

**ITEM NUMBER: 5a**

<b>20/00212/FUL</b>	<b>Demolition of Garages, Two-Storey Extension and Alterations to Existing Medical Centre, and Associated Works.</b>	
<b>Site Address:</b>	<b>Doctors Surgery Parkwood Drive Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2LD</b>	
<b>Applicant/Agent:</b>	<b>Mr NORMINGTON</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>James Gardner</b>	
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>		<b>Chaulden And Warners End</b>
<b>Referral to Committee:</b>	<b>Objection received and DBC has an interest in land</b>	

**1. RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission be **GRANTED**.

**2. SUMMARY**

2.1 The location of the site is considered appropriate for the provision of enhanced medical facilities, Policies CS4 and CS23 being supportive of community facilities.

2.1.1 The impact on nearby dwellings has been considered and, subject to the inclusion of a planning condition requiring the first floor windows on the northern elevation to be permanently fitted with obscure glazing and non-opening below 1.7 metres from finished floor level, the impacts on privacy would be minimal. Owing to the low eaves height and overall distance from the dwellings to the north, it is not considered that any loss of daylight and sunlight would be so severe as to weigh in favour of a refusal of planning permission.

2.1.2 The level of parking provision is considered to strike an appropriate balance between sufficient parking and encouraging patients / staff to utilise more sustainable methods of transport. There would be no significant adverse impacts on the highway network, and Hertfordshire Highways have raised no objections.

**3. SITE DESCRIPTION**

3.1 The application site comprises an area of approximately 0.27 hectares and is currently occupied by single-storey garages with associated concrete hardstanding and an existing medical centre.

**4. PROPOSAL**

4.1 Planning permission is sought for demolition of existing single-storey garages and the construction of a two-storey extension to the existing Parkwood Drive medical centre. The extension would be of two-storey construction and positioned at roughly 90 degrees to the existing building. It would measure approximately 25m (L) x 10.35m (W) with a maximum height of 7.25m. A roof with a shallow pitch is proposed to be utilised. The building would be externally finished in a mixture of brick, render and include powder coated aluminium windows. The proposal also includes the provision of a reconfigured parking area, alterations to the boundary treatment, installation of lighting security lighting, and the installation of solar panels on the existing roof slope of the surgery.

**5. PLANNING HISTORY**

4/00743/16/FUL - Side and rear extension

GRA - 11th July 2016

This application was relatively modest and did not provide a significant amount of additional space.

## **6. CONSTRAINTS**

Parking Accessibility Zone (DBLP): 4

CIL Zone: CIL3

Former Land Use (Risk Zone): Petrol Station, Warners End Road, Hemel Hempstead

Parish: Hemel Hempstead Non-Parish

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)

Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Hemel Hempstead)

Smoke Control Order

Town: Hemel Hempstead

## **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

### Dacorum Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages

CS8 – Sustainable Transport

CS9 – Management of Roads

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS13 – Quality of the Public Realm

CS23 – Social Infrastructure

CS29 – Sustainable Design and Construction

CS31 – Water Management

CS32 – Air, Soil and Water Quality

### Dacorum Local Plan

Policy 13 - Planning Conditions and Planning Obligations

Policy 51 - Development and Transport Impacts

Policy 57 - Provision and Management of Parking

Policy 58 - Private Parking Provision

Policy 62 – Cyclists

Policy 99 - Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands

## Policy 113 - Exterior Lighting

### Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

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

## 9. CONSIDERATIONS

### Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

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

### Principle of Development

9.2 Policy CS4 (The Towns and Large Villages) of the Dacorum Core Strategy states that “*Non-residential development for small-scale social, community, leisure and business purposes is also encouraged, provided it is compatible with its surroundings.*”

9.2.1 Policy CS23 (Social Infrastructure) states that “Social infrastructure providing services and facilities to the community will be encouraged.” and clarifies that new infrastructure will be:

- Located to aid accessibility; and
- Designed to allow for different activities.

9.2.2 Paragraph 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that, to provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should, amongst other things:

- Plan positively for the provision of community facilities; and
- Ensure that established facilities and services are able to develop and modernise and retained for the benefit of the community.

9.2.3 Whether the development is small-scale is very much a matter of interpretation. The application does not fall to be considered as a major application, as the site area is not large enough, but in terms of size and extent of built development, it would be hard to argue that the surgery extension is small-scale. Nonetheless, it is important to have regard to the context; specifically, the fact that the application site is in close proximity to the Warners End Local Centre wherein, in accordance with Policy CS4, social and community uses are acceptable without restraint. The site is also currently occupied by an existing doctor’s surgery, which in itself is not small-scale in nature. While the area may be designated as residential, the immediate vicinity is not imbued with a strong residential character; rather, it is characterised by an electrical substation, garage forecourt and lock-up garages. It is also relevant to note that the application site is located within an urban area of Hemel Hempstead, where development is to be expected to be primarily located, in accordance with Policy CS1 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

9.2.4 This application seeks to cater for latent demand for GP services within the area whilst accommodating growth arising from new residential development and an anticipated requirement for the surgery to increase its patient list from 17,550 to in excess of 20,000 patients. The surgery is

currently operating significantly above the average capacity for Hertfordshire surgeries (34.5 patients/m<sup>2</sup> against 21 patients/m<sup>2</sup>), and therefore is in need of expansion in order to cater for its existing patients.

9.2.5 Given the policy support found within CS4 and CS23 for social infrastructure, it is considered that a compelling argument can be made in support of the proposal. Policy CS4's encouragement for small-scale non-residential development in residential areas does not mean that medium-scale development is unacceptable; rather, it is merely not actively encouraged and can, subject to being compatible with its surroundings, be acceptable.

9.2.6 As a result, the development is considered to accord with the Policies CS4 and CS23 of the Dacorum Core Strategy and paragraph 92 of the NPPF.

#### Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.2.7 Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy seek to ensure that, amongst other things, development preserves attractive streetscapes, incorporates large areas dominated by car parking and integrates with the streetscape character.

9.2.8 The design of the extension has been influenced by the physical constraints of the site and the requirement that the surgery remain operational throughout the course of the building works.

9.2.9 The building would differ considerably in design from the dwellings located on Long Chaulden, yet this is to be expected given its intended use as doctor's surgery.

9.2.10 Buff brick and cream textured cement render are proposed to be utilised for the external finishes of the extension. The area is of mixed character and therefore it is not considered that this design approach is flawed. The mixture of brick and render would provide a level of visual interest.

