

**ITEM NUMBER: 5b**

<b>20/01866/FUL</b>	<b>Demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of five dwellings</b>	
<b>Site Address:</b>	<b>16 Park Road, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire</b>	
<b>Applicant/Agent:</b>	<b>Mr R Added</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Robert Freeman</b>	
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	<b>N/a</b>	<b>Boxmoor</b>
<b>Referral to Committee:</b>	<b>The application has been referred to the Development Management Committee at the request of Councillor Uttley. Councillor Uttley is of the opinion that the application should be rejected on the given its harm to the street scene, loss of amenity for residents and lack of amenity space for future occupants. Councillor Uttley’s comments are reported in full within Appendix A</b>	

**1. RECOMMENDATION –** That planning permission be **GRANTED**.

**2. SUMMARY**

- 2.1 The proposals are considered to result in a high quality residential scheme for the site and would make a valuable contribution to the overall supply of new homes in accordance with Policies CS11, CS12 and CS17 of the Core Strategy.
- 2.2 The proposals are not considered to be harmful to the appearance of the area in which they would be located nor would they result in significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. As such the proposals would be in broad accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011
- 2.3 The proposals would incorporate sufficient, safe and convenient measures for access in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.

**3. SITE DESCRIPTION**

- 3.1 The site is located within the urban area of Hemel Hempstead. It is located at the corner of Park Road and Vicarage Close and comprises a large detached dwelling and its curtilage. The application site also extends to a semi-circular area of hard standing immediately to the rear of the residential curtilage.
- 3.2 The majority of Vicarage Close comprises terraced properties with the exception of numbers 2, 4 and 6 on the northern side. These properties are generally constructed of brick featuring tile hanging or cladding at first floor level. The existing house, 16 Park Road comprise a four bedroom detached dwelling. The property and off-street parking are located at the eastern end of the application site, with access from Park Road.
- 3.3 The site is sloping up from the eastern side (Park Road) towards the rear and west of the site (Vicarage Close) resulting in a level change of approximately 3.9m

## **4. PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 The proposals involve the demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of 4 x 2 bedroom units and 1 x 3 bedroom. These houses are designed as a contemporary terrace of small two storey houses stepped up the hill at Vicarage Close.
- 4.2 The dwellings would be constructed from red brickwork with the first floor and roofs proposed in a red clay tile. First floor terraces would be sited above carports and between units to increase amenity space within the scheme. These will be set behind timber or tile clad sections at 1.5m in height and continuing the materiality of cladding at first floor level to the individual properties.
- 4.3 Each new property would be provided with a single parking space except for the larger replacement dwelling at the junction of Park Road and Vicarage Close which would have two parking spaces accessible from Park Road.

## **5. PLANNING HISTORY**

- 5.1 The proposals have been subject to two pre-application requests (4/02122/19/PRE and 19/03164/PRED) and has been reduced in scale from six units to the five under consideration.
- 5.2 The second pre-application on the site has been evolved and is reflected in this application. The applicants have engaged positively with officers in the development of this scheme.

## **6. REPRESENTATIONS**

### Consultation responses

- 6.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

### Neighbour notification/site notice responses

- 6.2 These are reproduced in full in Appendix B

## **7. KEY 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:

#### Core Strategy

NP1 - Supporting Development  
CS1 - Distribution of Development  
CS2 – Selection of Development Sites  
CS4 – The Towns and Large Villages  
CS8 – Sustainable Transport  
CS11 – Quality of Neighbourhood Design  
CS12 - Quality of Site Design  
CS13 – Quality of Public Realm

CS17 – New Housing  
CS18 – Mix of Housing  
CS29 – Sustainable Design and Construction  
CS31 – Water Management  
CS32 – Air, Soil and Water Quality  
CS35 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.

Local Plan

Policy 10 – Optimising the Use of Urban Land  
Policy 13 – Planning Conditions and Planning Obligation  
Policy 18 – The Size of New Dwellings  
Policy 51 – Development and Transport Impacts  
Policy 54 – Highway Design

## **8. CONSIDERATIONS**

### Policy and Principle

- 8.1 The site is located within a residential area of Hemel Hempstead where in accordance with Policies NP1, CS1, CS2 and CS4 of the Core Strategy the provision of new dwellings would be encouraged.
- 8.2 These dwellings would make a valuable contribution to the supply of new homes in accordance with Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy
- 8.3 The evidence emerging in relation to the Single Local Plan (SLP) indicates that there is a high demand for small 1 and 2 bedroom houses. The proposed scheme would provide five high quality 2 bed homes providing an improving the housing mix within the locality in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.4 Housing needs to be designed to a high standard and delivered at the optimum densities for the site in accordance with Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 10 and Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011. Under Policy CS10 the Council will promote higher densities and more dwellings in and around town and local centres. The design of new dwellings is expected to respect adjoining properties in terms of site layout, coverage, scale, height, bulk, materials and landscaping.
- 8.5 All new development will also be expected to be constructed to the highest environmental and sustainability standards in accordance with Policies CS28, CS29, CS31 and CS32 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.6 The Council will secure contributions to off-set the impact of new development upon the local and strategic infrastructure necessary to support growth under Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy.

### Layout and Design

- 8.7 The proposed development has been carefully designed to make the best use of this site and provide appropriate residential development in accordance with Policies CS10 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.8 In doing so, the applicants have responded to the challenging issues of amenity and neighbouring impact to ensure that a satisfactory approach to the provision of new dwellings is achieved in this scheme.

- 8.9 The proposals seek to establish a terrace of residential units stepping up Vicarage Close and reflecting the terraced form and limited separation between units in the Cotterells, Heath Brow, Park Road and Vicarage Close in the wider neighbourhood to the site. In view of its terraced form the scheme will significantly increase the overall density of development upon the application site to approximately 83 dwellings per hectare. Although this is more than the 57 dwellings per hectare for the terraced units in 1-19 (odd) Vicarage Close, it presents a similar number of dwellings to the street for the extent of street frontage.
- 8.10 The form of the terrace provides continuous accommodation at first floor level with the incorporation of additional walled amenity spaces above car ports and seeks to reflect the treatment of terraced and detached units in Vicarage Close through the choice of materials and detailing.
- 8.11 The design of the terrace incorporates strategically placed amenity areas at first floor level reducing the overall bulk and massing of the development and recessed from the rear elevations to provide both visual relief and allow light to neighbouring properties in Park Road.
- 8.12 The resulting terrace is considered to be appropriate in terms of its design, bulk, scale and use of materials and as such is considered to be an acceptable form of residential development in accordance with Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011
- 8.13 In terms of site coverage and layout, the scheme is set back sufficient distance from the edge of the highway to allow sufficient space to allow vehicles to enter car ports and parking spaces between residential units. It utilises the area above these car ports to facilitate the provision of alternative amenity spaces which, in the case of a single unit (Unit 1) at the western end of the site, is accessed from the main living areas to the property. Given that the site is limited in depth, the footprint of the dwellings is prioritised however a range of amenity spaces are cleverly created at both first floor and roof level to ensure a high level of external amenity for future occupants. The scheme is not considered to be cramped and given its terraced form, design and detailing would not appear incongruous nor harmful to the overall character and appearance of the area.
- 8.14 Given concerns with the impact of the property on the visual amenity of the area, Unit 1 has been reduced in scale and given a more conventional appearance through amendments to its design. The internal layout has been flipped to provide bedrooms at ground level and additional low level landscaping around the property will be provided to soften the appearance of the dwelling and in the interests of visual amenity.
- 8.15 Bin stores are provided to the front of each residential unit to ensure that residential waste is not intrusive or unsightly.

#### Residential Amenity of Proposed Homes

- 8.16 The dwellings have been designed to provide high quality and adaptable living spaces. These are considered to provide a reasonable and appropriate level of internal space in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 18 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.
- 8.17 Four dwellings would have access to private amenity space at ground floor level which although limited in length would be south facing and provide a well-proportioned and desirable amenity space for the size of the dwelling. The other residential unit (Unit 1) has

its floorplan flipped to provide direct access from its main living room area onto a private terrace at first floor level commensurate with its footprint. Two units fronting Vicarage Close would also benefit from private amenity spaces located above proposed car ports in addition to the rear gardens, whilst Unit 2 would also benefit from a private roof terrace. These amenity spaces provide private spaces of varied character and appearance.

- 8.18 In addition to the external amenity space provided within the scheme, the units are a short walk from the Water Gardens and town centre with its variety of open spaces and play activities for children.

### Impact on Residential Amenity

#### *1-7 Vicarage Close*

- 8.19 Unit 1 at the western end of the application site would be sited some 12.6m from the ground floor to Nos.1-7 Vicarage Close and 14.4m from first floor accommodation. This unit would not result in any significant loss in daylight or sunlight to the main habitable rooms to these properties given its location to the north of the terrace, its limited height and juxtaposition. Given that the distance between the rear elevation of Unit 1 and the front elevation of the terrace would fall below the recommended 23m distance in Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan, there would be no windows at first floor level facing the neighbouring units in the interests of maintaining privacy thereto. The associated roof terrace would also be enclosed to prevent overlooking of neighbouring land. I am also satisfied that the appearance of the building would not be unduly overbearing to these properties, albeit that the outlook would be changed from the view of an open area of hardstanding to the rear elevation to this property. The mass of this elevation is broken by the use of tile hanging.

#### *2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close*

- 8.20 The proposed dwellings would be located opposite the properties at 2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close. There would be a separation distance of between 15-16.8m between frontages. There are no specific requirements for the separation of frontages to residential properties within the adopted Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011. The distance is sufficient to ensure that there is no loss in either daylight or sunlight to these neighbouring units as a result of development. The front elevations of 2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close are already in public view and are at an elevated position to the application site. In view of the separation and acknowledging that the arrangement is typical of front to front relationships between dwellings, it is considered that there is no significant adverse impact upon the privacy of these properties.

#### *18 Vicarage Close*

- 8.21 The flank elevation of the proposed dwelling at the western end of the site would be located between 15-16.8m from the front elevation of 18 Vicarage Close. Given that this property would be located on higher ground and the distance involved, there are no concerns with regards to the impact of development upon the residential amenities of this unit.

#### *18 Park Road*

- 8.22 The most significant impact on neighbouring property will be that to 18 Park Road. The proposals have been carefully designed to address concerns with the impact that development might have upon this property and with a view to addressing concerns raised at the pre-application stage.

- 8.23 The primary concerns are with the impact of development upon the daylight to the property and the impact of the proposals upon privacy. In addition it is also important to consider whether the proposals might be overbearing to this property. 18 Park Road is located to the south of the application site and as such would not suffer any loss of sunlight.
- 8.24 Units 2 and 3 of the scheme have been carefully considered to ensure the protection of the amenities of this unit. This is reflected in the low eaves level and tall velux windows within the vaulted bedrooms serving units 2 and 3 that have specifically been incorporated to avoid views over the property in the interests of privacy.
- 8.25 In terms of daylight careful consideration has been given to the application of 25 degree and 45 degree rules, but more so to the overall massing and site placement of properties. The eaves height of units 2 and 3 is low and the properties located significantly distant from the openings. The terrace is located to provide a gap between properties and allow light to permeate to the main windows. Due to the amount of open sky enjoyed by the property it is unlikely that daylight factors will be significantly affected by the proposals. The BRE suggests that a method for measuring diffuse daylight such as a Vertical Sky Component (VSC) be used to accurately analyse the impact. This involves taking a VSC at the centre point of each affected window and distance/height of any obstructions within 180 degrees. It is evident that there are no obstructions to the window to the west or south.

#### Impact on Highway Safety

- 8.26 The proposed scheme has been amended to address the concerns within the response of Hertfordshire County Council as highway authority.
- 8.27 In terms of off-street parking provision, the site is located within designated Accessibility Zone 3 where Saved Appendix 5 of the Local Plan 1991-2011 requires a maximum parking provision of 1.5 parking spaces per 2 bed unit and 2.25 spaces per 3 bed property. This would result in an overall shortfall of 2.25 spaces. The shortfall in each property correlates with an expectation for visitor parking provision.
- 8.28 It is however noted that KD Plaza is located within Accessibility Zone 2 and is arguably a comparable walk from the town centre to the application site. The proposal would exceed the parking requirements for a property in Zone 2 by 0.5 spaces (1.5 spaces being the requirement for a three bed unit). The application site also falls within a CPZ where the provision of on-street parking is strictly controlled.
- 8.29 The provision of a single space per 2 bedroom property and 2 spaces for the 3 bedroom property is considered to be sufficient off-street parking given the close proximity of the development to the town centre and in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy. Given on-street parking restrictions and the accessibility of the site for visitors and occupants alike, this is not considered to result in an unreasonable or significantly adverse impact on highway conditions.
- 8.30 The proposed works are also not considered to be significantly harmful to pedestrian safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy given the limited number and extent of new crossovers to the pavement at the southern side of Vicarage Close and given relative few units served. Pedestrian visibility splays have been included and will be secured by condition.

#### Sustainability

- 8.31 Policy CS29 requires all development embrace the principles of sustainable construction. The new buildings will be expected to be constructed to a Building Regulation requirements in relation to Part L and with a high level of thermal efficiency. Fixtures and fitting will be required to conserve energy and water. Further details of sustainable construction measures will be secured by condition.
- 8.32 In terms of securing improvements in the biodiversity value of the site, the proposals are subject to a landscaping condition under which such matters will be considered further in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy.

### CIL

- 8.33 All new residential developments are expected to contribute towards the on-site, local and strategic infrastructure needs required as a result of development and in accordance with Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy. The Council has adopted a CIL Charging Schedule to secure contributions towards the cost of infrastructure. The site is located in Charging Zone 3 and in accordance with the Schedule new residential development will be charged accordingly.

