In relation to protected species, the County Ecologist is satisfied with the content of the reports and the recommendations contained within them for mitigation measures.

9.20 From the evidence in the PEA and the nature of the buildings involved, the potential for bat roosts is negligible/low and any impacts can be limited if demolition/clearance occurs as described (ivy cut back at end of active season and supervised tile removal). Whilst the buildings proposed to be demolished are of low value (to bats), two integrated bat boxes are to be incorporated into the design of the new building. The demolition/clearance methods described and the mitigation measures set out will be secured by condition.

9.21 In relation to nesting birds the PEA report and its recommendations are considered acceptable and will be secured by condition (demolition and clearance outside breeding season and bird boxes under the eaves).

9.22 Turning to habitat loss and biodiversity net gain, the existing climbing vegetation on the roof and adjacent wall of the main building provide both a locally significant visual and ecological resource. The applicants are keen to retain this wall but until further investigations are undertaken it is not clear if this will be possible. As such an ecological statement has been setting out the various scenarios and ensuring that any loss of habitat can be adequately compensated. The applicants are not willing to spend money on further investigations until planning permission is secured in principle.

9.23 If the wall can be retained as currently proposed, then no additional biodiversity net gains would be required. A condition will be imposed stating the wall is to be retained.

9.24 If it transpires the wall cannot be retained (due to structural reasons) then a scheme of compensation will need to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA. This could include a green roof within the development, additional planting on an alternative site, or as a last resort a financial contribution to a local biodiversity project (biodiversity off-setting).

9.25 The development is considered acceptable and with the inclusion of the suggested conditions, the proposal protects biodiversity in accordance with the NPPF and Policy CS26.

Archaeology

9.26 The application is supported by an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) which has been reviewed by the County Archaeologist.

9.27 The site is located within Area of Archaeological Significance No. 21 which covers the core of historic Berkhamsted. Given the sites position on the main medieval street between the castle and the town, the potential for medieval remains here is very high. The applicants DBA recommends post consent investigations comprising a watching brief. It is unlikely that any finds would be a constraint to development. As such it is agreed that post consent investigations are acceptable, however the County Archaeologist considers that given the high potential for assets, and the uncertainty about the level of preservation of such remains, the site should be evaluated prior to the commencement of development following by further work if necessary to mitigate the impact of the development to any in situ remains.

9.28 To ensure any archaeological implications are appropriately dealt with in accordance with para 199 of the NPPF and Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy 2103, pre-commencement conditions will be imposed requiring a Written Scheme of Investigation.

Contamination

9.29 The application site has a long established commercial/industrial land use history. Whilst the application does not propose a substantially different end use there is the possibility of the presence of contamination that could impact the environment. The Councils Scientific Officer has requested the imposition of pre-commencement conditions. It is considered necessary and reasonable to impose such conditions and the LPA is satisfied that any contamination identified can be adequately mitigated via details required by condition.

Flood Risk / Drainage

9.30 The site is located within Flood Zone 1 wherein there is no constraint to development as a result of Flood Risk. The Environment Agency have confirmed they have no objection and no comment to make.

9.31 Turning to drainage a Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy have been submitted and reviewed by Lead Local Flood Authority. Whilst objecting to the proposals, they are satisfied that the imposition of a pre-commencement condition could adequately deal with drainage matters.

Noise / Disturbance

9.32 Given the proposed use and the concerns raised by local residents a noise survey was requested. A 'Workshop Noise Assessment (Report No 18-0086-2 RO1) which sets out the nature and scale of the operations likely to be undertaken within the proposed building has been submitted. It lists the machinery and tools likely to be used and the predicted noise levels associated with them. It also sets out background noise readings of the existing area.

9.33 The Councils Environmental Health team have been consulted and they do not have any significant concerns in relation to noise and disturbance associated with the development. They are satisfied that 'the report submitted identifies the building will not have opening windows and will use mechanical ventilation. These measures would serve as mitigation'. It is recommended that a condition be imposed ensuring the development operates fully in accordance with the submitted report.

9.34 In addition given the proximity of adjacent residential properties it is considered necessary and reasonable to condition the hours of operation.

9.35 Whilst it is concluded that the proposal is acceptable on planning grounds and there is no evidence to suggest the proposed uses would result in material harm to the residential amenity of surrounding residents, should noise or general disturbance become an issue in the future this could be adequately dealt with outside the planning process by Environmental Health legislation.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.36 These points have been addressed above other than crime prevention, alternative sites and devaluation of house prices.

9.37 Concern was raised by residents in relation to crime and access to their properties via the application site. The comments of the County Crime Prevention Officer were sought and having undertaken a site visit she is satisfied that the proposal would not give rise to any concerns. Crime in the surrounding area is relatively low and she considers that in relation to designing out crime, crime prevention, security and safety the area will be more secure as a result of its re-development. The proposal will result in a greater level of natural surveillance and the new buildings will be managed and used frequently by the school.

9.38 The development will have a safe and secure access for all users and will incorporate natural surveillance to deter crime and the fear of crime. The proposals thus comply with Policy CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy 2013.

9.39 Local residents suggest that the school has alternative sites across the town, which would be more suitable for this building. Whilst this may be true this cannot be given any weight in current considerations. The application must be assessed as submitted and on its own planning merits.

9.40 The impact of a development on local house prices is not a material planning consideration.

10. RECOMMENDATION

10.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions.

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

1812 – P210 REV 01 – DEMOLITION PLAN
1812 – P500 REV 01 – Vehicle Access Plan
1812 – P100 REV 01 – Proposed Site Plan
1812 – P010 REV 01 – site location plan
1812 – P220 REV 01 – Proposed plans
1812 – P230 REV 01 – Proposed plans
1812 – P240 REV 01 – Proposed plans
1812 – P340 REV 01 – Proposed plans

1812 – P350 REV 01 – Proposed plans
1812 – P360 REV 01 – Proposed plans
1812 – P370 REV 01 – Proposed plans
1812 – P110 REV 01 – Sections
Archaeology Desk Based Assessment (May 19 - Oxford Archaeology)
Workshop Noise Assessment Report No. 18-0086-2-R01
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Daytime Bat Inspection Survey Nov 19

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

3. 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).

4. No demolition / development shall commence until an Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:
 - (a) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording.
 - (b) The programme for post investigation assessment.
 - (c) Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording.
 - (d) Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation.
 - (e) Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation.
 - (f) Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

Reason: To ensure that reasonable facilities are made available to record archaeological evidence in accordance with saved Policy 118 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

5.
 - i) Development shall take place in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under Condition 4;.
 - ii) The development shall not be brought into first use until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 4; and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: To ensure that reasonable facilities are made available to record archaeological evidence in accordance with saved Policy 118 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

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

For the purposes of this condition:

(i) A Phase I Report consists of a desk study, site walkover, conceptual model and a preliminary risk assessment. The desk study comprises a search of available information and historical maps which can be used to identify the likelihood of contamination. A simple walkover survey of the site is conducted to identify pollution linkages not obvious from desk studies. Using the information gathered, a 'conceptual model' of the site is constructed and a preliminary risk assessment is carried out.

(ii) A Phase II Report consists of an intrusive site investigation and risk assessment. The report should make recommendations for further investigation and assessment where required.

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

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with Policy CS32 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraphs 178 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

7. All remediation or protection measures identified in the Remediation Statement referred to in Condition 6; above shall be fully implemented within the timescales and by the deadlines as set out in the Remediation Statement and a Site Completion Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted.

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

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with Policy CS32 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraphs 178 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

8. The demolition works and development hereby approved shall be constructed/ undertaken fully in accordance with the recommendation set out in the submitted Preliminary Ecology Assessment.

No above ground work shall commence on the building hereby approved until details of integrated bat and bird boxes has submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard against harm to protected species and to ensure the development contributes towards the conservation and restoration of habitats in accordance with the NPPF and Policy CS26 of the Core Strategy 2013.

9. The existing north-eastern and southern boundary walls and attached vegetation shall be retained in their entirety in perpetuity.

If the walls cannot be retained for structural reasons then prior to the commencement of development (including demolition) a scheme of ecological compensation measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These measures shall be implemented as agreed and thereafter maintained as such.

Reason: To safeguard the character, appearance and historic interest of the area and to ensure the development does not have a negative impact on biodiversity/ecology in accordance with Policies CS26 and CS27 of the Core Strategy 2013.