9.2.11 The site is currently occupied by a number of single-storey Council garages and an associated concrete hardstanding. Whilst low and reasonably unobtrusive, the garages are not synonymous with a high quality urban environment. The new building would go some way to revitalising the area and providing a clear and necessary public benefit – i.e. greater GP capacity.

9.2.12 Approximately 95m<sup>2</sup> of green space and 2 trees would be lost in order to provide an acceptable level of parking. The location of the green space (in close proximity to cars and dwellings) and its limited size effectively precludes the use of it for any meaningful outdoor pursuit or recreational activity. The green space would not be lost in its entirety. An area of approximately 288m<sup>2</sup> would be retained and therefore the visual buffer of the green space between the parking areas and the buildings to the south and south-west would remain. Therefore, the loss is not considered to be unacceptable. The benefits of the removal of the utilitarian garages, coupled with the provision of one replacement tree and some minor enhancements to the landscaping near the site entrance, are considered to outweigh any harm arising from the loss of the green space.

9.2.13 The development is therefore considered to be comply with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

#### Impact on Residential Amenity

9.2.14 Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy states that, amongst other things, development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to surrounding properties.

#### Loss of Privacy

9.2.15 Specific guidance on privacy within the Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan recommends minimum distances of 23 metres between the main rear wall of a dwelling and the main wall (front or rear) of another. No mention is made of minimum distances between non-residential premises and dwellings. That a non-residential building will not be occupied at all times, and when occupied will be so for some specific, productive purpose (such as work), is an important consideration. As such, it is considered that only limited weight should be given to this guidance. Other relevant factors shall now be considered.

9.2.16 The building includes a number of windows at ground and first floor level on the northern elevation. Whilst such windows would ordinarily afford views over the rear garden areas of the dwellings located on Long Chaulden, the plans indicate that that these windows are to be fitted with opaque vision glass, thereby negating any potential overlooking. Should planning permission be granted, it is considered appropriate to include a condition which requires the opaque vision glass to be retained in perpetuity, and for the first floor windows to be non-openable below 1.7 metres from finished floor level. It is acknowledged that the windows may give the impression of overlooking, but there would not, in fact, be any. The windows also serve to break up the mass and bulk of the building.

9.2.17 Consideration has been given to potential overlooking of the rear garden and windows of no. 51 Parkwood Drive and the bedsits located above the garages to the south of the site. The separation distance is such that the proposal does not give rise to any concerns over loss of privacy. In the case of the no. 51, views of the garden and windows would be oblique, while the front facing windows of the bedsits would be located over 32 metres away.

#### Visual Intrusion

9.2.18 There is no statutory planning definition of the terms “visual intrusion” or “overbearing”. The proximity of built development, height, mass and bulk, topography, orientation and the existing layouts of adjoining dwellings are all relevant factors that can be taken into account. As such, whether development is visually intrusive or overbearing is a matter of planning judgement.

9.2.19 It is acknowledged that the existing garages are small-scale and single-storey in nature. The new building, by contrast, would be higher and have a greater visual presence than the existing development. However, it does not automatically follow that the development would have an unacceptable impact on the dwellings to the rear of the site (located on Long Chaulden).

9.2.20 The rear elevations of nos. 434 - 438 Long Chaulden do not contain any habitable windows. As such, the development would not be visible from within these dwellings. Whilst there would be some loss of views above the existing garages from the rear gardens, planning policies seek to protect the character and appearance of a street scene in the interest of the public good; they do not protect the private views of nearby residents. The new development would be located between approximately 13 – 19 metres away and utilise a mixture of materials (buff brick and cream textured render), all of which would help to break up the mass and bulk of the building. Its overall height has been kept to a minimum by using a roof with a shallow pitch, further limiting the visual impact.

9.2.21 The surgery building would extend across approximately half the width of the plot demised to no. 432 Long Chaulden. This is an end of terrace plot and therefore wider than the majority of those in the area. As a result, the surgery building would only marginally overlap the rear elevation, leaving direct views up the garden and beyond more or less unimpeded. No. 430 Long Chaulden would not be significantly impacted by the proposed development. The nearest section of the surgery building would be approximately 20 metres away from the original rear wall of the dwelling and located at an oblique angle. Whilst acknowledging that there would be an increase in height compared with the current garages, the use of a shallow pitched roof (approximately 5% angle), combined with the

depth of the building, mean that the total height of the roof structure would not be visible, as demonstrated on drawing no. 125\_D (Rev. E).

### Noise and Disturbance

9.2.22 Concerns have been raised in terms of noise and disturbance arising from the parking area, which would be adjacent to the boundaries of 424 – 432 Long Chaulden. Whereas the rear gardens of these properties are currently shielded by the rear walls of the existing garages, these are proposed to be removed. Vehicle movements will be limited to driving into, or backing out of, 10 parking spaces. It is reasonable to assume that cars manoeuvring within this area will be doing so at a low speed and therefore engine revolutions are unlikely to be high. A distance of approximately 17 metres would exist between the car parking spaces and the rear walls of the dwellings fronting Long Chaulden. A fence / wall would also be interposed between the parking spaces and garden. Details of the proposed boundary treatment have been provided and are shown on drawing no. 102\_I. In summary. These are considered satisfactory and a condition will be included with any grant of planning permission to require the fence / wall to be provided prior to first occupation of the development.

9.2.23 The surgery opening hours are proposed to be increased, details of which are outlined in the table below.

<b>Day</b>	<b>Current Operating Hours</b>	<b>Proposed Operating Hours</b>
Monday	08:30 - 20:00	08:30 – 21:00
Tuesday – Wednesday	07:00 - 18:30	07:00 – 21:00
Thursday – Friday	08:30 – 18:30	08:30 – 21:00
Saturday	09:00 – 12:00 (alternative weeks)	09:00 – 18:00
Sunday	N/A	09:00 – 13:00

9.2.24 A doctor's surgery is not an inherently noisy land use. Although the increased opening hours may give rise to additional car movements, it is unlikely that the intensification would be so great as to be materially different from the current state of affairs. Indeed, the existing garage forecourt is already used for the parking of vehicles, some of which are likely belong to nearby residents and not patients of the surgery.

9.2.25 The Council's Environmental Health Officer has not raised any concerns with regard to noise disturbance.

### Security

9.2.26 Details of the boundary treatment to the north have been provided and would provide a satisfactory level of security. Further, it is considered that the removal of the access way through to Parkwood Drive, which runs behind nos. 436 and 438 Long Chaulden, would result in improvements to security.