### Representations

#### *Procedural Matters*

- 8.34 The application does not require a site notice to be displayed in view of its location and scale. All relevant neighbours have been consulted in accordance with our Statement of Community Involvement and it is evident from the large response to the consultation exercise that all residents within the locality of the application site are aware of the scale and nature of the proposals. As such they have not been prejudiced by a lack of any formal site notice being displayed at the site.
- 8.35 I am also satisfied that the plans submitted are accurate and a sound basis on which to make a planning decision.

#### *Loss of Amenity Area/Play Area*

- 8.36 A number of residents have expressed concern with regards to the loss of a tarmacked area at the western end of the site, both in terms of its visual impact and amenity. On occasions this is referred to as a play area despite not providing any formal play function or activity. The land in question appears to have been transferred into the ownership of the applicant albeit it still forms part of and has rights relating to its use as a public highway. The hard standing does not have a formal dropped kerb and as such its use for parking is unauthorised.
- 8.37 Given its limited function as part of the highway and potential enclosure by the applicant, its amenity value to the wider area is considered to be negligible and its loss as a public space cannot be regarded as grounds for refusal of a planning application.
- 8.38 The area will need to have its formal rights as a highway extinguished through a Stopping - Up Order. Stopping-Up Orders can be made under either the Highway Act 1980 or under the Town and Country Planning Act and are subject to separate application considered by the highway network management team. This processes is separate to the planning application process and is thus not material to the consideration of this proposal.

#### *Protected Species*

- 8.39 A number of residents have also indicated the presence of protected species at the site including nesting birds and bats. It is unlikely that bats would be utilising the building proposed for demolition; particularly given its age and structure. This need not prevent the development of the site subject to appropriate licencing and in the event of evidence of use being found at the site. It is suggested that advice is incorporated in relation to such matters via an informative to the planning permission.

#### *Construction Noise*

- 8.40 In addition there are concerns from residents regarding noise and pollution as a result of development. The construction of the dwellings will result in some temporary disturbance to residents within Vicarage Close, but this in its own right does not justify the refusal of planning permission, All activities relating to construction and noise nuisance will be controlled by the Environmental Health team under their Regulations. Further details of construction management are required to be submitted by condition.

#### *Human Rights*

- 8.41 The development has been assessed against the provisions of the Human Rights Act and in particular Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 of the Act itself. The Act gives further effect to the rights including in the European Convention on Human Rights. In arriving at this recommendation, due regards has been had to the applicants reasonable development rights and expectations which have been balanced and weighed against the wider community interest as expressed through third parties, the Development Plan and Government Guidance.

## **9 RECOMMENDATION**

- 9.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following planning conditions:

### **Condition(s) and Reason(s):**

- 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:**

**P268\_SP\_01 (Proposed Site Plan)**

**P288\_GA\_01 Revision P01 (Proposed Ground Floor Layouts)**

**P268\_GA\_02 Revision P01 (Proposed First Floor Layout)**

**P268\_GA\_03 Revision P01 (Roof Plan)**

**P268\_GA\_04 Revision P01 (Proposed Elevations)**

**P268\_GA\_05 Revision P01 (Proposed Elevations)**

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

- 3. No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These**

**materials shall be made available for inspection at the application site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

- 4. No development shall take place until details of the boundary treatment to the first floor terraces and the cladding at first floor level shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the terrace enclosure shall thereafter be retained in perpetuity.**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to protect the residential amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.

- 5. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the proposed access and parking areas have been provided in accordance with drawing No P268 GA01 Revision P.01**

Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of the parking area, in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policy 54 and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan (2004).

- 6. A 2mx2m pedestrian visibility sight splay, free from obstruction between a height of 600mm and 2.0m and relative to the back of the footway shall be provided on both sides of vehicular access prior to the operational use and thereafter**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of the development in the interest of highway safety

- 7. No construction of the superstructure shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:**

- all hard surfaces within the site;
- other surfacing materials;
- means of enclosure,
- soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs;
- existing and proposed ground levels and
- the location of services

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

- 8. Any tree or shrub which forms part of the approved landscaping scheme which within a period of 5 years from planting fails to become established, becomes seriously damaged or diseased, dies or for any reason is removed shall be replaced in the next planting season by a tree or shrub of a similar 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), Policy CS12 (e) of the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 170 (b & d) of the NPPF (2019).

9. **The proposed bin storage facilities shall be provided prior to the occupation of the dwellings hereby approved and shall thereafter be retained in perpetuity.**

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy

10. **Prior to the commencement of the site works the applicant shall submit a construction management plan setting out details on any demolition works, removal of materials from site, parking for all contractors, sub-contractors, visitors and delivery vehicles, storage of materials to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority and that area shall be maintained available for use at all times during the period of site works.**

Reason: To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

11. **Notwithstanding the details provided, no construction of the buildings hereby approved shall take place until full details of the measures for sustainable construction have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details shall address the requirements under Policy CS29 of the Core Strategy. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure that the development takes full account of Policy CS29, CS31 and CS32 in the interests of sustainable construction

12. **Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within the following classes of the Order shall be carried out without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority:**

**A, B and E**

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development in the interests of safeguarding the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy (2013). Also, to enable the Local Authority to retain control of the development to safeguard the outdoor amenity space of the development and safeguard against spatial pressure to the retained trees on site in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Saved Policy 99 of the Local Plan (2004)

#### **Informatives:**

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

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

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

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

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

Any external lighting scheme should be designed to minimise light spill, in particular directing light away from the boundary vegetation to ensure dark corridors remain for use by wildlife as well as directing lighting away from potential roost - nesting sites.

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

## APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments

Councillor Uttley  
Boxmoor Ward

I have had a look at the proposals and having visited the site at Vicarage Close on Friday, I have attached some photos for your perusal. I recommend that you go if you can manage it, as I think the photos I have taken do not do justice to the pleasant open aspect of the close.

Nevertheless, I hope you can see from the panorama, the close has a very open feel, with every single home on it having a front garden and/or driveway area. On top of this, the semi-circular area which is currently unbuilt upon, and has previously been a shared amenity area for all residents, is over 10m wide, (and longer than 10m from the fence of 16 Park Road) and this adds to the open nature of the cul-de-sac.

The semi-circular area was originally built with paving slabs, intended as an amenity area, not for parking, as can be seen in this old photograph (untitled 26 from 1979). I understand that the council concreted it over at some point, possibly to save on upkeep (although as I understand it, this was not the Council's responsibility). I have also attached a photo of the original plans for the close (Untitled 25), and you can see that the houses 16, 18 and 20 Park Road were part of this development. Every house on the close has a front and back garden.

It is my view that the proposal as it stands should be rejected on three main grounds:

- 1) Street Scene – The close was all built at the same time, along with the house at 16 Park Road. It was designed to be open and friendly, with each house being set back from the road, with front gardens and/or driveways as well as back gardens.
  - a. CS 11 b) and CS 12 f) this development does not preserve or integrate with the attractive streetscape. The new houses do not have any front gardens, bar a bin storage space, and otherwise front directly onto the pavement. This is directly in conflict with the current attractive streetscene.
  - b. CS12 c) this development would be a visual intrusion to all that live on the Close. House 1 would jut out into the centre of the close, with no front gardens, and be overbearing on the close as a whole. In particular, it would limit daylight and sunlight to front of the house 1 (and to a lesser extent 2) Vicarage Close, which would be looking out directly on the rear of house 1. The road is less than 5m width at this point, and these two houses would become confined into a small space in the corner of this development.
- 2) Loss of amenity by current residents.
  - a. CS12 g) viii) This proposal does not respect adjoining properties in terms of amenity space. By building on this semi-circular area, which until very recently was a

	<p>shared amenity area, and is still used as such, the development is directly responsible for loss of amenity, contrary to NPPF 127f).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. CS12 c) Loss of privacy for Nr 18 Park Road. the houses 2 &amp; 3 will be looking over the garden of Nr 18 Park Road, with bedroom windows looking out over the short gardens for their own house onto the garden of Nr18 (these are velux so it isn't 100% clear how much overlooking there would be). There is potentially some cover from trees, although one of these is not yet planted so unlikely to provide any cover for a while. Also, without TPOs I imagine these trees would not last long, since the gardens they are in are so small.</li> <li>c. CS12 c) this development would limit daylight and sunlight to the garden/house at Nr 18 Park Road.</li> </ul> <p>3) Lack of amenity space for future occupants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Amenity space for future occupants. The houses all have very small gardens, especially number 1, which has two miniscule areas. The garden space for these residents is contrary to NPPF 127 f).</li> </ul> <p>As well as the above, there are also the usual parking issues, with each 2 bed house having only 1 space, and the 3 bed having only 2 spaces. However, I am aware that parking doesn't normally hold much weight as an issue alone, but perhaps this is indicative that there has been an attempt here to fit too many houses into too small a plot.</p>
--	--

Hertfordshire Highways	<p><b><u>Original Comments</u></b></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 recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:</p> <p><u>Planning Application:</u></p> <p>The proposals is to replace an existing larger house, garden and hard standing with 5 new smaller dwellings, consisting of 4 smaller 1-2 bedroom dwellings and one 3 bedroom dwelling, with new pedestrian and vehicular access from Vicarage Close and Park Road with car parking from existing 2 parking to 6 car parking spaces.</p> <p><u>Application site and Local Road Network.</u></p> <p>The development site is located on 16 Park Road in Hemel Hempstead. The property No 16 is an existing house at the front of the site with off-street parking and a garden. The site is generally sloping towards the road. The existing garden is timber fenced with a Holly tree, an elm tree and a Fir tree to the south west corner of the site.</p> <p>A tarmacked semi-circular area to the west also forms part of the application site. This semi-circular tarmacked area is identified as</p>
------------------------	--

highway land which is within the highways boundary, but in the application form this land is declared as in control of the applicant. It is possible the land may be owned by the applicant with highway rights.

In terms of highway response, the land ownership is not a material consideration unless there are access issues. This response is based on the assumption that if the planning permission is granted the applicant will secure the land via stopping up order to remove highway rights and if this fails then the applicant will have an un-implementable planning permission.

The existing house and off-street parking is positioned in the east part of the site, with access from Park Road. Park Road is an unclassified local access road some 414m in length linking St Johns Road and Charles Street. Vicarage Close forms a "T" Junction with Park Road. Vicarage Close is a cul-de-sac some 55m in length providing access to 3 detached properties (2, 4 and 6) and 2 lines of 9 and 7 terraced properties. All these properties in Vicarage Close are with integral garages and 2 parking spaces.

There is double yellow line parking restriction at Vicarage Close junction with Park Road, and single yellow line along Vicarage Close adjacent to the application site. Vicarage Close is approximately 5.5m wide. There are no on-street parking restrictions in front of the existing detached properties opposite to the application site.

#### Accessibility

The application site is surrounded by residential properties and the proposed development is to replace an existing dwelling. However, the application site is in easy access to Hemel Hempstead train station and near town centre and Riverside shopping centre, and as such benefits from good public transport links.

#### Planning History

The applicant submitted two pre-applications to Dacorum regarding this scheme, the first in August 2019 proposed the demolition of the existing house and six new dwellings on the site. This was followed up in December 2019 with the secondary pre application for a smaller scheme of five new dwellings. The scheme of five houses was put forward, allowing for larger plot with increased parking. From existing 2 spaces to 6 spaces.

#### Recommendation.

Highway Authority recommends the planning application to be refused for the following reason:

Reasons for refusal:

a) The application form indicates no alterations to vehicular access. There are no existing access or parking to the application site off Vicarage Close. The application proposal is for 4 parking spaces ie 2 x2 spaces car port. It is an offence to drive over footway without dropped kerb

1 Under Highway Act 1980 (section 184) make it an offence to drive a

vehicle across the footway or verge where there is no proper vehicle crossover.

2 For example, a standard dropped kerb a single driveway for two cars is 5.4m wide (4 x0.9 dropped kerb + 0.9 m flushed kerb on either side. The application is seeking full planning permission. The applicant should provide the full details of the vehicle crossover to scale and the parking layout to accommodate 4 cars.

3 The application site at the corner plot of junction between Park Road/ Vicarage Close. The vehicles from the car park are likely to reverse on to Vicarage Close. Adequate Visibility splays (both vehicle and pedestrian) should be provided for cars reversing from car port in the interest of highway safety.

4 The standard UK parking bays is 2.4m wide and 4.8m depth. This is under review by the parking authorities. Modern cars are generally longer and don't fit within parking space and they overhang. Cars overhanging in public car parks and supermarkets has limited effect. However, cars parked on site in residential parking should be within the curtilage of the application site and should not overhang over footpath.

5 It appears that the depth of the car ports for parking space 1 to 4 is 6m to the back of the footpath. The width of parking space is barely 2.4m wide. This parking arrangement should supported by swept path diagrams to demonstrate that a car can reverse adequately with another car parked in the car port.

6 Parking spaces 5 and 6 are from Park Road. The proposed parking spaces measures 5m to the back of footpath. The preferred parking bay depth is 5.5m Modern cars are generally longer and don't fit within parking space and they overhang. Cars parked on site should be within the curtilage of the application site and should not overhang over footpath. Adequate provisions should be made to intercept surface water discharging on to public highway.

7 There are number of street furniture including buried cables along the footpath adjacent to the application site. The applicant should take appropriate measures to contact the relevant authorities/utilities to move any street furniture at the applicant's cost.

8 NPPF. Promotes safe and secure layouts and identify the need to minimise conflicts between traffic and other road users. County Council's transport policies promotes design and layout to give priority to pedestrians, cyclists and other Non-vehicle users and provide for safe and convenient. The existing footpath as proposed stops at unit 2. There is no continuation of footpath around unit 1. This arrangement would result in inconvenience for pedestrians or people with sensory or mobility difficulties.