10. No development shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site based on the approved drainage strategy and sustainable drainage principles, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage strategy should demonstrate the surface water run-off generated up to and including 1 in 100 year + climate change critical storm will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site following the corresponding rainfall event. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

1. A detailed drainage plan including the location and provided volume of all SuDS features, pipe runs and discharge points into any storage features.
2. Detailed engineered drawings of the proposed SuDS features including their, location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features including any connecting pipe runs and all corresponding calculations/modelling to ensure the scheme caters for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + 40% allowance climate change event.
3. Demonstrate an appropriate SuDS management and treatment train and inclusion of above ground features such as a blue roof etc. reducing the requirement for any underground storage.
4. Provision of Thames Water agreement for proposed run-off rates and volumes.
5. Final detailed management plan to include arrangements for adoption and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, both on and off site in accordance with Policy CS31 of the Core Strategy 2013.

11. Upon completion of the drainage works, and prior to the building being bought into use, a management and maintenance plan for the SuDS features and drainage network must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The management and maintenance plan shall include:

1. Provision of a complete set of as built drawings including the final drainage layout for the site drainage network.

2. Maintenance and operational activities for the lifetime of the development.
3. Arrangements for adoption and any other measures to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory maintenance of the surface water network on the site and to reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants. In accordance with Policy CS31 of the Core Strategy 2013.

12. The first floor windows and doors in the eastern of the extension hereby permitted shall be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7m above the floor of the room in which the window is fitted. All parts of the windows and doors below 1.7m from the floor level shall be permanently fitted with obscured glazing.

The first floor stairwell window (window further to the left) in the western elevation of the building hereby approved shall be permanently fitted with obscured glazing

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenities of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings in accordance with Policy CS12 (c) of the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 127 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

13. The development hereby approved shall be operated fully in accordance with the submitted Berkhamsted School Old Dairy Workshop Noise Assessment (Report No. 18-0086-2 R01) . The extract fan serving the workshop shall have a sound power level not exceeding 70dBA and shall not contain any tonal character.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of surrounding properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy 2013.

14. Prior to the commencement of development (including demolition) a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan should consider all phases of the development. The construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan which shall include details of:

- o construction vehicle numbers, type and routing;
- o traffic management requirements;
- o construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking);
- o siting and details of wheel washing facilities;
- o cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway;
- o timing of construction activities (to avoid school pick up/drop off times);
- o provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities;
- o post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and temporary access to the public highway;
- o construction or demolition hours of operation; and
- o dust and noise control measures.

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way, in accordance with Policies 51 and 54 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS8 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraphs 108 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

15. The workshops hereby permitted shall not be operational other than between the hours of:

08.00 - 17.00

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of the locality in accordance with to Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 127 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

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 and during the course of several applications 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.
 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.

 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-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Berkhamsted Town council	Decision: Objection Comments: 'Although the Committee had no objection to the principle of replacing the Old Dairy, the scale, height, proximity and subsequent overlooking and intrusion onto neighbouring dwellings is inappropriate. The Committee would like the Planning Officer to take the issues raised by

	<p>the residents into account and request the following revisions to the proposed scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . the removal of ivy and the resulting impact on wildlife and habitat needs to be considered with the restoration of green walls to replace any demolished or destroyed; . the restoration or replacement of any destroyed adjacent historic walls; . the installation of a secure gate to secure the site at night with a master light switch to prevent light pollution; . limited or no access and repair only access to the roof; . the roof materials should be sympathetic to the local properties; . the workshop plant must not be proximate to the wall backing on to Bridge Street properties to avoid the transmission of vibration and noise; . the rear fenestration of the upper structure should be above 1.8m and opaque; . a sunlight assessment should be completed to assess the possible loss of amenity in adjacent patio gardens in summer months as well as winter; . given the narrow access off Castle St onto the site, a demolition plan and method statement should be submitted. <p>The Committee also requested clarification regarding the change of use and its potential implications.</p> <p>CS12, Appendix 3 (i, iv, vi).'</p>
<p>Archaeology Unit (HCC)</p>	<p>This application is essentially identical in archaeological terms to previous scheme 4/01127/19/FUL. Our advice therefore remains the same as for that application and is reproduced below.</p> <p>The proposed development is within Area of Archaeological Significance no. 21, as identified in the Local Plan. This covers the core of historic Berkhamsted, and includes the motte and bailey castle and medieval town, as well as areas of prehistoric, Roman and Saxon occupation.</p> <p>The proposed development site is in close proximity to Berkhamsted Castle (Historic Environment Record no. 39), an 11th century motte and bailey castle which is a Scheduled Monument. It is one of the best preserved Norman castles in the country. Castle Street is likely to have come into existence in the 12th century as a thoroughfare linking the castle to the newly rebuilt St Peter's Church (Thompson & Bryant 2006, 7).</p> <p>Given the site's position on the main medieval street between the castle and the town, the potential for medieval remains here is very high. This is confirmed by the applicant's archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (DBA; Oxford Archaeology 2019). The significance of such remains is likely to lie in their contribution to the overall understanding of the history and notably the configuration of the medieval town. The DBA mentions that an archaeological watching brief just to the north of the site at 27</p>

Castle Street revealed ground that had been disturbed by development in the 19th and 20th centuries, and residual medieval pottery (HER no. 18194). There is, however, evidence of medieval remains surviving well in this part of Berkhamsted (e.g. at the junction of Mill Street and Castle Street to the north (HER no. 13125), and further to the south along Castle Street (HER nos. 10944, 12319, 16203 & 31498), and the level of disturbance may vary from site to site.

The DBA recommends that archaeological investigations take place post consent, and that these comprise a watching brief. We are not entirely in agreement with these recommendations.

It is unlikely that remains that may prove a constraint to development will be present, and therefore we agree that archaeological works may occur post consent. However, given the high potential for archaeological assets of some kind, and the uncertainty about the level of preservation of such remains, the most pragmatic approach will be to evaluate the site before development commences, followed by further work if necessary to mitigate the impact of the development on any in situ remains.

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

1. The archaeological evaluation, via trial trenching, of the proposed development area, prior to any development taking place. This office is happy to discuss the nature and scope of this evaluation with the applicant or their archaeological agents, as site constraints may complicate the positioning of a trench or trenches;
2. such appropriate mitigation measures indicated as necessary by the evaluation. These may include:
 - a) the preservation of any archaeological remains in situ, if warranted, by amendment(s) to the design of the development if this is feasible;
 - b) the appropriate archaeological excavation of any remains before any development commences on the site;
 - c) the archaeological monitoring and recording of the ground works of the development, including foundations, services, landscaping, access, etc. (and also including a contingency for the preservation or further investigation of any remains then encountered);
3. the analysis of the results of the archaeological work with provisions for the subsequent production of a report and an archive and if appropriate, a publication of these results
4. such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the archaeological interest of the site.

www.hertfordshire.gov.uk

I believe that these recommendations are both reasonable and necessary to provide properly for the likely archaeological implications

	<p>of this development proposal. I further believe that these recommendations closely follow para. 199, etc. of the National Planning Policy Framework, relevant guidance contained in the National Planning Practice Guidance, and in the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic England, 2015).</p> <p>In this case two appropriately worded conditions on any planning consent would be sufficient to provide for the level of investigation that this proposal warrants. I suggest the following wording:</p> <p>Condition A</p> <p>No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include assessment of significance and research questions; and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording 2. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording as suggested by the evaluation 3. The programme for post investigation assessment 4. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording 5. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation 6. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation 7. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation. <p>Condition B</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Any demolition/development shall take place in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under Condition A. ii) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured. <p>If planning consent is granted, then this office can provide details of the requirements for the investigation and information on archaeological contractors who may be able to carry out the work.</p>
<p>Hertfordshire County Council Highways</p>	<p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>The Highway Authority has commented previously on a similar planning application (ref: 4/01127/19/FUL). The application was withdrawn due to the scheme having been revised and the external massing reduced</p>

and modified, to respond to concerns raised (principally by local residents) during the previous application consultation period. This application in terms of highway implications remains the same. Therefore, the previous comments also remain the same as follows:

CONDITIONS

1. Provision of Parking and Servicing Areas

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed access /on-site car and cycle parking / turning /waiting area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.

Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of the parking /manoeuvring area, in the interests of highway safety.

2. Construction Management Plan

Construction of the development hereby approved shall not commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the highway authority. Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan.