### Loss of Daylight / Sunlight

9.2.27 Saved Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan states that residential development should be designed and positioned in such a way that a satisfactory level of sunlight and daylight is maintained

for existing and proposed dwellings. Significant overshadowing should be avoided (see the Building Research Establishment's report "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight" 1991).

9.2.28 Where development is located opposite a window, the 25-degree rule should generally be applied, with the centre of the lowest habitable room window being used as a reference point for the test. If the whole of the proposed development falls beneath a line drawn at 25 degrees from the horizontal, then it is unlikely that there would be a substantial effect on daylight and sunlight. Drawing nos 125\_D (Rev. E) and 127\_A (Rev. A) demonstrate that there would be no breach of the 25-degree rule as it relates to the dwellings located on Long Chaulden (i.e. nos 432 – 438).

9.2.29 Although the new building is located to the south, the distance from rear windows of these dwellings, coupled with the limited eaves height would ensure that acceptable levels of daylight and sunlight are retained for the internal living environments. The overall height of the building is limited, and there is a reasonable distance between it and the existing residential dwellings to the north. Sunlight would, therefore, continue to be received over the top of the building. It is acknowledged that there may be some overshadowing of the rear-most sections of the gardens; however, this needs to be balanced against the substantial public benefits arising from the proposal.

#### Overshadowing

9.2.30 Concerns have been raised in connection with potential overshadowing of the gardens to the north, and therefore shadow diagrams have been provided by the architect to demonstrate the extent to which the gardens would be affected on 20<sup>th</sup> March (Spring Equinox), 21<sup>st</sup> June (Summer Solstice) and 20<sup>th</sup> September (Autumn Equinox)

9.2.31 The shadow diagrams can only provide a snapshot of the maximum extent to which overshadowing would occur on the three days referred to above. In the days between, there will naturally be variations – some favourable, others less so. It is, however, clear that the impact on the gardens during the summer months, when it would be reasonable to assume they would be more frequently used, would be relatively minimal, as the sun would be higher in the sky. It is submitted that considerable weight should be attributed to this fact. It is considered that the impacts of overshadowing would not be so significant as to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

#### Conclusion - Impact on Amenity of Neighbours

9.2.32 Having had regard to all of the points raised by local residents and all relevant material considerations, it is considered that the impacts of the development would not be so severe as to warrant a refusal of planning permission. Secondly, the substantial public benefits associated with providing enhanced medical facilities for the approximately 17,550 people currently registered as patients of Parkwood Drive Surgery, further weighs in favour of the application.

9.2.33 It is considered that the development accords with saved Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan and Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

#### Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.2.34 In accordance with paragraph 111 of the NPPF, a travel plan and transport assessment form part of the submission documents and will be referred to throughout this section of the report.

#### Layout

9.2.35 Access to the application site would remain unchanged. However, it is proposed to reconfigure the internal layout of the site in order to address concerns raised at pre-application stage regarding parking provision.

9.2.36 The dimensions and layout of the perpendicular parking spaces is acceptable and in accordance with Appendix 5 of the Dacorum Local Plan. The proposed parallel parking (numbered 14, 15, 29, 30 & 31) spaces do not have a minimum length of 6 metres, but it has been demonstrated by swept path analysis that vehicles could use these parking bays safely. There would be sufficient space (6m) between the parking spaces along the northern boundary and parallel spaces to the south to ensure acceptable levels of manoeuvrability.

9.2.37 Hertfordshire Fire and Rescue were consulted as part of the application process and have confirmed that firefighter access to the site would be adequate.

9.2.38 In total, 5 disabled car parking spaces – equating to 11.9% of the total number of spaces – would be provided and 4 are shown as being located conveniently close to the main entrance and proximate to an informal pedestrian crossing. There is no specific number with regard to how many disabled car parking spaces should be provided, although Appendix 5 states that 4% of total car parking provision should normally be so allocated. In this instance, where a reasonable percentage of patients are likely to be old or infirm, it is appropriate that a higher percentage be provided; therefore, the proposed level of provision is considered to strike an appropriate balance.

### Traffic Impacts

9.2.39 Saved Policy 51 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) seeks to ensure that overall road capacity is taken into account when considering development proposals.

9.2.40 Policy CS9 of the Dacorum Core Strategy seeks to ensure that traffic generated from new development is compatible with the location, design and capacity of the current and future operation of the road hierarchy, taking into account any planned improvements and cumulative effects of incremental development.

9.2.41 It is acknowledged that the increased capacity of Parkwood Drive Surgery will result in a greater number of vehicle movements. The traffic generation is likely to consist of two elements: patients and staff.

9.2.42 The surgery currently serves approximately 17,550 patients, but it is anticipated that this will increase to around 20,000 patients following the extension. Additional visits to the surgery will, however, be spread over the course of the day rather than being confined to the peak hours of 08:00 – 09:00 in the morning and 17:00 – 18:00 in the evening. Regard also needs to be had to the proposed increase in the hours of operation – in particular, increased capacity at the weekend – further reducing the need for travel during peak times. The existing and proposed hours of operation are provided below for ease of reference:

<b>Day</b>	<b>Current Operating Hours</b>	<b>Proposed Operating Hours</b>
Monday	08:30 - 20:00	08:30 – 21:00
Tuesday – Wednesday	07:00 - 18:30	07:00 – 21:00
Thursday – Friday	08:30 – 18:30	08:30 – 21:00
Saturday	09:00 – 12:00 (alternative weeks)	09:00 – 18:00
Sunday	N/A	09:00 – 13:00
<b>Total Operating Hours:</b>	54.5 / 57.5	64

9.2.43 A staff travel survey undertaken by Summers Inman indicated that 89.3% of staff currently commute to work by private car, equating to a total of 25 people. However, the survey results did highlight that there is some limited potential to encourage modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport. Measures to realise this potential are outlined within a travel plan submitted as part of this planning application. Should planning permission be granted, it is recommended that a condition requiring the travel plan to be implemented at all times be included.

#### Adequacy of Parking

9.2.44 Policy CS9 states that the traffic generated by new development must be compatible with the location, design and capacity of the current and future operation of the road hierarchy, taking into account planned improvements and cumulative effects of incremental development, whilst Policies CS8 and CS12 seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision.

9.2.45 Saved Policies 57 and 58 (and associated Appendix 5) of the Dacorum Local Plan promote an assessment based upon maximum parking standards, which are intended as way of encouraging shifts to more sustainable forms of transport in areas of high accessibility.