**Amended Comments**

Notice is given that the 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 would not object to the development subject to the following conditions:

**Condition 1 :**

**Prior to the commencement of the site works the applicant shall submit a construction management plan setting out details on any demolition works, removal of materials from site, parking for all contractors, sub-contractors, visitors and delivery vehicles, storage of materials to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority and that area shall be maintained available for use at all times during the period of site works.**

Reason;- To minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway

**Condition 2**

**Before the first occupation of the approved development the access arrangement from Vicarage Close as shown in principle Proposed ground Floor layouts No P268 GA01 Revision P.01 shall be constructed and completed to the satisfaction of the Highway/Planning Authorities.**

Reason: To ensure that the proposed access is designed and constructed to the current Highway Authority's specification as required by the Local Planning Authority.

**Condition 3:**

**A 2mx2m pedestrian visibility sight splay, free from obstruction between a height of 600mm and 2.0m and relative to the back of the footway shall be provided on both sides of vehicular access prior to the operational use and thereafter**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of the development in the interest of highway safety

Advisory Note.

Informative:

I recommend inclusion of the following advisory note to ensure that any works within the highway are to be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the highway Act 1980.

New or amended crossover – construction standards

AN1) Construction standards for new/amended vehicle access: Where works are required within the public highway to facilitate the new or amended vehicular access, the Highway Authority require the construction of such works to be undertaken to their satisfaction and

specification, and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission, requirements and for the work to be carried out on the applicant's behalf. Further information is available via the website:

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/changes-to-your-road/dropped-kerbs/dropped-kerbs.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

#### Storage of materials

AN2) 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.

#### Obstruction of the highway

AN3) Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

#### Mud on highway

AN4) 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 always be taken to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available via the website

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/highways-roads-and-pavements.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Planning Application: (20/1866/FUL)

Planning application is to replace an existing larger house, garden and hard standing with 5 new smaller dwellings, consisting of 4 smaller 1-2 bedroom dwellings and one 3 bedroom dwelling, with new pedestrian and vehicular access from Vicarage Close and Park Road with car parking from existing 2 parking to 6 car parking spaces.

Planning History

The applicant submitted two pre-applications to Dacorum regarding this scheme, the first in August 2019 proposed the demolition of the existing house and six new dwellings on the site. This was followed up in December 2019 with the secondary pre application for a smaller scheme of five new dwellings. The scheme of five houses was put forward, allowing for larger plot with increased parking. From existing 2 spaces to 6 spaces.

Highway Authority was consulted on the above Planning Application and the Authority recommended refusal on inadequate details on vehicle crossover to parking layouts and the potential conflict between the vehicles and other road users. The applicant submitted an amended layout to the highway authority on 7<sup>th</sup> September. 2020. The highway Authority acknowledged the receipt of the plans. On 4<sup>th</sup> October, received an e mail from Planning Case Officer as a formal Consultation.

Application site and Local Road Network.

The development site is located on 16 Park Road in Hemel Hempstead. The property No 16 which is an existing house at the front of the site with off-street parking and a garden. The site is generally sloping towards the road. The existing garden is timber fenced with a Holly tree, an elm tree and a Fir tree to the south west corner of the site.

A tarmacked semi-circular area to the west also forms part of the application site. This semi-circular tarmacked area is identified as highway land, which is within the highway's boundary, but in the application form this land is declared as in control of the applicant. It is possible the land may be owned by the applicant with highway rights.

In terms of highway response, the land ownership is not a material consideration unless there are access issues. This response is based on the assumption that if the planning permission is granted the applicant will secure the land via stopping up order to remove highway rights and if this fails then the applicant will have an un-implementable planning permission.

The existing house and off-street parking are positioned in the east part of the site, with access from Park Road. Park Road is an unclassified local access road some 414m in length linking St Johns Road and Charles Street. Vicarage Close forms a "T" Junction with

Park Road. Vicarage Close is a cul-de-sac some 55m in length providing access to 3 detached properties (2, 4 and 6) and 2 lines of 9 and 7 terraced properties. All these properties in Vicarage Close are with integral garages and 2 parking spaces.

There is double yellow line parking restriction at Vicarage Close junction with Park Road, and single yellow line along Vicarage Close adjacent to the application site. Vicarage Close is approximately 5.5m wide. There are no on-street parking restrictions in front of the existing detached properties opposite to the application site.

#### Accessibility.

The application site is surrounded by residential properties and the proposed development is to replace an existing dwelling. However, the application site in easy access to Hemel Hempstead train station and near town centre and Riverside shopping centre, and as such benefits from good public transport links.

#### Access and Parking

The development proposal is for one 3 bed unit and 4 smaller units. The parking provision is 2 spaces for the 3 bed units to be accessed via Park Road (existing) and 1 space per smaller units (4 spaces) to be located in car port beneath the terrace and to be accessed via Vicarage Close. The existing parking provision on site is 2 spaces and the proposed parking provision is 6.

The application form still indicates that there are no alterations to the highway in relation to vehicular access. The application proposal is for 4 parking spaces ie 2 x2 spaces car port. It is an offence Under Highway Act 1980 (section 184) to drive over footway without dropped kerb. One of the key reasons for earlier refusal. The applicant's amended ground floor layouts drg no P268 GA 01, Rev P.01 now includes the need for vehicle crossovers.

Applicant should follow the instruction as on Advisory note AN1

#### New or amended crossover – construction standards.

I am pleased confirm that the proposed car ports are of adequate width and depth for cars to be parked within the curtilage of the application site.

There are number of street furniture including buried cables along the footpath adjacent to the application site. The applicant should take appropriate measures to contact the relevant authorities/utilities to move any street furniture at the applicant's cost.

#### Capacity and safety

The proposed development is an intensification on the use of existing site. However, the level of traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development is unlikely to have any significant impact on the local road network.

	<p>It is considered that there are no existing highways safety issues present in the local road network that need to be considered.</p> <p><u>Refuse</u></p> <p>I would recommend LPA to consult your refuse collection team.</p> <p><u>Fire Safety</u></p> <p>In terms of access to Fire Tender, the layout provides direct access via Park Road and Vicarage Close.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>In terms of capacity, safety and sustainability the proposed development complies with the policies set out in NPPF. The Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of consent subject to the above conditions and advisory notes</p>
--	--

## APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Address	Comments
2 Park Road	<p>We wish to object to the proposed development</p> <p>We fully support and endorse the submissions made by 17 Vicarage Close, 4 Park Road and 25 Park Road</p> <p>Specifically, we object on the grounds that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The development is not in keeping with other properties in either Vicarage Close or Park Road</li> <li>2) There is inadequate parking provision for a development of this size - parking is already at a premium in the area and this would simply add to the problem in both Vicarage Close and Park Road</li> <li>3) There is likely to be a resultant rise in noise and pollution</li> <li>4) Increasing from one perfectly adequate property to five smaller 'boxes' is clearly over-development of the site</li> </ol>
4 Park Road	<p>I object to the proposed demolition and proposed development of 5 houses (4 two bedroom, and and 1 three bedroom) on the site of one detached home.</p> <p>More details of the objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to the proposed demolition and construction of 5 new dwellings (to house up to 14 people in place of one house) as it would not be in keeping with the style of the existing properties on Park</li> </ol>

Road/Vicarage Close. Park Road is mainly made up of 1930s housing, and bungalows, semi-detached and detached properties not a modern, tightly spaced terraced building as proposed. Consideration needs to be given to the transition from detached dwellings on that side of the road and I am not sure that the height and scale of the proposed buildings provides an appropriate transition between the detached homes in that part of the area.

2. I object to the proposed planning on the grounds of increased traffic and parking issues as there is inadequate provision for parking on the proposed site. There are already limited permit parking spaces that would be under increased demand from the residents and visitors to the proposed development. The 5 new properties only have spaces for 6 cars onsite whereas the existing home has its own contained parking for 3+ cars for one home. There is wholly inadequate provision for 14 extra cars plus their guests assuming 1 car per resident.

3. I object to the proposed development as it is proposed to replace a detached home with 5 separate and terraced dwellings, increasing the population 3-fold and there will be increased noise and disturbance from those new residents.

4. An important ground for objection is that bats and other wildlife including nesting birds are likely to be affected by this proposed development. I know that there are a number of bats in this area, I have seen bats flying around the eaves of these neighbouring properties at dusk and count at least 20-30 sightings both summer 2019, and in spring/summer 2020. I am concerned that the proposed development will affect their roosts and also their commute to their roosts as the proposed development is in the line of travel of the bats. I believe that such a survey will demonstrate that the proposed development is likely to affect bat foraging and/or their commuting habitat.

My understanding is that the planning authority has a legal obligation to consider whether bats are likely to be affected by a proposed development. If a survey has not already been undertaken to determine the potential for bats on site and/or the presence of bats, the planning authority should request that the developers commission an appropriate survey. PLEASE CONFIRM THIS HAS BEEN COMMISSIONED.

5. I object also on the grounds that I believe the proposed demolition and development will have an impact on the habitat and wildlife in my area, in particular birds. I also feel that the development could be made more sympathetic to the local environment, enhancing opportunities for biodiversity. The proposal does not include retention of existing wildlife features on the site such as the hedgerows and trees, nor do the proposals use native plants and trees in any landscaping designs. The planning application omits to mention the existing plants and trees and hedgerows on site. PLEASE CAN I HAVE SIGHT OF ANY TREE SURVEY CARRIED OUT AS PART OF THIS APPLICATION

6 I object to the plan as there are extremely small green

	spaces/amenities for each property. The drawings do not show that 2 parking spaces will be accessed from Park Road, and the other will mean additional vehicle movement on the narrow cul de sac Vicarage close.
8 Park Road	<p>I object to this planning application in the following grounds...</p> <p>That it is clearly an overdevelopment of one house to five houses  Loss of parking and lack of adequate provision for parking  Loss of what was a community area where the local children could safely play outside  Increased traffic in what has been a pleasant And open area  Wildlife habitats being squeezed yet further, disruption to bat colonies which fly regularly in the evenings in the area</p> <p>Additionally I feel very sorry for the direct neighbours surrounding the proposed properties because there will inevitably be loss of privacy, light and space, disrupting the community no end.</p> <p>I believe this is an application which has been proposed with no regard for the community and neighbours that are being left with the consequences.</p>
10 Park Road	<p>I oppose this proposal of converting the existing house into a block of flats.</p> <p>This proposed development is totally out of character for a street of residential houses and there is already very limited parking provisions on Vicarage/Park Road for visitors and residents that a development of this sort will add to the problem. This in turn will increase the flow of traffic on these quiet streets.</p>
13 Park Road	<p>This will create more traffic &amp; Parking problems in a very busy road  Not in keeping with current properties</p>
14 Park Road	<p>We have concerns re the proposed application 20/01866/FUL   Development of land to replace existing house with 5 new dwellings.   16 Park Road Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP1 1JS</p> <p>Density of building and occupation planned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The plan proposes an increase from 1 property with 3 bedrooms to 5 properties with a total of 11 bedrooms which will increase the stress on the existing services, from utilities such as sewage to GP Practice Lists.</li> <li>- The increase in building and reduction in garden area will mean less soak away options during heavy rainfall and an increase in direct flow into the drainage system on Park Road. Currently during heavy rain there is a significant runoff of water from Vicarage Close into Park Road; any additional increase will impact on the drainage system in Park Road.</li> </ul> <p>Adequacy of Parking/loading/turning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The application includes garage space for a car and cycles next to</li> </ul>

	<p>the proposed buildings. However it is common for houses of more than one bedroom to have more than one car. If this is the case, it will create a parking and access problem. The entrance to Vicarage Close, a cul de sac, is narrow which means any parking on the road could create access difficulties for emergency services, bin lorries etc. Additional housing will increase the pressure for parking and the narrowness of the road could lead drivers, despite their best intentions to comply with the Highway Code, to park partly on the pavement. This would adversely affect disabled person's access including making it more difficult for those with sight impairments to navigate the pavement. Vicarage Close acts as a through-path for those coming from the station and going into town which adds to the normal pedestrian traffic in the Close.</p> <p>- Pressure on parking spaces could create an over-spill into Park Road. This would add to the existing parking pressures on Park Road which allows parking on one side of the road only.</p> <p>Traffic Generation</p> <p>- The proposed application of an increase from 1 household to 5 households with cars will generate an increase in traffic on both Vicarage Close and Park Road. The additional traffic will create an impact on the air quality for everyone and the road safety of pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
15 Park Road	<p>1.0 Application Form.</p> <p>1.1 There are some concerns with the application form and I would question some of the assertions made.</p> <p>1.2 Under 8 - there is a right of way that will be extinguished. The public have a right of way at the top of site on the semi-circular part of the plan.</p> <p>1.3 Under 9 - the application says that there are 2 parking spaces - the existing spaces could probably hold 3 cars. Also the property has rights to parking access see the drop kerb on Vicarage close. The owner demolished the garage and fenced it of. So there are probably 4 spaces rather than 2. The development will only increase off road parking by 2.</p> <p>1.4 Under 10 - there needs to be Tree Survey and it is likely that the roots of proposed replacement trees will damage properties and have to be cut down in a few years.</p> <p>1.5 Under 11 - the proposal will reduce lawn and so will add to the water running down the hill adding to overflow on the drains. The drains then run down Charles St to flood the Cotterells.</p> <p>1.6 Under 12. There are bats in this area. The applicant asserts that there are none on his property. The applicant should have a bat survey before asserting that there are none at number 16.</p> <p>2.0 The plan</p>

2.1 The demolition of a good quality detached family home with a garden is proposed to meet the Council's housing target in Policy CS17. The development will build 5 homes. The target is being achieved under existing buildings throughout the council area e.g. Charles St, Cotterells, Kodak, Town Centre etc. etc. So CS17 can be met under existing plans and developments. This development is surplus and irrelevant to that policy target. As such the whole proposal is unnecessary.