The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall include details of: a. Construction vehicle numbers, type, routing; b. Traffic management requirements; c. Construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking); d. Siting and details of wheel washing facilities; f. Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway; g. Timing of construction activities to avoid school pick up/drop off times; h. Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities; i. Post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and temporary access to the public highway.

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way

I should be grateful if you would arrange for the following note to the applicant to be appended to any consent issued by your council:-

INFORMATIVES

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.

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-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

COMMENTS

This application is for: Demolition of existing old dairy building and redevelopment of site to provide a site facilities building and associated development.

The Site is located on the east side of Castle Street, Berkhamsted, situated behind the residential dwellings of no. 25 and 26 Castle Street.

ACCESS

Access to the site will remain unchanged, via the coaching access between 25 / 26 Castle Street currently serving the building.

PARKING

There will be two parking spaces within the site to serve the building. Employees will continue to use existing parking within the wider campus to supplement parking available within the site.

Since the proposed development will work within the wider operations of the Castle Campus of Berkhamsted School, parking requirements for the proposed building will be met within existing parking arrangements for staff at the school

Standard car parking bays with minimum dimensions of 4.8 metres x 2.4 metres will be provided.

WORKS IN THE HIGHWAY

No works are required in the highway

TURNING SPACE

Drawing no 1812-P500 "Vehicle Access Plan" provides swept path drawings which indicate that vehicles including a flatbed van are able to enter and leave the site in forward gear.

TRIP GENERATION

No significant number of additional trips will be result from this proposal being implemented, since the development relocates the existing Estates Management buildings to a single Estates Hub.

	<p>External deliveries to the Estates Hub will be limited to one per week and would be made by a light van. Movements of items to and from the Estates Hub to serve the Campus (internal movements) would be made by flatbed lorry, twice a day (out in the morning and back in the evening) and very occasionally during the day to pick up and drop off materials.</p> <p>CONCLUSION HCC as highway authority considers that the proposals would not have a severe residual impact upon highway safety or capacity, subject to the conditions and informative notes above</p>
<p>Contaminated Land (DBC)</p>	<p>Having reviewed the documentation submitted with the above planning application and having considered the information held by the Environmental Health Department I have the following advice and recommendations in relation to land contamination.</p> <p>The application is for the substantial redevelopment of an area with a long established commercial/industrial land use history. Therefore, although the application does not propose to introduce a significantly different end use the possibility of the presence of contamination that could impact the environment and the redevelopment itself should be considered by the applicant. For these reasons it is recommended that the following planning conditions are imposed on the permission should it be granted.</p> <p>Contaminated Land Conditions: Condition 1:</p> <p>(a) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to the submission to, and agreement of the Local Planning Authority of a written preliminary environmental risk assessment (Phase I) report containing a Conceptual Site Model that indicates sources, pathways and receptors. It should identify the current and past land uses of this site (and adjacent sites) with view to determining the presence of contamination likely to be harmful to human health and the built and natural environment.</p> <p>(b) If the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the report which discharges condition (a), above, indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination then no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:</p> <p>(i) A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;</p> <p>(ii) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.</p>

(c) No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report; if required as a result of (b), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

(d) This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:

(i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (c) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.

(ii) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.

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

Condition 2:

Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 1 encountered during the development of this site shall be brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority as soon as practically possible; a scheme to render this contamination harmless shall be submitted to and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority and subsequently fully implemented prior to the occupation of this site. Works shall be temporarily suspended, unless otherwise agreed in writing during this process because the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.

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

Informatives:

The above conditions are considered to be in line with paragraphs 170 (e) & (f) and 178 and 179 of the NPPF 2019.

The Environmental Health Team has a web-page that aims to provide advice to potential developers, which includes a copy of a Planning Advice Note on "Development on Potentially Contaminated Land and/or for a Sensitive Land Use" in use across Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire.

	<p>This can be found on www.dacorum.gov.uk by searching for contaminated land.</p>
<p>Lead Local Flood Authority (HCC)</p>	<p>Original Comments;</p> <p>Thank you for consulting us on the above application for demolition of the existing old dairy building. Redevelopment of the site to provide a site facilities building and associated development.</p> <p>We acknowledge there was a previous application submitted for this site, however we understand this is separate therefore will not be referred to within this response.</p> <p>We have reviewed the information submitted by the applicant in support of the planning application, and we understand that a blue roof will be incorporated into the scheme providing a 50% betterment for the 1 in 30 year runoff event, however, the calculation has not been provided</p> <p>Previously developed sites should aim to discharge at the original pre-development greenfield rate where possible. If not, a significant reduction in the current rate of discharge should be achieved and evidence provided as to why greenfield rates are not viable. We require technical justification as to why greenfield runoff rate cannot be achieved.</p> <p>The applicant has indicated on the application form that surface water runoff will also be discharged into a main sewer. In this case, evidence should be provided to show the relevant water company accepts the proposed volumes and rates.</p> <p>In this case, due to a lack of information submitted, we are unable to assess how the applicant intends to manage surface water runoff from the site.</p> <p>In the absence of a surface water drainage assessment, we object to this application and recommend refusal of planning permission until a satisfactory surface water drainage assessment has been submitted. This should as a minimum include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Statement of compliance with the NPPF and NPPG policies, LPA local plan policies and HCC SuDS Guidance and Policies. - Anecdotal information on existing flood risk with reference to most up to date data and information. - The location/extent of any existing and potential flood risk from all sources including existing overland flow routes, groundwater, flooding from ordinary watercourses referring to the national EA fluvial (river) and surface water flood maps. - A drainage strategy which includes a commitment to providing appropriate SuDS in line with the non-statutory national standards, industry best practice and HCC Guidance for SuDS. - Detailed calculations of existing/proposed surface water storage volumes and flows with initial post development calculations/ modelling in relation to surface water are to be carried out for all rainfall events up

to and including the 1 in 100 year including an allowance for climate change.

- Evidence that if the applicant is proposing to discharge to the local sewer network, they have confirmation from the relevant water company that they have the capacity to take the proposed volumes and run-off rates.

For further advice on what we expect to be contained within the FRA to support an outline planning application, please refer to our Developers Guide and Checklist on our surface water drainage webpage <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/recycling-waste-and-environment/water/surface-water-drainage/surface-water-drainage.aspx> this link also includes HCC's policies on SuDS in Hertfordshire.

Overcoming our objection

The applicant can overcome our objection by undertaking a surface water drainage assessment which demonstrates that the development will not increase risk elsewhere and where possible reduces flood risk overall. It should give priority to the use of sustainable drainage methods, the SuDS hierarchy and management train. Production of a surface water drainage assessment will not in itself result in the removal of an objection.

Informative to the LPA

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

Additional Comments;

Thank you for consulting us on the above application for demolition of existing old diary building. Redevelopment of site to provide a site facilities building and associated development.

The Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy carried out by Heyne Tillet Steel reference 1976 Revision A dated 13 May 2019, and the information submitted in support of this application does not currently provide a suitable basis for assessment to be made of the flood risk arising from the proposed development. In order for the Lead Local Flood Authority to advise the relevant local planning authority that the site will not increase flood risk to the site and elsewhere and can provide appropriate sustainable drainage techniques the following information is required as part of the flood risk assessment;

1. Drainage plan identifying location of existing/proposed connection.

	<p>2. Confirmation from Thames Water that they are satisfied with the connection and proposed discharge rates.</p> <p>Overcoming our objection To address the above points, please see the below comments;</p> <p>1. A surface water drainage layout plan should be provided to support the scheme and include the location of all SuDS features, pipe runs and connections into the surface water sewer overlain on the development layout along with all the corresponding detailed calculations. The FRA states that a CCTV survey of the existing connections has not been carried out. Where it is proposed to utilise an existing, this should be assessed.</p> <p>2. We require permission from Thames Water that they are satisfied with the proposed rates and volumes. This information should be provided upfront prior to the approval of planning permission to ensure that the proposed scheme is feasible. An agreement in principle rather than a formal permission would be acceptable.</p> <p>For further advice on what we expect to be contained within the FRA to support an outline planning application, please refer to our Developers Guide and Checklist on our surface water drainage webpage https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/recycling-waste-and-environment/water/surface-water-drainage/surface-water-drainage.aspx this link also includes HCC's policies on SuDS in Hertfordshire.</p> <p>Please note if the LPA decide to grant planning permission we wished to be notified for our records should there be any subsequent surface water flooding that we may be required to investigate as a result of the new development</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>I have read the submitted noise report.</p> <p>I don't have any concerns there will be a harmful noise impact based on predictions. The report identifies the building will have no opening windows and use mechanical ventilation. This will serve as mitigation for noise breakout from the workshops.</p> <p>I would suggest a couple of conditions for noise, one requiring that the workshop shall be ventilated by means of mechanical ventilation and have no opening windows, and one requiring an assessment of the mechanical ventilation system once installed to ensure this does not give rise to any noise issues at neighbouring residential.</p> <p>I suggest the attachment of following conditions.</p> <p>Section 5.0 of the Berkhamsted School Old Dairy Workshop Noise Assessment (Report No. 18-0086-2 R01) prediction of noise levels identifies the following</p>