9.2.46 The maximum standards as they relate to doctor's surgeries require 3 spaces per consulting room plus 1 space per employee (other than consulting doctors). Parkwood Drive is located within Zone 4 wherein between 75% and 100% of parking requirements should generally be provided on site – i.e. between 71.25 and 95 spaces (calculated on 21 consulting rooms + 32 nurses / admin staff). A total of 42 spaces are proposed to be provided as part of this development.

9.2.47 Paragraph 106 of the NPPF states that:

*Maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network, or for optimising the density of development in city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport (in accordance with chapter 11 of this Framework).*

9.2.48 Furthermore, paragraph 105 of the NPPF advocates that, if setting local parking standards, authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport; local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles.

9.2.49 Policy CS12 and the NPPF are supportive of the 'case by case' approach to parking provision. In light of this it is submitted that more weight should be given to the particular set of situations subsisting in the local area.

9.2.50 Parking Capacity:

- With the exception of the 'Keep Clear' restrictions in place within the vicinity of the Long Chaulden junction, there are no other parking/waiting restrictions along **Parkwood Drive**, thus enabling unrestricted on-street parking.
- **Varney Road** is located a short walk away and benefits from unrestricted on-road parking.
- There are no parking/waiting restrictions in place along **Long Chaulden** within the vicinity of the site. Informal footway parking is available along both sides of Long Chaulden within close proximity to the site,
- The primary car park associated with the nearby **Warners End Local Centre** – accessed from Long Chaulden - has a capacity of approximately 42 car parking spaces.
- A further car park with additional parking can be accessed from Northridge Way.

### 9.2.51 Preferred Means of Travel to Doctor's Surgery:

According to the results of the travel survey, 60.9% of respondents travel to the surgery by car – either as a driver or a passenger – with the remaining 39.1% making their way there by sustainable means. As 63.8% of respondents live within 2km of the surgery, it is considered that there is the potential for a greater number of trips to be made by alternative means - for example, by cycling or walking.

### Loss of Garage Parking

9.2.52 It is acknowledged that proposal will result in the loss of existing garaging; however, as with many Council garages, the dimensions are not generally considered to be able to satisfactorily accommodate modern vehicles. As such, their primary use, if in use at all, is for storage and therefore any loss of actual parking is not likely to be significant.

### Conclusion

9.2.53 Whilst it is argued that there will be a sufficient parking to satisfy demand, a balance clearly needs to be struck between providing an abundance of parking, in opposition to the sustainability agenda, and a level of parking at which walking and / or cycling become more desirable.

9.2.54 The Highway Authority were consulted but do not wish to restrict the grant of planning permission. Matters pertaining to parking provision fall within the remit of the local planning authority, although the Highway Authority may make specific comments were car parking would undermine sustainability objectives (by discouraging the utilisation of more sustainable means of travel), or where a shortfall may exacerbate local conditions to such a degree that the free flow of traffic or highway safety would be prejudiced. Therefore, given the support of the Highway Authority, it follows that there would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety; neither would the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

9.2.55 The provision of 42 spaces would, in my view, represent a sufficient level of parking in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

### Other Material Planning Considerations

#### *Impact on Trees and Landscaping*

9.3 Saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Local Plan encourages the preservation of trees and states that high priority will be given to their protection during development.

9.3.1 The development proposal would result in the loss of 4 trees. The most notable would be those labelled as T4 (Alder) and T5 (Ginko biloba) on the "Tree Protection and Impact Assessment" (R3\_3751019\_AR03). The removal of these trees is regrettable, as they are rated as category A and category B, but is necessary in order to facilitate the required additional parking provision for the doctor's surgery. As there is no prospect of relocating the affected parking spaces (nos. 19-25) to another part of the site, on balance, given the substantial benefits arising from the proposal and the fact that the trees are not covered by a Tree Preservation Order, it is considered that the loss can be justified. A replacement tree (*Acer campestre* Elsrijk) is proposed to partially mitigate the loss.

9.3.2 The trees labelled as T6 (Elder) and T7 (Wild cherry) are located along the eastern boundary of the application site. They have, however been described by the applicant's arboriculturist as having "*little value and are in poor condition close to the fence line...*".

9.3.3 There would be some minor encroachment into the root protection area of the T1 (Oak). Accordingly, should planning permission be granted, a condition will be included to require the submission of a tree protection plan prior to the commencement of works in this location.

#### *Ecology*

9.3.4 A Preliminary Ecological Assessment carried out by the applicant's consultant highlighted that T1, T6 and T7 are considered likely to support breeding birds. As T6 and T7 are scheduled for removal, it would be appropriate to include an informative with any grant of planning permission:

*9.3.5 All wild birds, nests and eggs are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The grant of planning permission does not override the above Act. All applicants and sub-contractors are reminded that site clearance, vegetation removal, demolition works, etc. between March and August (inclusive) may risk committing an offence under the above Act and may be liable to prosecution if birds are known or suspected to be nesting. The Council will pass complaints received about such work to the appropriate authorities for investigation. The Local Authority advises that such work should be scheduled for the period 1 September - 28 February wherever possible. If this is not practicable, a search of the area should be made no more than 2 days in advance of vegetation clearance by a competent Ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest.*

9.3.6 Drawing no. R3\_3751019\_LA01 outlines the areas of new landscaping and it is noted that 6 bat boxes are proposed to be installed. Overall, this is considered acceptable.

#### *Land Contamination*

9.3.7 The Council's Scientific Officer was consulted and is of the opinion that it is necessary for the developer to demonstrate that the potential for land contamination to affect the proposed development has been considered and, where it is present, will be remediated.

#### *Human Rights*

9.3.8 A local resident has commented that, were the development to go ahead, this would result in a breach of his / her human rights under Protocol 1 Article 1 and Article 8 of the Human Rights Act.

9.3.9 The courts have taken the view that Article 8 of the Human Rights Act will normally have been considered as an integral part of a Planning Officer's approach to material considerations. The degree of seriousness required to trigger a lack of respect for the home has to be substantial, with the competing interests of neighbours, other individuals and the community as a whole, including the right of the landowner to make beneficial use of his land all being relevant factors.

9.3.10 Article 8 rights are a material planning consideration and should be respected. However, these rights need to be balanced against other planning considerations and this will be a planning judgement.

9.3.11 All of the relevant factors, including the detailed objections, have been considered and it is submitted that this will not have deprived anyone of their rights under Article 1 or Article 8 of the Human Rights Act.