2.2 The proposed 'terraced step' houses are out keeping and character for Vicarage Close. The materials and design are completely different.

2.4 There is loss of privacy to houses overlooked by the development under the plans - the adaptations do not meet the concerns raised in the pre-application meetings with the Council.

2.5 Noise funnels down Vicarage Close and into Park Road - having open terraces will add to noise pollution as well as affecting homes in Park Rd and Vicarage Close.

2.6 I can't see that the plan shows or takes into account the Parking zone pole which acts as an obstruction to vehicles turning from Park Rd into Vicarage Close. This is a material oversight.

2.7 The combined affect of the Parking Zone Pole, the Lamp post and the Electricity box is to act as visual barrier to vehicles and bikes turning into Vicarage close. As there are no cars entering Vicarage Close this is not a problem but once the houses are built there it will be as cars from the development will be entering Vicarage Close as cars are turning from Park Rd into Vicarage Close.

2.8 The bin sheds to house the council bins will also act as visual barrier to people turning into the road and increase the chance of an accident.

2.9 Pedestrians have to move out from the lamp post, the parking zone pole, the box and move into the road or across the pavement and also act as a barrier to road users.

2.10 Vicarage Close is a popular route for school children going to Hemel Hempstead School or South Hill School. The increased traffic, increased parking, the loss of semi-circular pavement (taken by one of the houses) at the top of the close will all add to potential dangers and hazards for the children. As we all know children often forget road safety issues - at the moment this is a very safe walk but once the development adds to the density and crowding the walk will become more hazardous.

3.0 Parking and Cars.

3.1 There is insufficient parking space for the numbers of houses. The parking spaces in the plan do not allow for a large cars or SUVs (a popular choice of car).

3.2 There is insufficient space for cars needed for certain types of disability.

3.3 The lack of parking space will adversely affect the amenity of surrounding properties through roadside parking on this narrow lane/busy junction as second cars, large cars, visitor cars all have to park in the area.

3.4 The overcrowding will act as danger to other road users, especially cyclists as well as pedestrians especially children and young people.

3.5 Vicarage Close is sometimes closed when we get bad snow - cars can't get up it or get stuck. The added cars will add to the problem.

3.6 The increase in cars, vans etc. will make it difficult for service and council vehicles to access the road.

#### 4.0 Capacity of physical infrastructure

4.1 Layout and density of building design and finishing materials: the houses are too dense. The materials do not look as though they are in keeping with the rest of Vicarage Close or Park Rd.

#### 5.0 Overlooking and Loss of privacy

5.1 The houses will overlook houses on Park Rd. Vicarage Close. This is a loss of privacy. Any new owner can adapt the house. Trees can be cut down.

#### 6.0 Overshadowing and Loss of outlook.

6.1 The houses will overshadow both houses on Vicarage Close as well as Park Rd. They will create an loss of outlook for houses in Vicarage Close and Park Rd. The adaptations made to the plan after the pre-meetings do not meet the concerns raised by the council officer.

#### 7.0 Local Plans and Planning policy.

7.1 The development fails CS4 in "Mixed-use development will be supported where it supports the principles of sustainable development and does not conflict with other policies" The plan fails to meet enough sustainable criteria.

7.2 The plan says that one of the houses is not sustainable and the other four are partly sustainable.

7.3 Only some criteria are met. The council should have regard to those criteria that are not met.

7.4 The development conflicts with other policies e.g. noise, traffic, overlooking, a highway being blocked, parking etc.

7.5 The plan fails the Sustainable Community Strategy e.g. "creating a cleaner and healthier environment" - strategic objectives and

	<p>Dacorum's distinctive character ie. CS23, CS24, CS25, CS26, CS28, CS29, CS30, CS31, CS32</p> <p>8.0 I am not sure that the application meets NP1 and would ask the decision maker to have regard to this.</p> <p>9.0 I do not think that the plan meets CS11.</p> <p>9. 1. CS11(d) - it does not maintain existing neighbourhood pattern. It is not in keeping with any houses in Park Rd or Vicarage Close.</p> <p>9.2. CS11(e) making best use of existing green infrastructure - the development destroys a large garden. The micro gardens will not provide the same sort of green infrastructure.</p> <p>9,3. It does not meet CS11 in that is is not based on the neighbourhood concept and clear design when the Close was built.</p> <p>9. 4. It does not meet neighbourhood needs because of noise, parking, pollution created by water not being absorbed.</p> <p>10.00 Vans.</p> <p>10.1 The plan assumes that people will have cars large numbers of home owners in Hemel Hempstead are van owners or users. They will not be able to park on the parking bays and will have to use the road.</p> <p>11.00 If the application is successful</p> <p>11.1 If the application be approved, the council should consider using its powers to enforce controlled hours of operation and other restrictions that might make the duration of the works more bearable. The proposed site of development is very small and contained, with no road frontage, so we would ask that consideration be made about how and where construction vehicles and staff would gain access to the site for unloading and parking without causing a highway hazard or inconveniencing neighbours.</p> <p>12.00 Human Rights Act.</p> <p>As the council is aware there are rights to privacy, family life as well as others under the Human Rights Act. This plan does not meet those criteria and I would ask the council to please consider the HRA in making its decision</p> <p>13.00 If you would like to discuss any particular point or want more clarification on these or other objections I would be happy to discuss with you.</p>
17 Park Road	<p>My objections to the proposed 5 dwelling plan for 16 Park Road relate to over-development of the site.</p> <p>This will be extremely intrusive on the privacy of the surrounding residents.</p>

	<p>Intolerable strain will be put on the existing parking facilities which are already over-stretched. The width of Vicarage Close is not conducive to easy access to the proposed properties.</p> <p>I have had no notification of the ownership of the semi-circular pavement area at the top end of the site that has been used for car parking in the past. Also it seems an extremely small space to sit one of the proposed properties!</p>
<p>18 Park Road (Comments Aitchinsons)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">from</p>	<p><u>The Site</u></p> <p>The site currently comprises a detached two-storey dwelling (16 Park Road) and its rear garden. I am advised that the semi-circular area of hardstanding originally formed a general amenity area for the residents of Vicarage Close. The surrounding area is residential in character and consists predominantly of two-storey detached and terraced houses.</p> <p>Ground levels on site slope down from west to east. This results in a notable change in levels between the front and rear parts of the site.</p> <p><u>The Proposal</u></p> <p>Permission is sought to demolish the existing dwelling and construct five new dwellings in its place. While the existing property fronts Park Road, the proposed dwellings would all be orientated north facing the existing row of detached properties on the northern side of Vicarage Close.</p> <p>The proposed dwellings would be two storeys in height and arranged as two semi-detached pairs and a detached property, all linked via first floor terraces. Houses 1, 4 and 5 would have fully pitched roofs, while houses 2 and 3 would have crown roofs. The external walls would be brick and tile hung.</p> <p>Gardens would be provided at the rear of houses 2 to 5, and units 1 to 4 would have outdoor terraces. The garden at house 5 would wrap around the side of the property, and the terrace for house 2 would be located at the top of the building within a roof void.</p> <p>House 5 would have three bedrooms, while the other units would have two. House 5 would also have two parking spaces, while the other units would have one. Parking for units 1-4 would be provided underneath the first-floor terraces.</p> <p><u>Overdevelopment of the site</u></p> <p>In our view, the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Currently, the plot supports a single residential dwelling and garden, and contributes positively to the spacious character of the area. In contrast, the proposal would represent a cramped and contrived form of development. The number of dwellings would be excessive, and the scale and amount of development would be incongruous to the</p>

existing layout and character of the area.

### Density

The Council's Character Area Statement for Hemel Hempstead identifies this part of the town as area 'HCA11: Cotterills'. The document advises that the general density of existing development in the area is 'medium range', between 25-35 dwellings per hectare.

The application site is approximately 578 square metres (0.0578 hectares), including the semicircular area of hardstanding. As such, the construction of five dwellings equates to a proposed density of approximately 86 dwellings per hectare, vastly exceeding (more than double) the average density in the character area.

When compared to the existing properties on the opposite side of Vicarage Close (2, 4 and 6), these have a combined site area of approximately 1112 square metres (0.1112 hectares) and a density of 26 dwellings per hectare, falling within the average range.

Likewise, the terraced properties at 1-19 (odd) Vicarage Road, which individually have smaller plots, have a density of approximately 49 dwellings per hectare, significantly lower than that proposed at the application site.

Appendix 3 (Layout and Design of Residential Areas) of the Dacorum Local Plan states:

*'Proposals should be guided by the existing topographical features of the site and its immediate surroundings. They should respect the character of the surrounding area, and in particular there must be adequate space for the proposed development without creating a cramped appearance.'*

Furthermore, Policy CS11(a) of the Core Strategy states *'within settlements and neighbourhoods, development should respect the typical density intended in the area...'*

Contrary to the above, the proposed density of the development would be excessive and out-of-keeping with the character of the area. In conflict with Appendix 3 and Policy CS11(a) there is inadequate space on site for the scale and number of dwellings proposed, resulting in a cramped and overcrowded form of development. As such, the proposal constitutes an overdevelopment of the site.

### Garden sizes and arrangement

Appendix 3 (ii) of the Local Plan states all residential development is required to provide open space for use by residents whether the development be houses or flats.

*'Private gardens should normally be positioned to the rear of the dwelling and have an average minimum depth of 11.5m. Ideally a range of garden sizes should be provided to cater for different family compositions, ages and interests. A reduced rear garden depth may*

*be acceptable for small starter homes, homes for the elderly and development backing onto or in close proximity, to open land, public open space or other amenity land. Larger family or executive style homes will be expected to provide a garden of greater depth. For infill developments garden depths which are below 11.5m but of equal depth to adjoining properties will be acceptable. Generally all gardens should be of a width, shape and size to ensure the space is functional and compatible with the surrounding area.'*

Furthermore, Policy CS12 (g) of the Core Strategy states new development should respect adjoining properties in terms of '*landscaping and amenity space*'.

The proposed rear gardens for houses 2 to 5 would measure just 5 metres in depth (approximately). As such, they would be less than half the minimum depth set out in Appendix 3. Moreover, house 1, would have no rear garden at all.

It is noted that the garden at house 5 would wrap around the side of the property, and the other properties would have terraces. However, the proposed terraces would be an incongruous feature, with no other houses in the area having anything similar. In particular, the terrace serving house 2 would be in a roof void at the top of the building and would be especially contrived.

In our view, the lack of useable garden space at the rear of the buildings, and the fact first and second floor terraces have had to be incorporated to overcome this, provides further evidence that the proposal represents a gross overdevelopment of the site.

#### Design and layout

Core Strategy Policy CS12 states new development should '*integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties in terms of: layout, security, site coverage, scale, height, bulk, materials and landscaping and amenity*'.

Appendix 3 of the Local Plan advises that spacing between dwellings should be provided at a distance which is consistent with the surrounding areas.

In terms of layout and spacing, the proposed dwellings would be arranged as two semi-detached pairs and one detached property, linked by first floor terraces.

The existing properties on Vicarage Close and Park Road are generally set back from the road, with parking and landscaping provided to the front. Furthermore, the existing properties benefit from decent sized rear gardens, generally exceeding the 11.5 metre minimum depth. As such, the existing layout of development has a spacious character.

In contrast, the proposed houses would be sited very close to the road and pavement on the southern side of Vicarage Close, and, as set out above, would have very shallow rear gardens (5 metres deep

approximately).

As a result, the proposal would appear cramped and physically constrained, at odds with the layout and spacing of existing development in the area. Furthermore, given their modest set back from the road, the proposed two storey dwellings would have a visually imposing and oppressive impact within the street, closing in the southern side of Vicarage Close.

In other respects, house 1 would occupy a very prominent and obtrusive position in the middle of the Close. It would be sited forward of the existing row of properties behind (1-19 odd), and as such, would have an awkward relationship with the existing pattern of development on the street, and an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area generally.

Contrary to criterion (iii) above, the proposed site coverage would also be excessive. The proposed built development, including the terraces and carports, would dominate the site, resulting in very little open space. Generally, existing houses in the area, have generous plot to building ratios. The proposed development would not accord with this.

Individually, the design of the proposed buildings would also be incongruous. Houses 4 and 5 would form a semi-detached pair, however, house 5 would be noticeably wider. Similarly, houses 2 and 3 would have crown roofs, while the other houses would have fully pitched roofs. Crown roofs are not a feature of the area and this added bulk at roof level would be perceptible from the street given the change in levels.

In our opinion, the proposed first floor terraces would also be a discordant feature, akin to a flat roof garage being used as a balcony. They would introduce noise and general activity at an elevated level within the street, and domestic paraphernalia (washing lines, parasols, play equipment etc) would be visible from outside the site to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area.

It is also important to note that the proposed boundary wall at the corner of Park Road and Vicarage Close would be considerably higher than that shown on the sketch street scene image above. As shown on the elevation plan below, the proposed wall would measure approximately 1.8 metres in height and would completely enclose the corner of Park Road and Vicarage Close, eroding the existing sense of openness.

Again, this would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street and would harm the visual amenity of the area.

In view of the above, the proposed development would fail to integrate with the existing pattern and spacing of development in the area. It would have a detrimental impact on both the Park Road and Vicarage Road street scene and would harm the visual amenity of the area generally. The proposal is therefore contrary to Appendix 3 of the Local Plan, Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy, and the relevant

provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

#### Poor standard of environment for future occupiers

In our view, the proposed development would fail to provide future occupiers with an acceptable standard of environment.

The Government's Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard, published in March 2015, states single bedrooms should be a minimum of 7.5 square metres.

Bedroom 3 in house 5 looks very small and could be below the above standard. We request that the Council investigate this matter as part of their assessment. Furthermore, double bedrooms must be a minimum of 11.5 square metres. The proposed second bedrooms in houses 1 to 4 also look small and could be below the above standard. We ask that the Council investigate this.