	<p>"It is proposed that the workshop will be ventilated by an extract fan with the discharge ducted up to the roof level with relief air intake would be via the courtyard. General background ventilation would be via a mechanical system drawing air in and exhausting into the courtyard. No openable windows are proposed".</p> <p>The prediction of noise levels assumes that that extract fan has a discharge sound power level of up to 70dBA. Therefore in order to avoid the likelihood of adverse impact the extract fan serving the workshop shall have a sound power level not exceeding 70dBA. The extract fan shall not contain any tonal character.</p>
--	---

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
91	1	0	15	1

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
1 Chapel Street Berkhamsted HP4 2EA	<p>The application states 'The proposed building is of a scale and design that is appropriate to the location, taking account of the Conservation Area status, the amenity of neighbouring residents, and also comments raised at during the previous application.' I do not believe this to be the case even remotely!</p> <p>We are still concerned about the height of the building. On the new plans the new building is 110.317 as opposed to the previous submission where it was 111.819. Not really a significant reduction in overall height and still approx 1.5. higher than the existing building and higher in fact than our own two storey residential property. This is still MASSIVE! On the Planning statement it asks 'Can the site be seen from a public road, public footpath, bridleway or other public land?' to which it says NO. It can in fact be seen from the road in various places. I call to mind the old saying 'is it a small cow or a large cow seen at a distance!' Its all very well showing how this will look as seen from over the road but come to my back window or into my garden and imagine how it will be having that monstrosity looming over you every day!</p> <p>The 'staggering' of the building does reduce the 'mass' of the building slightly but it is still way to big. It still dramatically alters the aspect of our property and completely changes the look and feel of the surrounding area. We would still be looking at a great big modern building in the midst of period properties. In the Town Planning meeting</p>

I attended it was discussed that as this used to be an Old Dairy the proposed building should go at least some way to reflect its previous usage, this doesn't seem to have been taken into consideration at all. This is a conservation area, we are not allowed to put dormers on the rear of our properties as it changes the aspect of the rear of the house. How is it that Berkhamsted school can propose to build such a building in the middle of a protected residential area...or is it one rule for us and another for Berkhamsted School??

(There is still a discretion on the plans, even within one drawing. In plan 1812-P350 East elevation it has the roof height matching Castle Street and in the next drawing it is below the height of the roofs on Castle Street. Which is it??)

The flat area of the roof causes a security and privacy issue for us. If someone breaks into the building (there is no gate to the yard) it would be easy to drop down into the gardens of Chapel Street unseen, especially as there are 'demountable roof ladders' handily provided. Also there are doors out onto the flat roof that I'm sure workers would go out onto especially in the warm weather and would be looking directly into our garden and those in Bridge Street.

The flat roof has a huge roof light, in winter this would be lit up from early afternoon and would cause major light pollution for Chapel street and Bridge street residents. In the Planning statement it says that the roof light can be opened to allow the area to be cooled...this effectively would allow all the noise and dirt to come straight out of the roof!!

One of our main concerns is that the property butts right up to our boundary wall. Throughout the document it is not clear whether the wall will be demolished or not. One minute it says 'the exact extent of demolition - pending survey investigation' the next minute it shows some walls to be demolished (1812-P220), and on 1812-P360 it shows the retention of existing brickwork up to 24 Castle Street and 1 & 2 Chapels street with New Facing brickwork. The demolition of this wall is not acceptable.

The Planning statement asks 'Are there trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character?' To which it says NO! If this wall is taken down it would completely destroy the look and feel of our garden. Killing off well established plants and destroying the biodiversity of the surrounding area. The plans show only one of two existing trees but not the hedge in my garden which would almost certainly be killed. The hedge and ivy provide a wealth of shelter to local wildlife. (This section seems to have been ignored)

If Yes to either or both of the above, you may need to provide a full Tree Survey, at the discretion of your local planning authority. If a Tree Survey is required, this and the accompanying plan should be submitted alongside your application. Your local planning authority should make clear on its website what the survey should contain, in accordance with the current 'BS5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations'.)

	<p>The following activities in the workshop causes me concern on a number of levels.</p> <p>Activities within the workshop are noted to include the use of the following; band saw, chop saw, circular saw, wood planer, mitre saw, bench drills, metal cutter, spindle moulder and grinder. The use of these items will be within the workshop and would be used no more than 2 to 3 hours per day. 6.32 A dust extraction system will be installed to the saw machinery; this will extract dust out of the building and the vent will expel at the refuse area, away from nearby residential units.</p> <p>This will all be very noisy. It has said that the workshop noise will be contained within the buildings but the whole area is so enclosed any noise just ricochets around the walls of the neighbourhood. Someone needs to come and monitor the decibel level as I know from experience when the students are unloading in equipment in the yard it is ridiculously loud.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the dust extraction. As someone who suffers from asthma, to have dust blown up into the air from wood and metal is going to cause me breathing problems. It says this is going to be away from residents but this will not factor in the wind blowing stuff around.</p> <p>In the letter I received from Berkhamsted School it says there will be 14 full time staff and 4-6 part time staff but the application still states 16 full time and 8 part time people. Which ever way you look at it that is still in the region of 20 people going in and out of the yard daily. I can't see how the school can say 'the level of future movement will not give rise to any noticeable change' It will be totally different to how it currently is, it will be busier and noisier in every respect.</p> <p>It states it will only be accessed 08.00 - 17.00 Monday - Friday, 08.00 - 17.00 Saturday and 08.00 - 17.00 Sunday and bank holidays...that'll be all day every day then!</p> <p>I still have concerns about parking. It is nearly impossible to park a round this area. People are inherently lazy and will always try and park as close as possible to where they work.</p>
<p>4 Bridge Street Berkhamsted HP4 2EB</p>	<p>Whilst I appreciate that some improvements have been made, I would like to make the following objections which I feel have not been taken into account.</p> <p>Currently I overlook a lovely wall of green, which is not only appealing to the eye, but also provides a vital habitat for various species of fauna and flora. By removing this and not restoring this aspect, will mean that these vital species are being lost in this ecosystem. This wall of ivy provides a vital habitat for birds, insects and butterflies throughout the year and should not be destroyed. From my understanding, I believe that the developers will make every attempt to retain the wall but due to the delicate state of this, it might not be possible. With this in mind and in order to offset any carbon emissions that will be generated during the construction process I would propose that a 'green wall be constructed. This would demonstrate to the local community that not</p>

	<p>only do the school have generosity but also great community spirit.</p> <p>The wall also helps protect my privacy as well. Whilst some measures have been incorporated to elevate previous concerns and pitched structures have now been staggered, it still brings the structure to within 20m of the back walls of our buildings. The plans also shows that there are windows and doors on the facing walls, which means that people can look directly into our rear windows but staff who work on the site will also have access to the flat roof area via the proposed door, which means that privacy is all but lost.</p> <p>The plans also indicate a rather excessive sky light which, when the lights are on, will increase the light pollution in this area. This could increase when the building begins to get more regular usage. Whilst the school have suggested that this will be kept to about 2-3 hours a day and occasional weekends, how can this be monitored and guaranteed?</p> <p>In addition this there is also a concern over the noise pollution, both during construction and on completion and when in use. Currently we live a very peaceful residential area in the middle of a town. Given the location of the building and the very close proximity to the centre of town, this is extremely rare; the noise of the proposed building works and the proposed usage of the building will destroy this. Again the school have said that is will be kept to about 2-3 hours a day and occasional weekends, but once again I ask, how can this be monitored and guaranteed?</p> <p>Furthermore, I would like to bring up the subject of parking. The planning statement states that there will be two parking spaces within the site. A letter from the school clearly states that 14 full-time office staff and a 4-6 part time staff members will be working there, potentially meaning that 20 staff could be on the site at any given time. Two parking spaces do not seem sufficient to supply these members of staff with adequate parking spaces. It has been mentioned that the staff will continue to use available parking within the school campus, but frequently I find this not to be the case. There is already a short full of spaces within the area with residents having to compete for street parking on a daily basis with school pupils and staff.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to bring up the issue of health with particular reference to dust and potential harmful substances. There has been no mention that due diligence has been carried out on the materials of the existing building. During demolition this will create an enormous amount of dust clouds impacting on the environment and subsequently our health. If the planning did go ahead this could still continue with the amount of dust generated from the workshop.</p>
<p>7 Bridge Street Berkhamsted HP4 2EB</p>	<p>I am a resident of Bridge Street and do not want this industrial building sited behind my house and impacting my life negatively. I enjoy living in the conservation area and fully respect the essence of where I live.</p>

Observations and considerations - Berkhamsted School has options and choices, local residents do not. The school is fortunate to have significant funds available to it and access to professionals whom can best advise how and where to invest such monies. Given the position, land ownership and occupancy the school affords, there are a breadth of assets available to the school. There is a reasonable expectation that the school has a social and community responsibility towards the town and local residents. The school has a clear choice of where to develop such a building and should be considerate enough to do so with the local community in mind. The school should seek to minimise the negative impact on the community not maximise it.