#### *External Lighting*

9.3.12 A lighting report has been provided with the application to confirm that the external lighting design complies with the requirements of BREEAM POL04 "Reduction of night-time pollution". Lighting is only to be provided where absolutely necessary. The scheme consists of column mounted fittings – 4m column – around the car park area and wall mounted fittings on the building. It

has been demonstrated that the nearby dwellings would not be adversely affected by light pollution. A condition will be included requiring the lighting to be installed and operated in accordance with the particulars.

### Response to Neighbour Comments

9.4 These points have been addressed above other than:

#### *Antisocial Behaviour*

9.4.1 The surgery extension would allow longer opening hours which, in turn, will lead to more natural surveillance. As such, it is not considered that there would be a material increase in antisocial behaviour.

### Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.5 This application is not CIL liable.

## **10. CONCLUSION**

10.1 The principle of the expansion of existing social infrastructure is acceptable in this location.

10.1.1 The distance of the building from the residential dwellings to the north (on Long Chaulden), coupled with a proposed planning condition requiring any windows at first floor level on the rear elevation to be obscure glazed, would ensure that there would be no significant impacts in terms of overlooking, loss of sunlight and daylight and visual intrusion. It is also noted that nos. 434 – 438 do not have any habitable windows on their rear elevation; that is to say, the elevation facing the development site.

10.1.2. The building is of an appropriate design and would integrate reasonably well with the existing surgery building.

10.1.3 On balance, the level of parking is considered to be acceptable, noting the lack of on-street restrictions in the area and presence of two public car parks. It is also not unreasonable to assume that some patients will walk to the surgery. Hertfordshire Highways were consulted and do not wish to restrict the grant of planning permission subject to conditions.

## **11. RECOMMENDATION**

11.1 That planning permission/listed building consent be **GRANTED** subject to 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:**

**102\_1 Rev. I**  
**125\_D Rev. E**  
**126\_B Rev. B**

110\_B Rev. B  
111\_B Rev. B

R3\_3751019\_LA01

778225-MLM-ZZ-XX-RP-J-0001 22/01/2020

Proposed GP Surgery Extension Parkwood Drive, Hemel Hempstead Travel Plan  
(dated January 2020)

1944-TEW-ZZ-XX-DR-E-4000-120-S0-P01

1944-TEW-RP-E-External lighting calculations -S0-P01

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

3. (a) **The Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the Phase 1 Contamination Assessment submitted at the planning application stage (Document Reference: Assura Aspire Ltd 778225-MLM-ZZ-XX-RP-J-0001 22/01/2020) indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination and so 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:**
- (i) **A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;**
- (ii) **The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.**
- (b) **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 (a), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.**
- (c) **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 (b) 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.

4. **Any contamination, other than that reported by virtue of Condition 3 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.

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

Reason: To ensure permanent availability of the parking / manoeuvring area and to ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

6. **The approved travel plan, “Proposed GP Surgery Extension Parkwood Drive, Hemel Hempstead Travel Plan”, (dated January 2020) shall be implemented at all times.**

Reason: In order to ensure that sustainable methods of transport are considered in the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS8 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

7. **The development shall not begin until full details of all proposed construction vehicle access, movements, parking arrangements and facilities to restrict the generation of dust and mud from the site proposed during the construction period have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The relevant details should be submitted in the form of a Construction Management Plan/Statement and the approved details are to be implemented throughout the construction programme.**

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 CS8 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

8. **No lighting other than that shown on 1944-TEW-ZZ-XX-DR-E-4000-120-S0-P01 (“Proposed site plan indicative lighting layout and calculation” dated Jan 2020) shall be installed without the prior written approval of the local planning authority. The lighting shall only be operated in accordance with 1.0 (General) of document: 1944-TEW-RP-E-External lighting calculations -S0-P01.**

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with saved Policy 113 of the Dacorum Local Plan and Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

9. **Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved, an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan prepared in accordance with BS5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction) setting out how trees shown for retention shall be protected during the construction process, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. No equipment, machinery or materials for the development shall be taken onto the site until these details have been approved. The works must then be carried out according to the approved details and thereafter retained until completion of the development.**

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

10. **The planting shown on drawing no. R3\_3751019\_LA01 shall be carried out within one planting season of completing the development.**

**Any tree or shrub which forms part of the approved landscaping scheme which within a period of 1 year from planting fails to become established, becomes seriously damaged or diseased, dies or for any reason is removed shall be replaced in the next planting season by a tree or shrub of a species, size and maturity.**

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

11. **The window(s) at first floor level in the northern elevation of the extension hereby permitted shall be non-opening below 1.7 metres from finished floor level and permanently fitted with obscured glass (minimum of level 3 on the Pilkington Scale).**

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).

12. **The boundary treatment in respect of the northern boundary, as shown on drawing no. 102\_I, shall be fully constructed prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved.**

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the neighbouring dwellings in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

13. **The D1 use hereby permitted shall not take place other than between the hours of:**

- (a) Mondays, Thursdays and Fridays: 08:30 - 21:00**
- (b) Tuesdays and Wednesdays: 07:00 - 21:00**
- (c) Saturdays: 09:00 - 18:00**
- (d) Sundays: 09:00 - 13:00**

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 positive engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage which lead to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.
2. The attention of the Applicant is drawn to the Control of Pollution Act 1974 relating to the control of noise on construction and demolition sites.
3. Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or carrying out of other such works that may be necessary to suppress dust. Visual monitoring of dust is to be carried out continuously and Best Practical Means (BPM) should be used at all times. The Applicant is advised to consider the control of dust and emissions from construction and

demolition Best Practice Guidance, produced in partnership by the Greater London Authority and London Councils.

4. All wild birds, nests and eggs are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The grant of planning permission does not override the above Act. All applicants and sub-contractors are reminded that site clearance, vegetation removal, demolition works, etc. between March and August (inclusive) may risk committing an offence under the above Act and may be liable to prosecution if birds are known or suspected to be nesting. The Council will pass complaints received about such work to the appropriate authorities for investigation. The Local Authority advises that such work should be scheduled for the period 1 September - 28 February wherever possible. If this is not practicable, a search of the area should be made no more than 2 days in advance of vegetation clearance by a competent Ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest.

## APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No development shall commence until full details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to illustrate the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Swept path analysis / tracking for the proposed parallel car parking spaces (spaces 14, 15, 29, 30, 31 as shown on drawing no. 102_F).</li> <li>o Location and details of cycle parking.</li> </ul> Reason: To ensure suitable, safe and satisfactory planning and development of the site in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).</li> <li>2. Provision of Parking &amp; Servicing Areas Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed access, on-site car parking and turning areas shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use. Reason: To ensure permanent availability of the parking / manoeuvring area and to ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).</li> <li>3. Travel Plan Three months prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, a suitably qualified person or organisation shall be appointed as travel plan co-ordinator. The details of the co-ordinator and a secondary contact shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved travel plan shall be implemented at all times.</li> <li>4. Construction Management The development shall not begin until full details of all proposed construction vehicle access, movements, parking arrangements and facilities to restrict the generation of dust and mud from the site proposed during the construction period have been</li> </ol>

submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The relevant details should be submitted in the form of a Construction Management Plan/Statement and the approved details are to be implemented throughout the construction programme. Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way in accordance with Policies 5, 12, 17 and 22 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

COMMENTS / ANALYSIS: The application comprises of an extension to the existing GP surgery and demolition of an existing garage area at Parkwood Drive, Hemel Hempstead. Parkwood Drive is designated as an unclassified local access road, subject to a speed limit of 30 mph and is highway maintainable at public expense.

ACCESS & PARKING: There is an existing simple priority t-junction and vehicle access into the site providing access to the surgery car park and a residential parking and garage area. The access into the site is to remain as existing and is an acceptable width to enable two vehicles to pass on another and in accordance with design criteria as laid out in Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide.

The proposal includes an increase in parking provision for the surgery from 26 to 42 car parking spaces, the layout of which is shown on submitted plan number 102F. The dimensions and layout of the perpendicular parking spaces is acceptable and in accordance with Manual for Streets (MfS). The proposed parallel car parking spaces (numbered 14,15,29,30,31 on plan 102F) are less than the recommended 6m in length and therefore HCC as Highway Authority would recommend that swept path assessment /tracking is provided to illustrate that vehicles can safely move in and out of the proposed parallel parking bays.

Details of the level of parking have been assessed as part of the submitted Transport Assessment. HCC as Highway Authority's main concern would be any negative effect the proposal would have on the free and safe flow of pedestrian and other highway users due to the level of on-site car parking and loss of the residential garage area. However it is unlikely that any effects would be significant enough to recommend refusal from a highway point of view when taking into consideration the location and the potential to encourage sustainable travel alternatives in accordance with Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan. Dacorum Borough Council is the parking authority and would ultimately need to be satisfied with the proposed level of parking.

SUTAINABLE TRAVEL / TRAVEL PLAN: A travel plan has been submitted as part of the application to support the promotion and maximisation of sustainable travel options to and from the site and to ensure that the proposals are in accordance with Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The travel plan is considered to be generally acceptable although the applicant would need to provide details of a suitably qualified person/organisation to act as travel plan co-ordinator at the site( at least

	<p>3 months prior to first use of the development) in addition to secondary contact. DBC has adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and therefore contributions towards local transport schemes would be sought via CIL if appropriate. TRIP GENERATION &amp; DISTRIBUTION: Following consideration of the extension of an existing use of the site and assessment of the submitted Transport Assessment, the development would not have a significant or detrimental impact on the local highway network.</p> <p>EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS: Following consideration of the increase in size of the surgery, the application may benefit from input from Herts Fire and Rescue. Therefore, details of the proposal have been passed to them for attention.</p> <p>CONCLUSION HCC as Highway Authority has considered that the proposals would not have a significant or negative impact on the safety and operation of the nearest highway. HCC has no objections or further comments on highway grounds, subject to the inclusion of the above conditions.</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>No objections on noise or air quality grounds, but given the nature of the development I would advise an informative for noise and dust.</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>Having reviewed the planning application I am able to confirm that there is no objection to the proposed development, but that it will be necessary for the developer to demonstrate that the potential for land contamination to affect the proposed development has been considered and where it is present will be remediated.</p> <p>This is considered necessary because the application site is on land with potentially contaminated land use history (infilled pond and garages) and as such the possibility of ground contamination cannot be ruled out at this stage. This combined with the vulnerability of the proposed end use to the presence of any contamination means that the following planning conditions should be included if permission is granted. Please note condition 1 acknowledges existence of an adequate phase 1 report.</p> <p>Contaminated Land Conditions: Condition 1:</p> <p>(a) The Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the Phase 1 Contamination Assessment submitted at the planning application stage (Document Reference: Assura Aspire Ltd 778225-MLM-ZZ-XX-RP-J-0001 22/01/2020) indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination and so 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>

(ii) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.

(b) 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 (a), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

(c) 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 (b) 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.

Informative:

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. This can be found on [www.dacorum.gov.uk](http://www.dacorum.gov.uk) by searching

	for contaminated land and I would be grateful if this fact could be passed on to the developers.
--	--

## APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

### Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
83	4	0	4	0

### Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
436 Long Chaulden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2NS	I am writing concerning the proposed two storey extension of Parkwood Drive Surgery, HP1 2LD. If this proposal goes ahead my one bedroom, single storey bungalow will be completely overlooked, as will my neighbours. The gardens are south facing so the light will be blocked out and the height of a two storey extension will be completely overbearing. Patients and staff in the building will be able to look down into the gardens and therefore I will have no privacy. The noise and disturbance from building works and demolition of the garages will also be very distressing and the back access to my garden will be compromised. The impact this proposal will have on our lives and homes will be very upsetting and very disruptive. I would invite you to come to my home so that you can see personally the effect this will have on both me and my neighbours. Please take my comments into consideration. Thank you.
434 Long Chaulden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2NS	I moved into 434, Long Chaulden, May 2019, I am really shocked and upset over the plans of the extension which will be overbearing running along the back of my garden, I will be overlooked which will have a detrimental impact on my privacy, I will have a severe loss of natural light and overshadowing which is causing me great concern for my health, I would also like confirmation of the boundary treatment proposals with my garden, I would also like in writing if there is any damage to my fence and gate that I have had put up only a few months ago, That you will repair as I had to have for my own safety and security as there is a awful lot of activity in the alleyway that leads up to my garden, I look forward to hearing from you and I prey you take my concerns into consideration, Many thanks Mrs Judith Brown.
432 Long Chaulden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2NS	I am writing to you concerning the proposed extension to Parkwood Drive Surgery which is immediately adjacent to the rear of my property. I have examined the plans and wish to object strongly to this application.  I live at 432 Long Chaulden, which is the first two storey dwelling adjacent to the proposed extension. At the moment I have a single storey, seven foot high garage at the end of my garden, offering me

security, privacy and no lack of light to the amenity of my garden. Trees and bushes in adjoining gardens obscure much of the existing Doctor's surgery, with much of the building being on low level land. The existing block of garages with first floor flats near the site, being on even lower ground. The existing residents consist of older people and some vulnerable families. Many of which have lived in their properties for a considerable number of years.