In addition, bedroom 2 in house 2 would be served by roof-lights only, providing a very poor standard of environment internally, with minimal outlook.

As noted earlier, the proposed rear gardens would also be very small and dominated by the proposed buildings. As such, they would not provide future occupiers with a good standard of amenity.

The proposed ground floor openings and gardens at the back of houses 2 and 3 would be overlooked by the first-floor rear facing windows at 18 Park Road, providing future occupiers of these units with an unacceptable level of privacy.

In addition, the ground floor front facing openings of all the houses, would be sited very close to the public footpath on Vicarage Close. As such, these rooms would have very little privacy with passers by being able to look in.

#### Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

A core planning principle, as set out in the NPPF, is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. This is echoed in Core Strategy Policy CS12(c) which states that development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties.

#### 18 Park Road

The proposed development would have a significant detrimental impact on the residential amenity of 18 Park Road.

The two storey rear elevations of houses 2 and 3 would be sited just 5 metres (approximately) from the common boundary and rear garden of 18 Park Road. As such, the development would have an adverse overbearing impact on the adjacent property and would completely enclose the northern side of the neighbouring garden.

As noted above, grounds level rise from east to west on Vicarage Close. As a result, the rear patio and ground floor openings at the back of 18 Park Road are situated below the main garden.

Houses 2 and 3 would therefore be constructed on higher ground, exacerbating their height and dominance when viewed from 18 Park Road.

In view of the above, the proposed development would have a visually oppressive and overwhelming impact on the adjacent property and garden. In this regard it is noted that 18 Park Road also has a side facing ground floor opening at the rear, which is orientated towards the application site and serves a dining room.

The development would also have a significant impact on the receipt of light at 18 Park Road. Appendix 3 of the Local Plan states '*a 45-degree angle of light should be maintained as a basic minimum to all significant windows of habitable rooms.*'

We believe houses 2 and 3 would intrude upon a 45-degree line taken from the nearest ground floor window at 18 Park Road, significantly affecting the receipt of light.

The affected window at 18 Park Road serves a lounge and therefore a habitable room within the property. The change in levels on site would further exacerbate the adverse impact on the receipt of light.

The proposal would also have an adverse impact on the privacy of 18 Park Road. While houses 2 and 3 would have no rear facing first floor openings, the proposed roof-lights, which are sited very close to the common boundary, would give the perception of overlooking, particularly when left open.

Moreover, future occupiers of the proposed first floor terraces would be able to overlook the neighbouring garden from an elevated position in very close proximity. While the plans show the proposed terraces would have privacy screens, the front elevation drawings indicate these would only measure between 1.3 metres and 1.5 metres in height (from floor level on the terrace). As such, they would not prevent overlooking.

In addition, noise and general activity associated with the proposed terraces would take place above the neighbouring garden, further compounding their adverse un-neighbourly impact.

#### 2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close

To achieve adequate privacy, Appendix 3 (iii) of the Local Plan states: '*The minimum distances of 23 m between the main rear wall of a dwelling and the main wall (front or rear) of another should be met to ensure privacy. This distance may be increased depending on character, level and other factors.*'

The proposed first floor front facing windows would be sited less than

15 metres from the front facing openings at 2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close opposite.

The proposal would therefore contravene the above standard and would harm the privacy and amenity of the properties opposite.

In respect of light, we would like the Council to investigate whether the proposed houses would intrude upon a 25-degree line taken from the front facing ground floor openings at 2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close. In this regard, it is noted that the proposed houses are located to the south of the properties opposite.

#### 18 Vicarage Close

My clients are concerned that the proposed first floor side facing window serving bedroom 2 in house 1 would overlook the front facing openings at 18 Vicarage Close at a distance significantly less than 23 metres, to the detriment of the privacy of these occupiers.

#### 1 and 3 Vicarage Close

The proposal would also have an adverse impact on the residential amenity and privacy of 1 and 3 Vicarage Close.

The proposed dwelling on plot 1 would be sited in front of these existing properties at a distance of approximately 13 metres. As such, views from the existing ground and first floor openings at 1 and 3 Vicarage Close would be adversely affected by the proposal.

Moreover, users of the proposed first floor terrace adjacent to plot 1 would be able to overlook the front facing openings of the properties behind, adversely affecting their privacy.

#### Loss of the semi-circular amenity area

My client believes that the semi-circular area of hardstanding, which forms part of the application site, was originally designated as a general amenity space for the residents of Vicarage Close.

Furthermore, they do not believe residents in Vicarage Close were notified or consulted of the sale of this land.

Policy 75 of the Local Plan (Retention of Leisure Space) states '*building on leisure spaces will not be permitted unless:*

*a) the proposal is ancillary to the leisure use of the land;*

*b) a sufficient proportion of the site with appropriate facilities is retained in open use to meet*

*the formal and informal leisure needs of the local population (see Policy 73 (b));*

*c) there is a demonstrable surplus of sports pitches and informal leisure space;*

*d) leisure space lost is replaced to an equivalent or better standard in an accessible alternative location; or*

*e) there is an overall benefit to sport as a result. In all cases the*

*amenity, landscape and nature conservation aspects of the site will be taken into account.'*

In view of the above, we request that the Council investigate the loss of this land, as part of their assessment.

My client would also like the Council to investigate whether the redevelopment of this piece of land would result in the loss of a public footpath (pavement).

#### Access and parking

My client is concerned that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on highway safety. Given the proximity of the proposed houses to the road and public footpath, vehicles backing out of the proposed car ports would have little visibility to the potential detriment of pedestrian and vehicular safety. This matter would be compounded by the narrow width of the road, and on-street parking which could obscure views further.

Additionally, the proposed house on plot 1 would obscure views within and across the Close, to the potential detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.

In terms of parking, the provision of one off-street parking space for each two-bedroom property would be below the standards set in Appendix 5 of the Local Plan, which requires 1.5 spaces for a two-bedroom dwelling. As a result, my client is concerned the development would lead to additional pressure for on-street parking in an area already subject to resident permit restrictions.

In this regard, my client is also concerned that the existing on street parking spaces along this part of Vicarage Close would be lost as a result of the development. As noted above, cars parked along this part of the road could obscure the views of vehicles leaving the proposed car port spaces. As such, my client believes double yellow lines will need to be implemented along both sides of the road.

#### Ecology

I am advised by my client that bats are present in the area. As the existing dwelling would be demolished this matter needs to be considered.

#### Other matters

It is noted that the plans in the Design and Access Statement do not have a scale bar. As a result, it is not possible to accurately measure these drawings and determine the impact of certain aspects of the development. For example, the section drawing below shows the proposed roof terrace at house 2. However, without a scale bar it is not possible to measure the height of the surrounding walls, and whether future occupiers will be able to overlook the neighbouring garden at 18 Park Road.

	<p>This matter needs to be addressed so both the Council and surrounding residents can properly assess the application.</p> <p>Furthermore, my client would like to note that the proposed block plans do not show all surrounding properties that will be affected by the proposal. As such, it is difficult to accurately determine the impact of the development on all surrounding properties.</p> <p><u>Site notice</u></p> <p>I am informed by my client that no site notice has been displayed at the site. Given the scale of development proposed, a site notice would need to be displayed on public land close to the site for a period of 21 days.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>In conclusion, I believe the proposal represents an unsustainable form of development.</p> <p>The scale of the proposal is excessive and would represent an over-development of this small and physically constrained site. The proposal would not be in-keeping with the existing pattern of development in the area, and the proposed crown roofs and first floor terraces would be incongruous and harmful to the visual amenity of the street.</p> <p>The development would harm the privacy and amenity of surrounding residents and would fail to provide future occupiers with an acceptable standard of environment.</p> <p>Furthermore, my client is concerned it would have a detrimental impact on highway safety and the proposed parking arrangements are unacceptable.</p> <p>For the reasons given above, we request that the planning application is refused.</p>
19 Park Road	<p>Key Considerations</p> <p>Policy and Principle: The provision of new dwellings within the key towns within the Borough is strongly encouraged in accordance with Policies NP1, CS1 and CS4 of the Core Strategy. Such units would make a valuable contribution to the supply of new homes addressing the need for new homes as set out in Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Layout and Design: A high standard of design is expected in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan, both upon the site and in relation to neighbouring properties. This should respect the adjoining properties in terms of layout, security, site coverage, scale, height, bulk, use of materials and landscaping.</p> <p>Layout and Design:</p>

	<p>Overdevelopment of the site, visually intrusive.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed dwellings in view of their site coverage, close proximity to the boundary and extremely limited (or non-existent) garden sizes will appear cramped and incongruous within the locality. The back gardens do not look like they meet the minimum requirement of 11.5M in depth and are in fact around 5M and will be significantly smaller than any other property nearby.</p> <p>Access and Parking:</p> <p>The following standards from Appendix 5 should be applied to the residential development of the site. 1 bed - 1.25 spaces 2 bed - 1.5 spaces 3 bed - 2.25 spaces 4 bed+ - 3 spaces.</p> <p>The proposals make insufficient space for off-street parking in accordance with the above standards and it is not clear whether there would be sufficient space to access and manoeuvre both into and out of the site within a forward gear.</p> <p>There are already parking problems in the area of Vicarage Road and Park Road and this would make parking worse. People currently park up the kerb now without these additional houses.</p> <p>Also what happens with visitor parking, there is no provision for this. This extra development will mean overspill of parking on to Park Road, which is also full with cars at the best of times.</p> <p>We would like to know how the semi-circle of land has been sold off without any notification to any local residents. Children use this area to play on as it is safe and off of the road, where will they play now?</p> <p>Residential and Amenity: The depth of the gardens to the proposed dwellings fall well below the expected standards in Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan. The number of dwellings is excessive and not in keeping with the existing surrounding houses.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Due to the number of proposed dwellings, the roof top and first floor amenity areas and the fact that the site is sloping up a hill, these dwellings will be visually intrusive, over bearing and create a loss of privacy to all neighbouring properties and gardens. To put in such a cramped development would have an adverse effect on the value of all of the affected houses.</p>
20 Park Road	<p>I object to this application for all the reasons indicated above. The proposal is out of keeping and will have a detrimental affect on all of the occupiers of the neighbouring houses. The increased noise, being overlooked from windows, roof terraces, private amenity areas, raised gardens etc will spoil our lives. There will be too many people and cars, with not enough parking spaces. The local wildlife will also suffer, including nesting bats.</p>

<p>25 Park Road</p>	<p>We object to this project and agree with all points raised by No. 4 Park Rd and find this proposed plan unacceptable. Currently parking in the road is at a premium - with a potential of 5 dwellings with only 1 parking space per household this is totally inadequate.</p> <p>Further, we understood hardstanding at the end of the existing property to be public land, how has this been included in plan. If purchased by applicant why were we not informed by letter or public notices (on lamposts etc). Seems very underhand. PLEASE CONFIRM HOW THIS HAS OCCURRED</p> <p>We also are able to back up the objection regarding the wildlife and know there to be a bat and hedgehog population in the area as we frequently see these in our garden.</p>
<p>29 Park Road</p>	<p>We strongly object to the proposed development at number 16 Park Road. We agree with all the opposing comments.</p> <p>The reasons we object to the development are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Parking - the proposed development does not provide sufficient parking space. In addition to this, there is already intense on-street parking pressure on Park Road, and we believe the new development will only add to the problem.</li> <li>2. Character of the design - the proposed development does not respect local context and street pattern. It would be entirely out of the character of the area.</li> <li>3. Loss of privacy and overlooking - the proposed development does not afford adequate privacy for the no 18. We would urge you to consider the responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act (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. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life.</li> <li>4. Disturbance to wildlife - the proposed development is going to have an impact on the wildlife in the area, particularly the bats that are regularly seen in this area.</li> </ol>
<p>31 Park Road</p>	<p>Having read all of the opposing comments we unequivocally agree with them all. We would further like to add the following comments in opposition to the application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Living in Park Road in a three bed property, with the opportunity to purchase up to three parking permits, has not been adequate parking provision for us at times. With the new proposal of only one parking space for each new two bedroom property, and two spaces for the three bed property, will create a significant increase in demand for parking spaces. We would like to ask the question what does the council intend to do to address this live issue?</li> </ol>

	<p>2. Following on from this point the selling off of the existing tarmacked area behind No 16 Park Road to No 16 Park Road has already created even less parking opportunities for permit holders in this area. When was the consultation period, and why were residents not informed of this proposal? There appears to have been a complete lack of transparency and this does feel somewhat underhand.</p> <p>3. We note that the plans show additional planting of at least one silver birch tree. This species of tree has the potential to grow over 30 metres in height and would therefore dominate the space in which it is proposed to be planted, its roots could also undermine much of the immediate area. With this in mind, we would also like to question the sustainability of the other proposed planting within the properties. It is suggested as being the resolution to privacy for those properties that will be overlooked by this development. We feel that soft planting is not a permanent solution to this pressing issue, but one that initially masks this. Lastly regarding this point, I think it is suggested that in some way new planting will help to alleviate the demands on the existing drainage system. But in reality the roots of these plants will seek out the nearby water course and therefore undermine it.</p> <p>4. We also note that the proposed plans show that each new property will have a waste bin storage area at the front of each the houses. As this will open onto the public pathway, there will not only be a conflict of interest in the use of the pathway, but there could also be possibility of passers by being subjected to the stench of decomposing waste matter.</p> <p>As residents who have lived in Park Road for the last eight years, we have always felt part of a supportive local community which is very respectful to its existing occupants, and the environment we live in, including the abundance of local wildlife. This application shows no respect for its current inhabitants and their future wellbeing.</p>
37 Park Road	<p>I strongly object to the proposed demolition and development of 16 Park road this is being carried out with total disregard to the residents in Vicarage Close and access via Park Road. The comments on particular made by 17 Vicarage Close and 4 Park road are extremely valid but I would like to stress others.</p> <p>With the proposed 5 properties in addition to driveway parking there is potential for 3No cars per household to park on the two roads mentioned earlier where parking is already a problem with the nursery parking and Saba who have no interest when challenged about other parking issues.</p> <p>Vicarage Close is used by parents and children alike to safely access the three schools along Heath Lane due to no through traffic I feel this would be compromised by the additional properties, which would put lives and health at risk.</p>
37 Park Road	<p>This road is permit parking. There are already too many cars for this road and not enough spaces, for which residents pay a premium to park, and cant. Even though plans show space for a car, reality is that most households have 2 or more vehicles, and there is simply no</p>