The school has many options to site the proposed development elsewhere in the town - for example, Mill Street - an existing number of buildings owned by the school, this would only impacting industrial units or the school itself, or, the tennis courts behind the school building on Mill Street (there are additional sports facilities at Kitchener's Fields and the Kings Road campus), or, the girl's campus on Kings Road where there is plenty of unused land and not immediately surrounded by residential property, or, Kitchener's Fields - where the school has secured all of the public parking and has ample land to build a sympathetic structure away from residents.

The duration of the building will be a long time of noise/dirt/dust/security risk/unable to open windows and enjoy our gardens - it will change our daily lives to have an industrial unit of such a size and scale being developed at the end of our back gardens.

1. Loss of light or overshadowing - the building will cast a shadow and over residential properties immediately bordering it - Bridge/Chapel and Castle Street. Other properties will be in the shadow of the building at different times of the day.

2. Overlooking/loss of privacy - Bridge Street properties have lost all privacy due to the design of the building directly looking into bedrooms and gardens - this is not the case now. The aspect from the residential properties will change negatively and be obliterated because of this building. The pitched structures have been staggered - which does not 'breakup' the bulk of the building. The closest of the pitched roofs being within 20m of the houses. The windows and doors on the facing walls result in the people in the building being able to look directly into the bedrooms, kitchens and gardens of Bridge Street. This is a loss of privacy. In addition, the people in the building can walk out onto a flat roof area, have conversations, create litter, cigarette butts and create another noise nuisance for Bridge Street.

3. Light pollution - The proposed lighting to the rear of the building is a large skylight system. This will result in light pollution - example of the school doing this is the school canteen. This light pollution will result in all bedrooms being impacted by this unnecessary light source and affecting our standard of living in Bridge Street. The roof lights will also immediately impact the properties.

4. Adequacy of parking/turning - The building location will add to the parking problem. The planning statement (3.5) states that there will be

two parking spaces within the site and employees will "continue to use existing parking within the wider campus to supplement available parking within the site." A letter from the school to some residents' states that the facility will "provide a central workplace for 14 fulltime permanent office staff and a further 4-6 staff on a part-time basis". Two dedicated parking spaces for 18-20 staff is not adequate. The overflow, 16-18 people will compound the already difficult parking situation in the conservation area which sees school students daily, competing with local residents for on street parking. Given the sensitivity of the parking issue and the conflict this has caused between residents and the school already, Berkhamsted school should address this issue not compound it.

5. Noise and disturbance resulting from use - The proposed use of the building is offices and workshops - change of use to that currently used. The noise pollution and disturbance to residents is that of a band saw, chop saw, circular saw, wood planner, mitre saw, bench drills, mettle cutter, spindle moulder and grinder. The industrial extremely noisy machines will be in use 2-3 hours per day 7 days a week. How can the proposed use be acceptable within a residential area? Furthermore, extra curriculum activities for students will mean that the building will be in use during the evening and weekends - thus causing a nuisance to residents 7 days per week. The noise of the school can already be heard by residents and that is one street away on Castle Street. Siting this industrial unit within 10 metres of residential property is unacceptable. Harmful, hazardous emissions during the build and whilst the building is in use have been downgraded. Asbestos, dust emission, building material emissions and harmful particles will be released into the atmosphere. These harmful particles will be ingested by local residents. The dust extraction system and vent will ensure that all of the waste and harmful particles will be blown to residents - the school cannot control the way the wind is blowing. The presence of air conditioning units will also be unsightly and noisy and be directed to the residents.

6. Visual intrusion - the building overlooks my property and negatively changes the aspect. There is a large natural green habitat in existence currently. This eco system supports families of foxes, nesting birds, bats and other wildlife. The proposed building will destroy this habitat in its entirety. It is clear from the documents submitted that the architects have not conducted appropriate surveys and have no intention of doing so. Instead, the architects are using terms to 'mask' the wilful destruction of the habitat and any archaeological interest.

7. Design, appearance and type of materials - The design clearly impacts the outlook from the residences negatively. The rear of the building has a roof area with doors opening onto it. Windows facing directly with a view into bedrooms and gardens enables employees and students to walk on the roof and look into private dwellings. This does not happen now as the building does not allow for this and there is no window or foot access onto the roof. Privacy is important to residents and we have the right to expect privacy. The roof has a direct route through to our properties which is a security risk.

	<p>8. This is clearly a noisy, industrial, commercial unit which should be located with other, similar buildings.</p>
<p>24 Castle Street Berkhamsted HP4 2DW</p>	<p>I am the property owner of no ** Castle St which adjoins this application</p> <p>This is a revised Planning Submission for this property (previously May 2019 which was withdrawn)</p> <p>The proposed roof line has been very slightly lowered on this amended application but fails to have reduced the impact that the proposed plans and elevations will have on my property</p> <p>I am writing with my concern over this totally unreasonable application in the middle of a group of residential properties.</p> <p>The detail shows a very much larger and taller replacement building than the existing.</p> <p>The proposed Ridge height shown is much higher than my adjacent property and would be much closer to my boundary.</p> <p>The proposed new building wall is detailed right on my boundary and at a much higher level than the existing wall</p> <p>In fact, the existing boundary wall at the approx. position where the proposed building will be nearest to my house is 3.45 M high</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The new height to eaves at this point will be at least 6M - The new ridge height of the proposed roof would be a staggering 10.2m high, within approx.. 4m of my boundary <p>This is clearly shown on drawing 1612-P350</p> <p>I would have a new wall height of approx. 6M right along the full length of my boundary with No.25</p> <p>In addition, Section 1 on drawing 1812-P110, appears to have been deliberately drawn much further back in Chapel St, to not show the full effect of the new taller building on my property No 24 Castle St</p> <p>The proposed new building will be enormous and hugely imposing and cause:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of light and overshadowing - to the whole of my property including my small outside space, as the new boundary wall and ridge heights are much greater than at present - Visual intrusion - ditto - Possible noise and disturbance resulting from use - the footprint and floor area is much greater than the existing. No doubt that will mean much greater personnel and possibly machinery activity than at present <p>As previously discussed, with you on the telephone you have agreed to allow me to show you the impact the proposed building would have on my property when you arrange your site visit</p>