My objections are as follows:

Overlooking:

o This proposal appears to extend to halfway along my property, thus it will completely change my outlook from an open view to that of a brick wall, not only giving me a total loss of view it will have a dramatic visual impact from my home.

o The back windows (although specified as being opaque) will result in overlooking my property, the bungalows and houses on Long Chaulden and their private gardens. The primary amenity area of my garden would be severely overlooked and it does not afford adequate privacy for the occupants of my property. This will certainly give us the feeling of being overlooked and lead to a considerable invasion of privacy and will definitely impact on the peaceful enjoyment of my home and garden (Human Rights Act, in particular Protocol 1 , Article 1).

Overbearing

o The close proximity of the extension to the boundary of my and neighboring properties will have an overbearing and dominating impact and would be entirely out of character to the adjoining properties.

o The extension represents a building much larger in terms of floor space and especially height, than the garages it is to replace, particularly first floor and roof height. The prominence of the replacement building is only compounded by the increases in height, volume and bulk particularly at first floor and roof level. The proposal would represent a building that would be materially larger than the one it would replace.

Overshadowing/Loss of light

o The height of the extension will lead to a lack of light into my garden and to that of neighboring properties. The overshadowing from the extension will be considerable, blocking the sun into my garden. I cannot see any proposed measurements of the height of the building but on the plans it is higher than the existing medical centre. I do not believe the height of the building to be sympathetic to the heights of surrounding buildings.

Security

o The security to our properties will be considerably compromised with the planned extension and open accessed car parking spaces.

o Crime and anti-social behavior in the area around the back of the shops and on Parkwood drive is considerable, the removal of the garages and open accessed car parking allows for a lack of security to our homes and would I believe open us to increased risk and fear of crime (NPF: 127).

o The plans make no mention of what is proposed to be put in place as a boundary either during or after building work, thus it appears leaving us vulnerable to potential crime.

#### Noise pollution

o The proposed parking spaces will be directly adjacent to my garden and home, at the boundary with my property, it will become a cause of noise, and disturbance at all times of the day and night with vehicles parking and turning around.

o The planned extension of Surgery hours till 9pm on week nights and on Sundays will certainly impact on the disturbance to residents. Although the parking spaces are planned for patients visiting the medical centre as they are open accessed they will undoubtedly be used by other car drivers.

#### Other points:

The expansion seems to be a grave disparity in scale to the proposed increased patient base of 12%. The number of consulting rooms going from 8 to 22, an almost 200% increase. This with the proposed increased surgery opening hours seems to be an over expansion to need.

The traffic plan quotes 1.5.1 There have been no recent and relevant planning applications associated with the proposed development site. I believe that plans were passed in 2016 to extend the surgery to the East of the centre, which were passed and not completed. These plans would have had little impact on residents.

The plans include the proposal that future developments would be possible to the site, which I take to mean that further building along the length of the properties on Long Chaulden adding to further disruption and traffic issues.

#### Travel Plan

The submitted travel plan, I believe to be farcical in its attempt to fool planners, councilors and HCC Highways for the following reasons:

o The traffic on Parkwood drive is already very busy especially during the daytime. Stoneycroft shops and the community centre parking is nearly always full during current surgery opening times and overflows into the local streets including Parkwood drive. Cars often queuing to get into the car parking causing road obstruction and difficulty in passing.

o Although Parkwood drive is a two lane road, parking is non restricted with traffic parking for deliveries, from vans and large lorries,

shoppers and overflow for the community centre parking along the road, thus becoming single lane in many places. Any restricted parking imposed in the area would have another impact on parking. With the extension to the surgery and the increased patient base this will only increase congestion due to patients travelling to the surgery.

o Public transport is limited to an unreliable bus service, offering services only to Long Chaulden, Gabebridge, the Railway Station and the town centre. Other areas of the patient base are not covered. According to the survey in the traffic plan only .7% of patients use the buses to get to the surgery. Patients feeling ill will not make a choice of travelling by bus to the surgery making it an unviable option for travel to the surgery.

See photos attached

Parking spaces at surgery:

o Although the development increases the available spaces to the surgery, there will be a loss of the 20 existing garages spaces, potential for local residents.

o The plans stated that 89% of the current 42 Full and Part time staff travel by car thus using 37 spaces throughout different times of surgery hours. Increased staffing will inevitable be working at the surgery, therefore reducing parking for the increased patient base.

o The plan state that the expectation is that there will be an increase of only 2 full time doctors and 1 nurse, which has either been wrongly quoted, for the sake of parking figures, or there is an over expansion to need and increased staffing levels.

o It is also suggested that additional staff not employed by the surgery be on-site, for surgery rooms to be used for community services adding additional need for parking spaces.

o The planned extension, if in full use, will dramatically increase the number of parking spaces needed beyond the available spaces. If the additional 15 rooms for patients are in use for 10 minute appointments, it would mean up to an additional 90 cars in any hour travelling along Parkwood Drive trying to find car Parking spaces.

o The available parking spaces are accessed via a narrow single lane entrance with only traffic passing in or out of the car park. Cars park up to either side of this entrance making access and particularly exit difficult. There is a blind bend around the garages and first floor flats on entrance to the car park and another tight bend around the proposed extension to access 14 of the spaces. These points are significant in the long term for both drivers and pedestrians.

o Parking and access to the site during the extensive planned building works will have a significant impact on the local area

The traffic plan quotes a statement from HCC Highways regarding parking:

" Any shortfall might exacerbate conditions locally such that traffic flow / safety may be adversely affected".