	<p>more room for cars to park. This is also a cut through road for school children, as young as 4, who will need to negotiate a busier road system as the result of more cars. This is also completely out of keeping with the area, this road is mainly detached or semi detached larger properties built many years ago, not an area for new build or smaller dwellings. That is why people purchased their houses on this road.</p>
45b Park Road	<p>Increase in traffic on an already busy side road which contains a sports centre &amp; their car park, a nursery and a public car park</p>
59 Park Road	<p>We object to this proposal.</p> <p>This proposed development is out of keeping with the existing houses on Park Road and Vicarage Close, would lead to more traffic and remove pavement on a road that is used by children walking to school, would be likely to exacerbate parking shortages, and could harm the local bat population.</p> <p>The application does not properly address many of the concerns that it raises (eg about environmental impact), and contains a number of inaccuracies (eg it states that the existing house that would be knocked down and replaced has three bedrooms, when in fact it has four).</p> <p>In addition we would draw the officers' attention to the many valid points made by other local residents.</p>
1 Vicarage Close	<p>The proposed scheme is a massive overdevelopment of the site, the 5 proposed dwellings on such a small plot would see a 3 fold increase on the number of houses per m<sup>2</sup> of land based on the current layout of the close. Core strategy policy CS12 states that new developments should integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties, this scheme is not in keeping with the rest of the homes with the close and the proposed terraces are not consistent with any properties in this area and would be an intrusion for many surrounding properties.</p> <p>The objections that have a direct impact on our property are:</p> <p>1. Outlook</p> <p>The proposed build will encroach on properties 1 &amp; 3 Vicarage Close being just 11.7 m from our Boundry wall, The proposed dwelling on plot one will substantially reduce the outlook from our property and will have a visual dominance that results in an overbearing and oppressive sense of enclosure, although its north facing and won't necessarily block out sunlight it will without doubt contribute to a loss of natural daylight.</p> <p>I believe that Guidelines state that there must be a minimum distance between front and rear facing windows of one property and a two story wall of another of 14 metres, the fact that the architects designing this scheme think an 11.7m separation distance is acceptable is ludicrous</p>

and sets a benchmark as to the validity of the entire development.

## 2. Overlooking

The proposed private amenity terrace for plot one will directly overlook front facing windows of our property, screening to the rear elevation is shown at as little as 1.3m on the plans and is shown to be designed with a slatted material, as such, it will not prevent overlooking. Furthermore this terrace will be the only source of outdoor space for plot one meaning it will have a lot of domestic paraphernalia for example washing lines, parasols etc, this would detract from the outlook of our property and overall would have a negative impact on the area.

It's also questionable whether the private roof terrace of plot 2 will also overlook our property, it's difficult to tell from the plans as the scales are not accurate enough to judge the full height of the terrace boundaries.

## 3 Parking

The Parking provision for the development falls well below the government guidelines, with just one space allocated to each 2 bed property and two spaces for the three bed. There has also been no allowance for visitor parking, which will put strain on already busy permit parking area, this on top of the loss of parking on the road up the close due to the new driveways will have a detrimental impact.

## 4 plan accuracy

Plan accuracy throughout the whole application is abysmal, there are so many errors and inconsistencies, some parts don't even have a scale. The most important ones for us, are firstly that there is very little mention of houses 1 & 3 Vicarage Close on the plans and they do not feature on the drawings despite being just 11.7 metres from the proposed build, this is very misleading to the planning officer, without a site visit you wouldn't even realise they were there!

Secondly, the height of the proposed properties has been determined by the ridge line from 16 Park Road, I fail to see how this can be accurate given that the site is on a gradient up in to the close?

## 5 Road safety

I have concerns over road safety surrounding the proposed development. I have a young family that frequently use the footpaths within the close, I feel that there are potential dangers for them and other local residents. The new carports would make it very difficult to see oncoming traffic and pedestrians on the footpath when reversing out, the proximity of the dwellings would be so close to the public highway, that when reversing out, by the time the driver has a clear view up and down the close they would already have crossed the footpath meaning they would not have been able to see approaching pedestrians.

	<p>On entry to the close, the road is barely wide enough for cars to pass, which will be made worse if new owners choose to park across their driveways due to the lack of allocated parking. The house on plot 1 also poses a risk of obscuring traffic coming down the close which currently is risk free due to the open plan layout.</p> <p>6 Loss of amenity space</p> <p>The development will be directly responsible for the loss of the shared local amenity space directly behind the rear of 16 Park Road, this space was designated as a play area when the close was built in 1966 according to several local residents that still reside within the close who bought their properties directly from the original developer Sunley homes, it is still used as such to this day. I believe that allowing a build on this area is contrary to NPPF 127f and policy 75 of the local plan (Retention of leisure space), as such I request that the council investigate the sale of this land as part of their assessment of this application.</p> <p>As well as the above points that are directly relevant to my property, there are several other major factors as to why the development should be refused, these include: All front facing windows and terraces directly overlook houses 2,4&amp;6 Vicarage Close, and at little over 14m separation distance, this is in breach of the 22m ruling and is an intrusion of their privacy.</p> <p>18 Park road will feel heavily overlooked by 3 of the 5 properties, local guidelines state that rear gardens must be a minimum of 11.5 metres from the house to the adjoining boundary to minimise this, the rear gardens of the proposed build measure just 5.6m according to the plans.</p> <p>The introduction of new trees along the boundary line to "soften the blow" are unlikely to prevent overlooking as they would take too long to reach maturity, having said that with gardens of little over 5m in length it unlikely they will stay in place very long anyway.</p> <p>As a side note, I believe it's the applicant's responsibility to display signage to notify local residents of the proposed development. This has not been done and I have weekly evidence to support this.</p> <p>I hope that you can see the validity of my objections and see the passion that I and the rest of the residents in this close have about the area we live.</p> <p>I would appreciate it if you could find time to carry out a site visit before making judgment on the application, so you can see for yourself the sheer size of the development on such a small space and the effects it will have on the surrounding residents.</p>
2 Vicarage Close	<p>My wife and I have lived in Vicarage Close since moving to Hertfordshire from Yorkshire in 1965. We bought a new property in the Close on sale from Sunley Homes and later when funds allowed, in 1979, moved from the town house at number 12 to a four-bed detached property at number 2. This property, of same original design</p>

as that at 16 Park Road, is opposite and across the narrow entry road into the Close from this property which is now proposed for demolition. The Close of eighteen families has always existed as a happy unit of friends and, although some deaths have occurred in recent times, houses that became vacant have been filled by new residents who similarly enjoy living in this carefully planned cul-de-sac, thus maintaining the good sense of community spirit. We have chosen to reside in Vicarage Close for over 55 years as a result of the high quality of life that has been offered by the success of the original plans:

#### Covenants

Covenants to the properties of the Close have generally been observed in a united approach to the management of the estate. One of the Covenants was that properties should remain open planned and no hedges should front the properties. These same Covenants also applied to Sunley Homes in Park Road, something that is conflicted by the proposed plans.

#### Wise design and distribution of buildings

Sunley Homes designed the estate wisely producing a balanced layout of blocks of buildings in which the sun and light was afforded freedom of access to all areas. Two blocks of town houses line the east-west and upper north-south branches of the Close. The detached six, originally all four bed houses were at the eastern end of the close and on Park Road sit as a block of like buildings. This orientation of the structures meant no building was overlooked by another except for the proposer's back garden, which can be seen to varying degrees by the 3 detached properties in Vicarage Close. Under the proposed plans, the new houses located in this garden will require that these detached properties therefore lose their current privacy as the five new properties gaze from minimal distance onto them. At first glance, it might seem that the site has some spaciousness but again, this can be attributed to wise and efficient planning by Sunley Homes who managed to cram eighteen properties, including three detached houses, into a relatively small area and still leave space for a children's communal play area to compensate for the small back gardens afforded to the town houses.

#### Children's play area - a site amenity

Part of the planned distribution of the layout was an area on which the site Foreman's office stood. This was the children's play/recreational area. It served as this for over 50 years from 1966 until it was acquired, without the knowledge of the residents of the Close, by the proposer of the suggested development. This extension of the proposer's land into Vicarage Close potentially means an amenity of the Close is removed from the youngsters and the generations of children that will follow. Should the proposal be approved, children will be confined to solitary play in their relatively small gardens. The children knew the area as the 'white pavement'. It was an area where the toddlers of the Close played communally in safety. Sunley's Site Manager saw to the safe and aesthetically appealing paving and

curbing of the area once his office was removed. The older children, particularly the boys, played football on the north-south road across the estate. Again, this was in relative safety as any vehicle entering the estate could see children at play before reaching them. The Foreman, on leaving the site for the last time stressed that cars and larger vehicles must not be parked on the paved area as the paving and curb would not bear the weight, thus ensuring the recreational facility of this highly valuable area of land. In around 1990, we were highly disappointed to see the Council cover this area in gritty tarmac, which we believed to be a consequence of the Council taking over the area. We now feel let down in the sense that this area of land has been sold off to a private owner, without warning to Vicarage Close residents, who now face total loss of this amenity space and the negative secondary consequences that result.

- Is there any possibility the council could put a compulsory order on this former children's amenity and restore to the children what has been lost by them recently?

- Why were no notices posted locally indicating this land was for sale?

Thank you for guidance in the material considerations that the council can take into account:

I am not a planner but a long-standing resident of the Close who will have to live here if the current proposer's plans are approved. Whilst a lay person when it comes to knowledge of planning, I am a resident whose home environment will be directly and adversely affected, along with the seventeen other families who reside in Vicarage Close and the residents of Park Road who will be indirectly, but significantly negatively affected. Therefore, what follows are our view of these plans and how they measure up to the criteria:

#### 1 LOSS OF LIGHT AND OVERSHADOWING

Plans greatly increase shade and loss of light within the estate. They put the equivalent of wall roof height across the middle of the estate linking with east-west town house blocks as an almost continuous barrier to light and the Sun's heat

My property, 2 Vicarage Close, is south facing. The sun radiates light and heat from a southerly direction and casts shadows in a northerly direction during the day. These plans will build the equivalent of a solid wall of new properties causing a shadow of semi-darkness from roof top height blotting out the sun, heat and considerable amount of light from striking my property. This will be particularly bad throughout the winter when the sun is low in the sky. Properties 4 and 6 will be similarly be affected.

#### 2 OVERLOOKING AND LOSS OF PRIVACY

Plans greatly increase potential overlooking and loss of privacy

Sunley Homes designed Vicarage Close wisely locating blocks of buildings and gaps to allow maximum penetration by incoming light

and heat in all areas of the site at some point in the day. This cannot be claimed by the TAS plans. They 'plug' the gaps that Sunley Homes created to cut out the heat and light entry. The plans show an overabundance of trees and plants, particularly between 18 Park Road and the new properties, in attempt to stop no 18 being overlooked. Trees disturb foundations when close to buildings and any new owners can easily dispose of them, leaving this property closely and widely overlooked.

Although Sunley managed to fit 18 properties into a relatively small plot, none of them are overlooked by their neighbours, except 16 Park Road where the landing window, half-way up the house, could be overlooked. The following houses which did not previously suffer visual intrusion will suffer direct, close and extreme visual intrusion if the plans are approved: detached houses 2, 4, 6 Vicarage Close; detached houses 18, 20 Park Road; town houses 1, 3, 14, 16, 18 Vicarage Close. We feel this is completely unacceptable.

At present we are only overlooked by 1 low down landing window: the plans show at least 10 windows and doors will overlook us directly opposite in addition to the planned balconies. There will be less than 15 metre separation distance (window to window). The scheme will remove the existing character of the area and, by demolishing the present property, will double the dwellings per hectare density on the narrow approach to the Close.

### 3 INADEQUACY OF PARKING

Plans create potential chaos

When we say 'road', let us remember this was planned prior to 1966 as a narrow access/exit road to a cul-de-sac and not designed to take upwards of possibly a further ten cars or more. The estate cannot carry such numbers particularly the entry/exit road which is only 4.8 metres wide and was designed to only have cars from properties feeding it on one side, not both sides as now proposed. Nor can we expect the newcomers to diligently park in their carport on every occasion. Cars parked both sides outside their house will block the road and seal off the Close to those higher up. Park Road already spills into Vicarage Close at times. What will happen to the second car or even third if there is one? Larger vehicles like ambulances and fire engines, which are time pressed, and of course the wider refuse lorries will have an impossible time completing their journey. I am an octogenarian and so are several others in the Close; we may need the emergency services in haste. Where will tradesman be able to park who need to have close access to their tools in their vans? The site does not have the capability to accept them. There would need to be a change made to the current resident parking zone as yellow lines would be needed down both sides of the road to avoid congestion. This would obviously increase the demand for parking spaces in Park Road, a road that is already lined with parked cars.