<p>3 Bridge Street Berkhamsted HP4 2EB</p>	<p>While some changes have been made from the initial proposal submitted back in May I do not feel that these have adequately addressed the concerns I registered at that time.</p> <p>Privacy - Firstly the issue of privacy remains. While the pitched structures have been staggered to 'break up' the overall bulk of the structure, this brings the closest of them to within 20m of the back walls of our houses. Given there are windows and doors on the facing walls of the pitched structures this means they will look out directly into our rear windows. As someone who works from home I will be directly overlooked during work hours and this feels intrusive. I do not understand why an elevated window cannot be installed further up the wall of the pitched structures facing onto Bridge St so that we can retain our privacy while the structures themselves can still receive plenty of light. Why must there be doors granting access to the flat roof?</p> <p>Light Pollution - While the handrail originally proposed for the rear edge of the flat roof has been removed, it has been replaced by an extensive skylight system, and the fact that roof access remains does not prohibit individuals from being able to walk over this skylight system to the very edge of the roof overlooking our gardens as I am sure it will be made of resilient, load bearing glass. Furthermore, the scale of this lighting system means that significant light pollution will result where the building lights are on, currently we enjoy a minimal level of such light pollution.</p> <p>Noise Pollution - In addition to light pollution the planning statement (6.31) lists an array of extremely noisy tools which are to be located within the workshop, while their use is stated to be limited to no more than 2-3 hours a day, how is this going to be regulated? This is an unenforceable pledge that is subject to abuse with little or no consequence, and once those tools are in situ in that space they will represent a substantial source of noise pollution in the centre of what is currently, given its proximity to the centre of town, an unusually peaceful area. The intended usage of this building feels fundamentally at odds with its location in the middle of a residential conservation area, office, or storage space would be one thing but a workshop full of saws (band, chop, circular and mitre), grinders, and drills, actually feels wantonly antagonistic!</p> <p>Parking - The planning statement (3.5) states that there will be two parking spaces within the site and employees will "continue to use existing parking within the wider campus to supplement available parking within the site". A letter from the school to resident's states that the facility will "provide a central workplace for 14 full-time permanent office staff and a further 4-6 staff on a part time basis". Two dedicated parking spaces for 18-20 staff does not feel at all sufficient which means the overflow will only compound the already difficult parking situation in the conservation area which sees school students frequently competing</p>

	<p>with residents for on street parking. I feel that given the sensitivity of the parking issue and the amount of conflict this has caused between residents and the school already, that any new proposal from the Berkhamsted School should at least seek to alleviate, rather than further compound this issue.</p> <p>Outlook - Currently the face, and roof, of the existing structure are covered in a well established layer of flora, comprised of Ivy and wild flowers. As my home office faces out onto this wall I have noted, at various times of the year, it provides a habitat for nesting birds, butterflies, insects and even a family of foxes which occupied the Ivy on the roof for a period. I had heard from Briony, who took the time to meet with the residents, that there had been talk of the developers attempting to retain this wall, but clearly that is impossible given its already delicate state due to the Ivy largely binding it together. As soon as the roof is removed, the Ivy which covers the wall will drag it down as well. Being pragmatic about this I don't expect the original wall to be retained, but I would ask that the school at least consider residents' outlook in their plans by undertaking to install a green wall. This is a point I raised in my previous remarks on the first iteration of these plans and would go some way to offsetting the carbon emissions generated by construction, providing an outlook similar to that being removed, as well as a habitat for the birds and insects which enjoy the current flora on this wall. Here lies an opportunity for the school to do something positive for the local residential community in addition to garnering some good publicity for building in an innovative, and environmentally conscious manner.</p> <p>Health - Finally I see no evidence in the supporting documents that a material analysis of the existing structure has been done in such a way to definitively rule in, or out the presence of asbestos or other harmful substances which, when agitated, throw up carcinogenic dust, the ingestion of which leads to lung cancer and mesothelioma. This is of great concern and I would absolutely want to see due diligence in this area before approving of any demolition activities on that site.</p> <p>Locally Listed Buildings - Finally I note in the Constraints section that there are 3 recorded locally listed buildings but in actual fact the houses on Bridge St are also locally listed. I received a letter from the council some years ago informing me that my property had been locally listed, and I would assume that this goes for all the other houses on the street. This surely needs to be reflected in the constraints?</p>
<p>6 Bridge Street Berkhamsted HP4 2EB</p>	<p>As a resident of Bridge street directly affected by the new build who did get a notice of this work, I can't help but feel that there has been a tactical effort to keep these developments quiet from the large number of residents who's homes and private lives it's going to greatly disrupt.</p> <p>I know that letters have been given out to around 4 homes on Bridge street and the old persons home on the corner of castle street (that will hardly be directly affected) as well as some people on castle street, but I know that a large proportion of people on Bridge street (in particular) are TOTALLY UNAWARE OF THE PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF THE SHED AND THE SUBSEQUENT BUILDING WORK that will be</p>

being carried out for a significant amount of time right on their doorstep. This will mean that their back yards and one street away will become a noisy building site, spewing up dust for an undefined amount of time.

Many of the people that this will affect have simply NOT BEEN INFORMED, or do not have access or knowledge of how to use the technology required for viewing / objecting to these plans.

Having read the proposal documents, I believe that THE IMPACT ON THE RESIDENTS OF BRIDGE STREET AND THE SURROUNDING AREA HAS BEEN GREATLY DOWNPLAYED. This is illustrated in Section 2.1 of the planning statement, which neglects to even mention the residents on both Bridge Street and Castle Street that will be directly impacted by work / the new building quite literally 10m from their bedroom windows.

The existing plans do not seem to include HOW CLOSE THIS NEW BUILD WILL BE TO OUR HOMES. The supporting document titled 'Existing plans' leaves off the perimeter of our homes to the new build with any meaningful scale.

Aside from the aesthetic impact this new build will have, our homes are around 100 years old, and while currently structurally sound (with a few minor cracks from expected settling / heavy vehicles), I WORRY ABOUT THE AFFECTS THAT DISRUPTION TO SOIL AND GROUND SO CLOSE TO THESE VERY OLD BUILDINGS WILL HAVE ON THE FOUNDATIONS.

I would ask WHAT INDEMNITY INSURANCE THE BUILDERS / SCHOOL WILL HAVE for covering any damage to adjacent properties through destruction / construction / ongoing settling / use of the building.

Personally, the back of my home directly overlooks the current shed that does (contrary to what their planning application says) border trees and HOST SIGNIFICANT WILDLIFE. I have often seen birds nesting in the plants that cover the shed, and I'd be keen for a nature survey to be carried out before the building is significantly disturbed to be sure there are not bats (a frequent sight in my back yard) or nesting birds (inc. owls) inside of the structure.

As per section 4.12.1 states " demolition and development in Conservation Areas will be permitted provided they are carried out in a manner which preserved or enhances the established character of appearance of the area." this will certainly not be the case.

Despite the significant disruption to my home during the destruction and re-build, I can't even begin to imagine how they think it appropriate to place a part of the school that will regularly be using BAND SAWS, CHOP SAWS, CIRCULAR SAWS, WOOD PLANERS, MITRE SAWS, BENCH DRILLS, METAL CUTTERS, SPINDLE MOULDERS, AND GRINDERS AS WELL AS A DIST EXTRACTION SYSTEM, RIGHT SLAP BANG IN THE MIDDLE OF A TOTALLY RESIDENTIAL AREA.

The current equivalent building for these services is in a non-residential area on Mill Street - it's unclear as to why this area cannot be re-

developed as it is much bigger and also away from private residences (what with it backing the Tesco car park and delivery entrance. THE NOISE ALONE WILL CAUSE SIGNIFICANT DISRUPTION TO DAILY LIFE (especially for those of us who work from home) and in the planning permission it also details that this could happen at weekends too. As outlined in section 1.8 of the Planning Statement the area will almost certainly be used for extra curricular activities outside of regular working hours. No set times have been defined, with loose approximations used so it's very open for them to use this as a carte blanche without restriction or thought.

I would also expect that for safety reasons, as with many commercial buildings these days, lights will be left on when the building is not being used which will lead to AN INCREASE IN LIGHT POLLUTION for some of the houses even closer to mine.

With a whole roof of windows and heat producing machinery I do not accept that it will be a heat-controlled environment (in fact section 6.26 details that it will be made of 'efficient building fabric to minimise heat loss') and I can absolutely see extra ventilation needed, most likely meaning doors and windows left open (esp in summer) ADDING TO THE NOISE AND DUST POLLUTION OF OUR HOMES CREATED BY A WORKSHOP AND VEHICLE MAINTENANCE AREA.

While I can see that efforts have been made to reduce the privacy impact on our homes once the building is completed, with a buffer of skylight-style windows being added, visibility into our upstairs windows will still be possible. In addition to this, it's unclear as to how long construction will take and the INTRUSION OF PRIVACY this will have with a building site and scaffolding looking directly into bedroom windows, back gardens and kitchens. Not to mention the view that I will left with both during and after construction.

I also cannot tell the affect that the angle sun bouncing off these slanted skylights will have on my home from these plans.

The argument in section 6.2 - 6.4 that "The proposed use of workshop and associated facilities falls within use class B2 with storage elements within use class B8..." I believe to be invalid, as ONCE BUILT THE BUILDING WILL CLEARLY HAVE GONE THROUGH A CHANGE OF USE AND SIT QUITE FIRMLY IN 'D1 NON-RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTIONS' - Clinics, health centres, crèches, day nurseries, day centres, schools, art galleries (other than for sale or hire), museums, libraries, halls, places of worship, church halls, law court. Non residential education and training centres." - what with it containing offices, 16 permanent staff (room for a further 8 on a part-time basis), a workshop and also being an enclosed area being used by the school for administration purposes. This, in my view stops it from merely being and area classified as 'General industrial / Storage or distribution'.