I feel that by extending surgery access at Gadebridge and Boxmoor and having additional services in the area covered by the patient base e.g. Long Chaulden, Bourne End, Central Hemel and Piccotts End would allow more patients walking access to surgeries thus cutting out the increased volume of traffic to Parkwood Drive and its sustainable

	<p>and environmental impact. The over expansion would suggest the existing satellite surgeries at Gadebridge and Boxmoor will be closed in the future, further exacerbating traffic problems.</p> <p>I understand that the council has offered suitable alternative accommodation which the partners of the surgery have turned down, it would be interesting to understand the reason for this.</p> <p>On a personal note this application has already had an effect of my mental health and feels a threat to increased vulnerability to crime and my home being my safe place. The thought of being overlooked and the overbearing nature of the extension will be like looking at a prison wall at the end of my garden.</p> <p>I would ask you to consider the responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act in particular Protocol 1, Article 1 which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes the home and other land. I considered that the extension will have a detrimental impact upon our neighbour amenity by virtue of the scale and form of the development and due to overlooking issues mentioned above and the privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential environment.</p> <p>Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life.</p> <p>Whilst I understand the need for expansion of local services due to the building of new houses in the area, I hope that the council has due regard for current residents and their security and reject these plans.</p> <p>If this application is to be decided by councillors, please take this as notice that I would like to be informed of the date the meeting of the committee at which this application is expected to be decided. of this as soon as possible.</p> <p>Please note I am sending my objection to these plans via email. I hope to receive an email on receipt of this email.</p>
<p>430 Long Chaulden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 2NS</p>	<p>Having examined the plans for this application , which greatly affects my property , I wish to register my strong objections to the application .</p> <p>My property is the second two storey building adjacent to the proposed extension. Garages presently form that boundary which allows light into my property , privacy and security .</p> <p>The existing Surgery has negligible impact on my property and blends well into the surrounding residential area. The proposal for the new extension will , however , have a dramatic impact on myself , my property, and the surrounding residential area, due to its size , close proximity and associated car parking provisions.</p> <p>Existing Property The height of the existing Surgery building is approximately 5.75 meters and is approximately 32 metres from my southern boundary . This has , in my opinion , a minimal impact on the surrounding area. The Surgery made a successful planning application in July 2000 for an extension to the Surgery which would have also have made a minimal impact on the area. This was not acted upon.</p>

Ref : 4/01338/00/FUL

I also appears that the Surgery was offered several alternative sites for expansion which were also not taken up.

#### Proposed Extension

The proposed two storey extension , if approved , would have a height of approx. 7.25 meters , an increase of 1.5 meters over the height of the existing building , a length of 25 meters and a width of over 10 meters and be built only 1 meter from the southern boundary line of the existing residential buildings . The extension will end 6 meters from my own southern boundary.

A building of this size placed so close to the boundary of existing residential buildings must have a severe impact on them . The general design for residential housing in Hemel Hempstead has another length of garden attached to any two storey building opposite, not built literally on the boundary line. The height , size , positioning and design of this building is not in keeping with the surrounding residential area.

The stated increase in the patient base is 12% , yet the increase in available floor space in the two story extension appears to be approximately 70% compared to the existing building .

The ground floor alone would give an increased floor space over the existing building of 35%

While the proposed increase in patient base for the Surgery is 12% , the expansion of consulting rooms from 8 to 22 is a increase of 175% There is a great disparity in these figures and seem to be greatly in excess of that required.

The application even mentions the possibility of expansion in the future .

This extension will overlook the properties to the north to a great extent , causing loss of privacy , especially to my property , as the end wall of the extension has a clear window in the upper floor which directly overlooks my garden.

#### Light

The loss of light into these properties due to the height and close proximity of the extension to my boundary will cause extensive overshadowing, my property , losing 75 degrees out of 180 degrees of light, approximately 40% of the of the light into my property . This is 4.8 hours of sunlight lost due to overshadowing..

#### Traffic

The plans state that 89% of the current 42 full and part time staff travel by car , using up to 37 of the 42 spaces , 5 of which are provided for disabled parking , across surgery hours . The staff numbers are to be expanded , and will probably increase again as the proposed expansion of the patient base is continued . Apart from the increased numbers of staff and patients using the car park , it seems that surgery rooms may be used for community services. This will put an increased strain on parking and congestion.

Increasing the Surgery opening times to 9pm weekdays and Sundays, as proposed, will exacerbate the traffic congestion problems and extend it over the time period it will occur. This will certainly have a large impact on the residents. Parking for residents in the area is a problem generally during the day but is at its peak during the evenings, when residents are returning home, and weekends.

Parkwood Drive itself runs along the back of a row of shops, with garages on the other side. Cars and vans are constantly parking on both sides of the road, usually allowing only a single lane, with large lorries often delivering supplies to the shops, causing further congestion. Cars often park on either side of the single lane entrance to the surgery car park, making access difficult.

The first 5 car park spaces near the entrance block the entrance while accessing and leaving those spaces.

Cars are parked on the road outside residential buildings throughout the day along the remainder of Parkwood Drive, allowing only single lane access.

The existing original garages running along the southern boundary of these properties are to be removed. These garages provide off road parking for 20 cars for local residents, which may now be removed, increasing the parking problem.

The garages provide a significant boundary, which has given privacy and security to the properties, reasons I selected the property when I retired seven years ago. It is proposed to replace these with parking spaces directly against the boundary. There is no obvious indication of a boundary wall between the parking spaces and the properties. Cars will now be able to park directly next to my boundary, possibly with a fence, or not at all.

The traffic around the Stoneycroft shops is well known to be busy throughout the day. The two car parks at Stoneycroft are very busy, with traffic often causing hold ups by queuing on the road both ways at the entrance, waiting to enter.

Proposed future residential expansion along the western portion of Long Chaulden will increase traffic flow along Long Chaulden, with increased traffic using the shops in the Stoneycroft area, increasing pressure on the already crowded parking situation in the car parks and surrounding streets, including Parkwood Drive.

Expanding the Surgery car park will prove attractive to shoppers unable or unwilling to park in the Stoneycroft car parks.

There is very little off road parking on Long Chaulden, even during the day. Parking on the main road itself with the amount of traffic that uses it would cause significant delays on what is a major route through the area.

The public transport bus service to Long Chaulden is unreliable, serving a limited base, Gadebridge, the railway station and the town centre. The survey in the traffic plan states less than 1% of patients travel by bus to the surgery. It is probable that the remainder too ill to

walk or not within walking distance will travel by car.

Noise

The constant traffic using these parking spaces during the day up to the proposed closing time of the Surgery of 9pm will increase noise and pollution into the properties late into the night on weekdays and on Sunday when before there was none . At night there will be an open car park , allowing a possible increase in social disorder , further reducing the security of the properties. This will increase the feeling of vulnerability and fear of crime in the local residents. If street lighting is installed , there will also be considerable light into my property at night where before there was little.

The need to match proposed new house building with local services is understood . However , the previous approved planning application for the Surgery was not acted upon and it seems no action was taken on the proposed alternative sites .

If the application is to be decided in council I would appreciate being informed when is to occur as soon as possible .