### 4 POLLUTION (NOISE AND AIR) AND DISTURBANCE TO WILDLIFE

	<p>Plans greatly increase potential noise and disturbance</p> <p>These plans squash into the small garden of formerly one detached property, five of these mini houses centred as part of the Close.</p> <p>The natural noise produced by one family unit will be multiplied 5 times. The new properties will face the detached houses across the narrow road and their short open planned frontage. The new properties form a continuous line from opposite the drive of 2 Vicarage Close to almost the outer edge of the former play area. The three detached houses will also make an almost continuous line nearly to the opposite end of the last proposed mini property. These lines of buildings will tend to confine, trap and eventually channel any sounds produced from either side either towards 18 Vicarage Close and Park Road depending upon prevailing weather conditions. Heavy fumes such as those from vehicles will also be confined and trapped and hopefully possibly, eventually swept out by moving traffic. None of this will be very pleasant from an environmental point of view. Presently, there is a wide-open space and nothing to hinder the dispersal of fumes and noise.</p> <p>According to these plans there will be 15 additional refuse bins and 5 waste buckets. These will be in very close proximity to the houses opposite, and the extra numbers will likely attract vermin and particularly foxes which are regular visitors up and down the Close.</p> <p><b>5 CONFLICTING DESIGN, APPEARANCE AND TYPE OF MATERIALS</b></p> <p>Planned property design is not in keeping with existing properties, numbers 2, 4, 6</p> <p>The surrounding area is residential with a mix of mainly 2-storey, detached, semi-detached and terraced houses. All properties in Vicarage Close are 3 and 4-bedroom family homes with no 2-bed properties, as proposed. Properties have spacious front gardens, set back from the road with garages and driveways. We strongly believe that the demolition of one visually attractive detached house in order to build 5 small dwellings creates an unsuitable over-development which in no way enhances the surrounding area in environmental terms.</p> <p>Finally, we came to Hemel Hempstead attracted by what was a well-planned town. These principles still apply and it would be a shame if 18 households were to lose their environment and amenities and be afforded a lower quality of life because of the financial benefit to be potentially achieved by one household who, in all likelihood, will no longer be a member of the local community</p>
3 Vicarage Close	<p>We write this in connection to the proposed plans to build 5 houses on the site of 16 Park Road, HP1. I have examined the plans and we know the site well having moved to Vicarage Close in August 2014. We write this to OBJECT strongly to the proposed development of these 5 houses and will set out the objections as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Planned development on the semi-circle piece of land - The</li> </ol>

proposals show the plan to build a house on the semi-circular piece of land seen opposite 1, 3 and 5 Vicarage Close. The houses situated at 1, 3 and 5 are located in the South East corner of Vicarage Close and are north facing. This location is affected by the lack of light during the day time, especially during the winter months. The current plot as it stands grants the maximum amount of natural light to shine on these premises. The proposals to build a dwelling directly opposite 1, 3 and 5 Vicarage Close will have a dramatic impact on the amount of natural light our properties will receive, especially when you consider the close proximity of the development to the front of our houses. The claustrophobic effect of this development will have an adverse effect of the views offered from the ground and first floor of 1, 3 and 5 Vicarage Close. This development will also overlook the front facing windows of our properties interfering with the current privacy offered.

2. Blind spot in Vicarage Close - The planned development on the semi-circle piece of land within Vicarage Close will create a blind spot for traffic (pedestrian and vehicular) when moving within Vicarage Close. Vicarage Close is a cul-de-sac of 18 houses, all of whom have motor vehicles. The cul-de-sac sees traffic from residents, visitors and commercial on a daily basis. The road as it stands is narrow and therefore traffic has to be careful when moving in and out of the close. I can foresee an issue of safety if the proposed plans are granted. Currently as is stands, if vehicles from 1, 3 and 5 wish to leave their driveway and exit Vicarage Close it is easy to acknowledge vehicles coming up the close as you can see them coming. The proposed plan to build on the semi-circular piece of land will make it impossible to see any vehicular / pedestrian traffic coming up Vicarage Close, especially for the residents of 1, 3 and 5. This blind spot is a massive safety issue and risks creating road traffic collisions. This risk is amplified when you consider that there are many children who play in the close, 5 children residing between 1, 3 and 5 Vicarage Close. This proposed plan will create a massive risk for children playing out in the close, as any vehicular traffic heading up the cul-de-sac will be unsighted to anyone in the road, hidden by the proposed new house.

3. Proposed properties will overlook many properties in Vicarage Close and Park Road - In addition to point 1 which was directed towards the specific dwelling on the semi-circle piece of land, the proposed plans aims for 5 houses in total to be built. Vicarage Close is such a unique development in which none of the current houses overlook one another thus allowing the maximum amount of light for each house. The proposed dwellings will have a dramatic impact on the right to light not only to 1, 3, 3 and 5 but also to 2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close and 18 and 20 Park Road. All the properties highlighted currently enjoy the access to light and privacy as successfully developed by the original property developers, Sunley Homes. The proposed plans appears to put an end to the right to light and privacy currently offered and I feel the plans do not fully address these issues.

4. Increase in vehicle activity and issue of parking - Any new development will always bring an increase in vehicular activity due to modern car ownership. The proposed plan does provide a parking space for each of the 5 new dwellings, however the average household in England, as quoted by nimblefins.co.uk, is 1.3 cars.

Using this statistic, the new development will bring an increase in vehicle traffic to the area, not just an increase in the vehicles associated with the new households, but also visitor and commercial traffic. Vicarage Close has very few opportunities for on-street parking as the majority of the Close consists of dropped kerbs allowing access to driveways. The proposed development removes one of the few opportunities for residential / commercial parking along Vicarage Close. The fear of this reduced parking opportunity may lead to cars parking in the two turning circles within the cul-de-sac or cars parking over the driveways of current residents in Vicarage Close. The vehicle impact will be seen beyond the boundaries of Vicarage Close and will have an impact on the parking on Park Road (a road that offers residential parking along one side of the road only), many of the houses on the South side of Park Road have no driveways and therefore rely on the residential parking spaces outside their houses currently offered on Park Road. Any increase of vehicular traffic will have an adverse effect on noise / pollution in the already densely populated area of Boxmoor.

5. Not in keeping with the current properties - The proposed construction of the 5 new dwellings would not be in keeping with the style of the existing properties on Vicarage Close / Park Road. Many of the properties on both Park Road and Vicarage Close were built from 1930's onwards and as a result sit back from the road and have traditional front gardens / driveways. The design of the proposed housing development offering no front gardens and the proposed roof terraces diverges away from the traditional look of the area and consideration needs to be made to maintain the unique building characteristics the area of Boxmoor currently offers.

6. Wildlife - any proposed development would have an impact on the currently wildlife in the area, reducing the access to open green space wildlife currently enjoy. One interesting point is to raise is the current bat population seen in the area around Vicarage Close, Park Road, especially seen between 16, 18 and 20 Park Road. Any proposed development would have to take into consideration the local bat population and commission a survey.

7. Loss of access to space - As a cul-de-sac the area offers a safe area for residents, especially children, to enjoy the outdoor space in relative peace which includes the semi-circular piece of land. This planned development includes the loss of this open space and will threaten the relative safety of pedestrians due to the increased number of parked and moving vehicles. It has come to our notice recently that the area (semi-circular piece of land) used for play has been sold to a non-resident of Vicarage Close without prior notice being given to any of the residents of Vicarage Close. We are wholeheartedly disappointed by the sale of this land, which we believed was Council owned, without consultation of the local residents. We also wish to bring to notice the lack of a site notice around the area of the proposed development. Given the scale of the development proposed, a site notice would normally be required to be displayed on public land close to the site for a period of 21 days, providing the wider local population with the details of the proposed new development. We ask the Council to look into the sale of the

	<p>semi-circular piece of land and the lack of a site notice being displayed.</p> <p>We understand the apparent financial motive for the proposer however the proposed development will have a long standing detrimental effect on the residents of Vicarage Close and Park Road long after the proposer has moved on. Our reasons have been set out and we OBJECT to the proposed development and urge the Council to reject the application.</p>
<p>4 Vicarage Close</p>	<p>My family and I reside at 4 Vicarage Close, located with less than a 15 metre separation distance (window to window) opposite the houses on proposed development site. This, the carport amenity space and balconies create serious intrusion on our privacy and light - the whole proposal is cramped and contrived.</p> <p>In respect of the above development we are writing to formally object to the planning application. The material planning considerations which should be taken into account in determining the above planning application are summarised below:</p> <p><u>Scale and Character of Development</u></p> <p>The surrounding area is residential comprising a mix of mainly 2 storey, detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings originally all built as one congruous development by Sunley Homes Ltd in the 1960s. All properties in Vicarage Close are three- and four-bedroom family homes (there are no two bed properties as proposed on new development).</p> <p>We consider that the scale, density, height and massing of the proposed development is out of character with the adjoining surrounding residential development which is generally low density with spacious full front gardens back from the road, driveways, garages and proportionally sized back gardens (there are currently no balconies or roof-top terraces as proposed on new development).</p> <p>We consider that the density of the scheme will adversely affect the amenity of the cul-de-sac and remove the central concrete semi-circle children's play area/ amenity space and existing character of the surrounding area. This play area/ amenity space was purchased without any consultation with Vicarage Close residents by the developer. This area also locates mains water and broadband services under it, making it unsuitable for development.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that the demolition of a single (perfectly suitable) residential family 4-bed dwelling and garden to build a provision of 5 houses constitutes an environmentally unfriendly over development of the site that is incongruous to the surrounding area. This development would also see one property being removed from Park Road, creating an increase in housing of 28 per cent, dramatically doubling the dwellings per hectare housing density on the narrow entry to Vicarage Close cul-de-sac.</p> <p>As a result, the above development fails to satisfy the design criteria set out in Policy CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.</p>

### Impact on Highway Safety

The proposed development does not provide adequate provision for car parking for the new properties or guests. The car port entries will add additional parking, traffic and turning stress on the local highway network. This could result in the need to open vehicle access at the end of the road onto Heath Lane, ceasing the cul-de-sac arrangement and creating a through road.

The entry to Vicarage Close has a narrow carriageway that is 4800mm wide. This is less than the neighbouring roads in Charles Street (7,000mm wide) and Park Road (6,000mm wide).

To permit and enable a safe turning radius for the new car port parking and for existing properties 2, 4 and 6, there would need to be changes made to the current resident parking zone, that introduced double yellow lines down both sides of the entry road. This would significantly reduce the currently available residents parking and increase overflow parking stress to Park Road. And contrary to this proposal, this development does cause changes to vehicular access from the public highway.

This is contrary to the provisions of the development plan and Policy CS8 and CS9.

### Additional comments

The overall application submission is ambiguous and lacking in information including important measurement inaccuracies within the drawings.

Notably, it is difficult to judge if rules on the 25- and 45-degree angles to surrounding existing properties are met?

Also, a more detailed Design and Access Statement has not been submitted with the application to consider its potential impact on noise, overlooking or loss of sunlight and daylight to surrounding residential properties?

In addition, screening on the car ports is a slatted wooden design that would cause privacy and noise issues. There are no details provided regarding the existing trees, length of time newly planted trees will take to grow and provide required privacy?

Or how the development of the concrete semi-circle children's play area/ amenity space complies with the development plan and will be replaced by an equally sized area somewhere else in the cul-de-sac?

If permitted, this or some such development would create future potential building plot(s) on the current site of existing properties 2, 4 and 6. This would invite/ create two or possibly more separate developments within the one (as intended) Vicarage Close cul-de-sac.

Considering all of the above we respectfully request that the above

	<p>planning application is refused on the grounds that it is contrary to Policies CS8, CS9, CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p>
<p>5 Vicarage Close</p>	<p>On behalf of my family, I strenuously oppose the proposed 5 home development at the current one home residence of 16 Park Road.</p> <p>We are the newest residents of our close. After having spent months looking at over 20 houses across Hemel Hempstead, we chose 5 Vicarage Close not just for the house itself, but for the privacy the close provided, including a safe space for my two sons (4 and 1 years old) to play as they grew up. It is worth noting that the previous occupant of 5 Vicarage Close, bought the house new and only left because she moved to a retirement community--- we have found that this is not a unique situation for our Close, once people move here, they tend to stay, due to the reasons stated above.</p> <p>But to list our most tangible oppositions:</p> <p>1) I would like to reiterate no 17's opposition to the visual obstruction that the proposed development would add to almost half of the residents of the close, including ourselves. I do not have more to add than they have written below, except to also state that the mitigation that is included in the plans are woeful solutions to what will be an almost complete lack of privacy for a significant number of houses. As I mentioned above, one of the main reasons we moved to the close was because it allowed for an open space for my children and other young children to play outside safely and securely. My son just learned to ride his bike and I have felt so lucky that we can let him practice on the semi-circle and the main road of the Close because he (and I) can see any oncoming vehicles with plenty of time to react. The addition of building on the current open semi-circle will not only take away a space that is currently used by my children to explore and play, but would obscure any oncoming cars up the narrow road separating 2,4,6, and the proposed development. Lastly, there are water-mains and broadband wiring located under the semi-circle that surely would prohibit any development?</p> <p>2) An increase in both vehicles and parking need would cause congestion and bottle-necking at the base of the close.</p> <p>3) We (particularly my 4 year old) are very worried about the damage or destruction to the habitat of the bats that reside in our Close.</p> <p>It is really unfortunate that after deciding so recently to build and grow our family and community in Vicarage close that we weren't made aware that the deeds to the semi-circle located at the back of 16 Park Road was for sale. It does feel like the rug was pulled out from under us and that the area could be used for something less cynical that continues to foster the sense of community that the Close offers.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for taking the time to listen to those of us that will be affected by these plans. The seriousness and validity of our objections are bolstered and vindicated by support from our local government, including our councillors and the MP, Sir Mike Penning, who has indicated he has written to your office.</p>