Please understand that this is not just affecting buildings, but homes and people's private lives. I can't help but feel that this is a TOTALLY INAPPROPRIATE STRUCTURE AND USE OF A BUILDING TO BE ON THIS SITE when the school has the financial means and land to build/update these facilities elsewhere. PLEASE REMEMBER THAT

	THESE ARE OUR HOMES, THE SCHOOL HAS A VARIETY OF OPTIONS FOR THIS DEVELOPMENT, WE DO NOT.
6 Bridge Street Berkhamsted HP4 2EB	<p>I live on Bridge Street and strongly object to this proposal. How can such a large development be even considered in a residential area but also how can the proposed development be squeezed into an existing area which currently does not impact on neighbouring properties and has no detrimental effect to the area!</p> <p>The height of the development will sit above all adjacent properties marring the aspect of the road and will not be in keeping with residential properties. Windows, roof lights and similar will impose on all adjacent and rear residential properties. Our gardens would back onto this proposed development and the noise from the building would reverberate along all gardens. We can already hear noise from class rooms which are located on the opposite side of the road to this development. How can a development/ building which will be open 7 days a week, being used as a workshop where students will be using circular saws, wood planers and similar, dust extraction systems fitted to the exterior of the building be seriously considered ! On a summers day with windows open, roof lights open and back doors open the noise levels would be unacceptable. This is a residential area and we do not want this development ! It seems to me that no thought or consideration has been given to the residential community.</p>
14 Bridge Street Berkhamsted HP4 2EB	<p>I object to this revised proposal on the grounds that:</p> <p>The overall size together with the planned activities of the proposed development are still out of character with the Conservation area and will disturb residents.</p> <p>Although the proposed gable ends are now staggered the roof line is still far higher than the existing structure and surrounding buildings on Chapel and Bridge Streets, and the office windows still overlook Bridge Street residents' first floor bedrooms. One may be a kitchenette but that will still be in regular use by office workers.</p> <p>The workshops will be a source of regular noise and dust pollution for residents. The gardens in Bridge Street are small, so the storage buildings will be very close to the back of people's houses. It is not made clear where the dust extraction pipe from the workshop will be situated: given the small footprint of the site, the dust has the potential to be blown across residential properties according to the wind direction.</p> <p>While the roof light has been moved to remove the supposed need for railings around the flat roof, it is now situated over the rear storage areas backing immediately onto the party wall with Bridge Street gardens, and as such will be a new source of light pollution and disturbance to residents. Unless it is made to a particularly high specification, glass is also more likely to transmit sound waves than other materials, so this feature will increase noise pollution over the previous design.</p> <p>Removal of existing boundary wall:</p>

I have concerns that the proposal: "includes provision to remove and re-build the east boundary wall (adjoining rear access lane to Bridge street properties) which is more recent."

The existing party wall at the back of Bridge Street houses is a fragile wall of single brick width. If it were to collapse during excavations it could place residents, their pets and their garden structures at risk.

Change of use: the application argues that this new development is not a change of use, however it states that the existing building is used for "storage and general yard area associated with the support services of the school."

The new building includes a workshop with mechanical equipment, which I would argue is a substantial change of use and will dramatically increase the noise disturbance. Also the office is a change of use.

This is a largely residential area and this new combined office and workshop without provision for sufficient parking will cause additional strain on street parking. Parking is already a source of tension between the school and residents, as sixth formers already park in Bridge St, Chapel St and Castle Street, in competition with residents. There is no space on the surrounding streets for additional cars from workers who would be using this office, and it is disingenuous to suggest they will park at other sites on the various school campuses across the town: it's human nature to try and park as close as possible to your work place.

There are discrepancies in the proposal as to the amount of traffic from the maintenance vehicle to and from the site - in one part of the proposal it states that the vehicle will be travelling out and back once a day, whereas in item 3.6 in the supporting documents it states that ?:

?????"The project brief requires the new development to be able to frequently to move equipment and materials between the workshops and????? the rest of the school."

I have reservations about the removal of the existing structure - there is no satisfactory survey of the potential for hazardous materials to exist within the building. I do not agree that this design is "of far greater architectural merit than the existing and therefore provides a positive effect to the character of the conservation area". The proposal is patently a grossly oversized building, and it adds nothing of architectural value. The character of the Conservation area and all the cottages along Bridge Street have local listed status - if I were to apply for planning permission to build right up to the boundary wall it would be rejected as out of keeping with the area. This plan does little to address the objections to the original proposal.

If this application was for a modest, low height, two storey office building which didn't overlook existing residents' bedrooms and included decent parking provision, I would not be submitting an objection. It is the overall size of the development with structures adjacent to boundaries on such a small enclosed site together with the proposed mechanical workshop which is unacceptable. The existing workshop site at Mill Street is a

	<p>more suitable site for that part of the school's operation. I am frustrated that Berkhamsted School is persisting with this contentious scheme to the detriment of local residents.</p>
<p>1 Bridge Street Berkhamsted HP4 2EB</p>	<p>We at number *****still have serious concerns with this newly revised planning proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It seems we will still be overlooked directly into our rear windows from the structure. So giving us no privacy. 2. We at number ***** are particularly concerned about an opening/gap which is on the left hand side of the garden wall. It is approximately 4-5 metres lower than the rest of the wall. This could seriously stop light coming into our house/garden. As the sun goes down in the summer evenings it actually recedes in this gap. As we spend a lot of time enjoying sitting in our garden most evenings this proposed building will affect the light and our privacy. 3. Very worried about significant lights from the structure (in the winter especially) infringing on our privacy and creating light pollution. 4. Noise from very noisy tools in the workshop. You say 2-3 hours a day. But, will that really be kept to that amount? We are a residential peaceful area. It seems odd to build these workshops so close to private dwellings. 5. Very concerned about our flora back wall. It has taken many years to grow and establish several creepers and ivy. This will all be demolished or killed. Along with the wildlife. We do in fact also find it difficult to believe that the wall can be retained. 6. You say 20 staff, but 2 parking spaces. I have lived here 28 years and parking is a challenge. Adding to an already creaking system will only make matters worse. We have had an ongoing battle for many years with students from Berkhamsted school. Why can't all the students park their cars in an area that is already been allocated to them (Kitchener's Fields). 7. Asbestos removal, dust creation during the build and the emissions from the workshop will be discharged into the atmosphere in the vicinity of our property. This is a health hazard. 8. My ***** so also have several members of my family who visit us regularly in Bridge Street. This is very worrying. Also many children come to our house. 9. This development will undoubtedly affect the value of our house.
<p>Stonycroft 9 Shrublands Road Berkhamsted HP4 3HY</p>	<p>I write on behalf of the BCA Townscape Group of which I am Chairman. The Group considered some progress had been made towards improvement of the plans for the site but were mindful of the continuing concerns of the neighbours in Chapel Street, Bridge Street and Castle Street, which it would like to support. These are: the proposed buildings are still too tall and bulky; light pollution is probable from its large roof lights; noise and dust pollution, 7 days per week, is possible from the</p>

	<p>machines in the workshop; and on-street parking would be exacerbated. Should permission be granted, the Citizens recommends that curbs be placed on all these aspects of the development.</p>
<p>31 Bridge Street Berkhamsted HP4 2EB</p>	<p>I hope that all of these objections are taken seriously and that the impact of this application will be considered properly and with thought for neighbours and the area where we reside. Here are some of my objections.</p> <p>The proposed building is too big.</p> <p>The activities proposed within the new building will produce too much noise for the surrounding residential neighbourhood.</p> <p>This is a locally listed building within a conservation area. Whilst existing residents are unable to have a dormer windows on their property, how this sort of structure is even being considered is beyond me.</p> <p>There will be loss of light to all of the properties that back on to the proposed building. Their homes will be greatly impacted.</p> <p>Loss of privacy to all neighbours backing on to the proposed structure.</p> <p>Light pollution with the large sky light.</p> <p>Parking..? The parking situation in Bridge Street and the immediate surrounding area is already at an unmanageable level. The school currently turns a blind eye to constant traffic violations along Chapel Street and this proposed building has completely insufficient parking for the said usage.</p> <p>Noise disturbance 7 days a week in a residential area. The site of a workshop with saws, metal cutters will produce immense amounts of dust and pollution.</p> <p>The building currently houses quite a lot of wildlife and it would be nice if this could be considered in some way.</p> <p>I hope that these comments and others will make a difference to this application and it should be refused on many many levels. It is a shame that residents of Bridge Street have to deal with this and feel scared that this will be granted as most of the school applications are.</p> <p>I have not even been informed of the planning and am a Bridge Street resident on the opposite side of the road. This will affect our side of the street as well and I am concerned that we haven't been informed by letter by the case officer.</p>
<p>25 Bridge Street Berkhamsted HP4 2EB</p>	<p>I am concerned about the proposal to convert the old dairy into a workshop in the middle of a quiet conservation area for a number of reasons:</p>

	<p>> The amount of dust and particulate substances that will be emitted from the proposed "workshop" space would likely dirty the neighbouring horticulture causing plants and local shrubs to be covered in higher levels of dust and particulates that will scare away locally nesting birds and wildlife.</p> <p>> The amount of noise created from a workshop filled with heavy construction machinery is alarm to say the least.</p> <p>> The transportation of large amounts of construction goods going to and from the site on a regular basis would be disruptive as I would expect the items being transported will be large and cumbersome and the pavements nearby do not need more heavy vehicles to add to their strain.</p> <p>> There isn't sufficient parking already in the neighbouring streets with most residents fighting against local school students to get a parking space in the morning. Having an extra building worth of staff without providing appropriate parking spaces for them would cause greater strain on the streets nearby, Chapel Street, Bridge Street in particular.</p>
<p>25 Bridge Street Berkhamsted HP4 2EB</p>	<p>I object to the planning permission for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noise disturbance to nearby residents. School pupils moving to and from the facility each hour will without doubt cause disturbance to nearby residents. - Pupils regularly crossing a busy road. An accident is bound to happen, with pupils darting across the road to get to their next class. Risk of life asides, it'll also disrupt the flow of traffic on Castle street. - Invasion of privacy. Currently the houses overlook shrubbery, inhabited by birds and other fauna. 20m is not enough distance to by any stretch - it's merely shoehorning a building into an awkward space. If you have to force it, it's probably... not worth it. - Pollution. Dust extracted near to resident's gardens will make the once-peaceful homes feel like they've landed on a building site. - The building is out-of-character with the conservation area. By definition, one should 'conserve' - not remove, rebuild and restructure, taking inspiration from tetris (again, to fit a building into an awkward shape). - Parking. Thankfully, I don't have a car, but I've witnessed the drama of pupils parking up the road, annoying residents. Parking is a mission as it is - with more people trying to park, it'll be mission impossible! - House values. All of the above will affect the value of our homes. Long-term residents have lived here for several years, and have key roles within the Berkhamsted community - they help to make Berkhamsted friendly and true to its roots. This will drive away valuable residents, and may have a butterfly affect on the town overall.

	<p>I'm surprised the school thought it would be a good idea to choose this location to build a workshop. It's caused a huge stir in the community - not only for directly-neighbouring residents, but for those on surrounding streets, too. There will be a huge commotion if the work goes ahead, and I thoroughly hope they reconsider.</p>
<p>28 Castle Street Berkhamsted HP4 2DW</p>	<p>I would like to object to this planning application.</p> <p>We have two children and the noise and dust created by this workshop once operational will have a negative impact on their ability to play in the garden given the likelihood of dust being expelled into the air and the noise created as well as potentially disturbing their day time sleep. In addition, this is a conservation area and I am concerned about the impact major works could have on the structure of my home.</p> <p>I also note that the site will only provide two parking spaces for the staff present. As I'm sure the council will be aware there is a significant parking issue on Castle Street and the surrounding roads that has not been addressed. This is exacerbated by the school who clearly do not provide enough parking for their staff and students given the number of them who park on the roads in the area on a daily basis. I am concerned that by providing only two parking spaces on this site residents will have even less chance of being able to park their cars, creating not just inconvenience in terms of having to park a long walk from our homes (particularly difficult for those of us with children) but also having an economic impact when we have to park in paid for car parks.</p>
<p>2 Bridge Street Berkhamsted HP4 2EB</p>	<p>As a Bridge Street resident I must, once again, register my strongest possible objections to the revised proposal 4/02119/19/FUL. Despite a number of minor alterations to the design, the modifications do not address many of the major concerns of the residents previously made. In fact, the modifications actually pose additional problems themselves.</p> <p>The fundamental question still remains however, as to why the school would even consider putting a noisy workshop in the middle of a quiet residential area an appropriate action to take.</p> <p>The extensive list of machinery to be used in the workshop is frightening. It has the potential to dramatically increase the noise levels for the surrounding residents. The revised plans for the skylight to stretch across the entire back section of this workshop will only serve to raise this noise pollution still further. There is no mention in the documents as to any kind of soundproofing to counteract this effect. There is also no detail in the plans as to the location of the machinery in regards to the layout of the building. This could potentially leave the residents of 1-4 Bridge Street with industrial machinery attached to the wall directly backing onto the gardens. There is a reference to a dust extraction system for the machinery. This would also generate noise and presumably need fans for operation when the machinery is in use. No mention either of air conditioning units, which I would assume to be part of a new build and mounted externally increasing the noise levels further.</p>

The skylight was increased in length as a solution to concerns from residents about overlooking and safety. The problem still remains however as there is still access to the flat roof. This negates any benefits of the staggered recessed gables. The privacy-arc and minimum separation distance would still be encroached. In a letter from the school dated 3rd September to only a few residents it states that this access 'would be restricted to routine maintenance activities.' Is roof access really required? If this were to be true why are two doors necessary? Assurances would need to be given that the flat roof area would not simply turn into a roof terrace. Surely one would be sufficient and could be placed on the smaller wall of the kitchen area to avoid overlooking. The windows on the gables overlooking Bridge Street could also be placed higher up in the gables. This would still allow light into the building without overlooking the residents and invading privacy. The skylight also has light pollution issues if not controlled and monitored properly.

The loss of light issue has been assessed by way of a 'Daylight and Shadow Analysis' (Document 44844847 Section 3.7). This survey does not cover the entire year (being taken from 22nd September/20th March and from 8am through 5pm). Surely a more detailed all year round survey would be required to assess how the surrounding buildings would be impacted throughout the summer months and also later in the day.

There is also reference to Dacorum Council's pre-app response (Section 3.1 - Bidwells document) to retain older boundary walls on the site where possible. In response (Document 44844846 Section 3.6) 'At this stage it is not possible to gain full access to them to ascertain either their age or condition and therefore would intend further inspection as and when fuller access can be achieved.' To the best of my knowledge the residents of Bridge Street have never been approached and would happily invite such an inspection. The survey team could then see for themselves the full extent of the natural flora and wildlife that reside there. Removal of these boundary walls would have a significant impact and a detailed assessment would need to be conducted to reassure the residents regarding safety concerns. There is no mention of a green wall to provide a similar or equivalent replacement if the boundary wall had to be removed. Again, this just shows a lack of concern and feelings towards the residents.

Full assessment of potentially hazardous existing building materials removal seems to be of little consideration. How would they intend to remove this safely and also how would new materials be brought on-site?

No indication is given as to the duration of the build. This will have a huge impact on the quality of life for all the surrounding residents and is already costing me sleepless nights. Traffic is a major concern with lorries clogging up the already congested surrounding roads adding to the daily parking nightmare.

The school has offered a contact by means of a letter to selected residents who objected last time on the proposal. This is totally inadequate especially as the letter contradicts the planning application

	<p>submitted. It reassured residents that the Estates Hub would now be smaller with 14 full-time permanent office staff and a further 4-6 staff on a part-time basis. Staff would be relocating 'from existing Estate Management Buildings'. The planning application clearly states under 'proposed employees' 16 full-time and 8 part-time. This does not exactly fill me with any confidence that the school is being entirely honest with the residents or council.</p> <p>There is absolutely NO benefit for the surrounding residents. Simple, better solutions do not appear to have been a consideration but the BEST solution would be not to build it at all.</p> <p>I can only hope that the council will act in the best interests of the residents and the conservation area and reject the proposal outright.</p>
<p>27 castle street berkhamsted hp4 3db</p>	<p>The revised scheme no longer has an adverse affect on our property at 27 Castle street.</p> <p>The school is a great asset to our town creating employment and educating our children and for these reasons I fully support the revised scheme.</p>