7 Vicarage Close	<p>My Family strongly object to the development of land to replace existing house with 5 new dwellings, Myself and my Family have lived on vicarage close for 42 years, our children and grandchildren have grown up on Vicarage close, it has always been safe environment for our children to grow up in, we have deep concerns regarding this proposed development.</p> <p>We feel that that the proposed development would be an overdevelopment of the allocated plot, this will greatly affect the local environment and will be overlooking our neighbours properties which would reduce the privacy we have all enjoyed for so many years. The new development would increase the traffic within the street, and we will there would be insufficient parking spacing resulting it being more hazardous for our children to enjoy the safety the street has always provided, we are also concerned with the loss of open space and the amenity area this development will cause, deeply effecting our grandchildren.</p> <p>We are concerned with traffic and increased parking in vicarage close. this will decrease road safety in the area making it more hazardous for our children to play and enjoy the environment that they have done so for many years.</p> <p>The proposed units do not have any front gardens or driveways as does the entire street, this would be completely out of character and intrusive to its current residents.</p>
8 Vicarage Close	<p>I object to the development for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic Have Traffic Engineers assessed the safety and practicality of the increase traffic flow and accommodation of additional vehicles? If not please confirm that such an assessment will be undertaken. Particular attention should be given to traffic movement in and out of the Close, ensuring that the limited levels of visitor parking are not reduced but extended, make allowance for potential disabled parking, and the safety of entry and exiting from the proposed development parking spaces. Please be guided by practicality rather than hiding behind inadequate existing minimums parking requirements.</li> <li>2. Out of character design The proposals do not respect and reflect the neighbourhood character. Neighbourhood characteristics that are not taken into consideration include: plot size and shape, streetscape, front setbacks, architectural style, location of car parking or size of private open space. In addition, the gradient difference will have an impact on the adjacent plots on Park Road and opposite in Vicarage Close.</li> <li>3. Loss of pavement and amenity space It is outrageous that the semi-circular pavement and amenity area at the top of the potential development is under threat. The change of use should be rejected in line with the Local Plan rules. Ideally, both uses will be preserved despite the change of ownership. There are potential safety issues if this use of this area is changed.</li> </ol>

	<p>4. Pavements adjacent to proposed development. It appears that the proposed plots currently have their bin stores directly outside their kitchen windows. It is unlikely that future occupants would want to use this storage due to the hazard and smell, particularly during the summer months. This seems impractical and as a result, bins may be permanently left out and become an obstruction on the pavement.</p> <p>5. Density The density of development is greedily excessive.</p> <p>6. Light Clearly there will be potential loss of light issues for adjacent houses, yet there is no evidence of a daylight and sunlight assessment. Please confirm that such an assessment will be undertaken. Even the proposed new treeline could result in further light reduction.</p> <p>7. Noise It is difficult to understand how the potential noise impact on adjacent properties can be acceptable given the density of development.</p> <p>8. Services Is there sufficient capacity and access to existing services, ie water, gas, electricity, and telecoms?</p> <p>9. Wildlife Given that endangered wildlife has been sighted, please confirm that a full wildlife assessment will be undertaken.</p>
9 Vicarage Close	<p>I have lived in this close since it was built in 1966 and have brought up my family here. I love where I live and feel strongly that this build is just not suitable, not only for this area, but for the small plot at 16 Park Road and the land to the rear.</p> <p>Parking is at a premium in this area and is controlled and helped with residents permits. Even so, when it is busy cars have to park opposite our driveways making it extremely difficult to reverse out and they also park on the road/pavement outside our properties making it difficult to gain access to our driveways. The addition of these 5 houses will only add to the problem.</p> <p>The new houses will have a negative impact on the close. House number 1 on the semi circular area will be stuck in the middle of the close and look very out of place. Also the current space is where local children have played for generations. My children and other children in the Close played there as children. It was a safe place where children would congregate to play Barbie's, bikes, hopscotch, skipping, as well as football, etc. It was a safe communal area for them to play where adults could keep an eye on them all while giving them a sense of community and independence. It would be a shame to see this taken away.</p> <p>A lot of the neighbours will suffer due to the proposed new houses being so close to their homes. Houses 1 and 3 will feel cramped into a</p>

	<p>corner, overshadowed by the house on the semi circle. While houses 2, 4 and 6 will have their windows looked straight into, which must be an invasion of privacy?</p> <p>Please help to protect the Close that I and my family dearly love, to secure a pleasant future for all of its residents.</p>
10 Vicarage Close	<p>I oppose the proposed development of 16 Park Road. This would heavily impact parking in our area, making entering and exiting our driveway a difficult manoeuvre. We also object to the over development of the design. We think this area should remain as it was originally intended with open space.</p>
11 Vicarage Close	<p>I unfortunately object to the development of land to replace 1 existing house with 5 new houses.</p> <p>Whilst I support development on this occasion it is my belief / opinion that this is an over development of this piece of land and will result in increased traffic which I do not think the area will cope with. This will then lead to the increased demand for parking.</p> <p>This development will lead to over population of the area, increase the noise levels and reduce the access to the open space of the close where residents meet as a community.</p> <p>Finally the roof terraces are not in keeping with the surrounding properties and will encroach on neighbouring properties privacy.</p>
12 Vicarage Close	<p>We purchased our family home in 1997 in Vicarage Close due to the benefits that our children would gain from using its open space layout. Our children have used this area on regular occasions over the past years, and the other children from the neighbourhood have also enjoyed playing in this area, making camps and playing games. This is the only communal area that our children have in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Respectively, we were very disappointed to hear that this space (believed to be common land for the residents) had been sold without public notice. How could this be possible?</p> <p>Another impact will be the increase in cars within the area. This will strongly impact the ability to enter or exit the driveway of our house, as there is limited narrow space across the road in an area that cars would need to use.</p> <p>This over development proposal would spoil the open space environment of the close that the original designer had intended for this community.</p> <p>Additionally, during the winter months, the hill entry to Vicarage close is occasionally impassable due to ice on the steep surface. The current north-side 1.5 fence shades the road from thawing. This higher development will make this situation dangerous for cars and pedestrians.</p>
14 Vicarage Close	<p>I would like to register my objection to the planning application reference 20/01866/FUL at 16 Park Road.</p>

	<p>I have lived in Vicarage Close since the houses were built in 1966, making me a resident here for 54 years.</p> <p>Never in my time here have I seen such a shocking plan to build five properties in place of just one house and it is clear to me that this is a massive over development of the site and not in keeping with houses in this area.</p> <p>When I moved in all those years ago in 1966 I was told by the Sales Office that the amenity space was a designated children's play area. I was very saddened to realise that our amenity space which children have used to play on for decades has been bought without consent and could potentially be turned in to an eyesore for Vicarage Close. This Close has always had an open outlook and feel with no development since the original development was built approximately sixty years ago.</p> <p>I do not believe that the proposed development would be 23 metres away from my home and this proposed development will ruin the feel of the close and will have a detrimental effect on parking, noise, privacy and the loss of our beloved amenity space.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that you will conclude that this one existing dwelling is not suitable as a development site in such an established area.</p> <p>The whole of Vicarage Close is a very close knit community and this proposed planning application has had a huge impact, not only for myself, but also for the elderly residents that enjoy the peaceful environment in Vicarage Close.</p> <p>There have been no Site Notices anywhere within the Close or in Park Road and I strongly believe that this proposed development will cause nothing but heartache and the new proposed dwellings would be tiny and not afford the new residents a good quality of living.</p> <p>Although each proposed house has one car parking space the reality is that more parking will be need that what is proposed, plus parking for visitors which is not being taken in to account. This will make Vicarage Close congested and unsafe for elderly residents and children in Vicarage Close.</p> <p>Please refuse this planning application for the sake of the entire Close and a visit to the site would, I'm sure, prove that this is just a house with a garden and not a development site.</p> <p>Many thanks for your time in considering my objection to this planning application.</p>
15 Vicarage Close	<p>Loss of the semi-circular amenity area, originally designated as a general amenity space for the residents of Vicarage Close. There was no consultation on the sale of this and we believed it was Council owned as they have maintained it previously. The proposal is an over-development of the plot. There is insufficient parking allocation which would lead to increased parking within the Close. Existing residents</p>

	<p>close to the new development would be greatly impacted. Where will visitors park? Access to the Close for Emergency vehicle's/Refuge Collection/Delivery vans etc. Could be impacted too. There have been no site notices posted re the proposal</p> <p>This proposal is not in keeping with the character of the area. It is cramped and contrived and will have a big impact on many of the existing residents</p>
16 Vicarage Close	<p>I wholeheartedly agree with the sentiments expressed so far by my neighbours for opposing this development. The project is totally unreasonable and shows little consideration for local residents. All comments that have been made so far are quite valid, however here are some of which I am particularly concerned:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why destroy a perfectly good family home, which has recently been refurbished, seems like a waste of valuable materials to me?</li> <li>2. Why build any new properties here when there are (still?)plans to build just off the Link Road,where there is plenty of space and no residents to disturb?</li> <li>3. We already have a parking problem, with vehicles regularly obstructing the footpaths and larger (delivery) vans having trouble negotiating the narrow access road to Vicarage Close. Building five new homes here, even with 6 parking spaces, will only compound the problem.</li> <li>4. I understand from some of the original residents that the tarmac semicircle at the back of 16 Park Road was intended as a children's play area when the close was constructed in 1966. Most people here say that it should still be a communal area.</li> </ol> <p>To summarise: 5 homes on a plot that was designed for just one cannot be satisfactory to anybody.</p>
17 Vicarage Close	<p>On behalf of my family I strongly oppose the proposed development. Having resided in Vicarage Close as a child before more recently becoming a homeowner here myself, I know the local area well. Whilst I understand that the proposal is financially lucrative for the proposer, I put it to you that in cost/benefit terms, these plans pose severe detriment to the local community on social and environmental grounds.</p> <p>Whilst my family's concerns are abundant, my key reasons for opposition are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The designed appearance of the proposed dwellings is not in keeping with the local built environment.</li> </ol> <p>The proposed housing development is of higher density than the adjacent detached properties that exist to the South (18 Park Road), lie parallel to the North (2, 4, 6 Vicarage Close) and line Park Road (nos 17, 19, 25) at its perpendicular intersection with Vicarage Close to the East. The design of the proposed units which lack any front</p>

gardens/open space and include roof terraces are completely out of character with these properties and the remainder of the properties in Vicarage Close which sit back from the road as a result of their traditional front gardens and/or driveways. I am in no doubt that these new houses, of completely different design, would visually appear at odds to the sensitively and holistically planned development that emerged as Vicarage Close in the mid 1960s.

2) The proposed properties will directly overlook 18 Park Road and several properties in Vicarage Close, and will block light to existing homes in Vicarage Close.

Sunley Homes successfully designed the current Vicarage Close development to allow penetration of light and, very importantly, to ensure that no home is overlooked by other houses within the Close. The 5 proposed dwellings (2 pairs and one single, linked by car ports and overlain by first floor 1.5m high wall-lined terraces) present as one parallel 38 m long block to the 3 detached houses (nos 2, 4 and 6) only a stone's throw away, across the (4.8 m) narrow road. This will act as significant obstruction to light and heat for these properties whose south-facing frontages currently receive light from the open space surrounding the one detached house that this development is proposed to replace.

Arguably, of yet greater concern is the close and extreme visual intrusion that the detached properties in Vicarage Close (nos 2, 4 and 6) and Park Road (nos 18 and 20) and the 5 town houses in Vicarage Close (nos 1, 3, 14, 16 and 18) are expected to suffer under this proposal as a result of being suddenly and newly overlooked. I am confident that you will agree that the proposed trees between the new properties and 18 Park Road and the proposed planting beds to the edges of the first floor terraces "to reduce visual impact" are potentially removable and simply represent a vain and unrealistic attempt to imply preserved privacy! The terrace walls, 1.3m or 1.5m high, whilst blocking light, lie below head height for the average teenager and adult and are therefore inadequate in this respect.

3) There will be significantly increased vehicle activity in Vicarage Close and its intersection with Park Road

According to these plans, the number of households is proposed to increase by 28%. The current demographic structure in Vicarage Close suggests that traffic will therefore increase by at least this amount. The increased noise and movement would be of detriment to the quality of life of residents within the Close, and even Park Road, but particularly to those properties that line the east-west branch of Vicarage Close extending from its intersection with Park Road. The road was planned to feed traffic from properties on one side, not both sides as is now proposed, and is therefore narrow at 4.8m. Even cars do not pass in opposing directions on this road; vehicles entering and exiting the Close are required to wait at the Vicarage Close/Park Road intersection and the north-south/east-west intersection of Vicarage Close respectively to allow an oncoming vehicle access. Vicarage Close is a cul-de-sac with one entrance/exit - the increased commotion, particularly at the bottom of Vicarage Close (outside 2

	<p>Vicarage Close, 19 and 25 Park Road) is a potential problem in the waiting.</p> <p>4) Increased vehicles will place unacceptable pressure on parking in Vicarage Close.</p> <p>Vicarage Close is too narrow to allow street parking for more than a couple of cars without looking unsightly, causing congestion and chaos, and posing a safety hazard. Since 'Statistica' confirms that the average number of cars per household in the South East is well above one, it seems reasonable to predict that new residents will arrive with more than the one vehicle that can be accommodated by a property's car port. It can only therefore be assumed that the surplus residents' and visitors' vehicles will be parked in the designated turning area at the top of the cul-de-sac (opposite no 19), on Vicarage Close's curbs that were never designed to bear this weight and possibly in Park Road, which is already lined with parked cars. In this situation, it will become impossible for refuse lorries to gain access and I fear for the safety of pedestrians (from within the Close and those who regularly use it to connect Park Road with Heath Lane), as well as for inhabitants should the emergency services need to gain access quickly to homes within the Close.</p> <p>5) Increased density of buildings will reduce access to open space in Vicarage Close.</p> <p>I am grateful for the freedom that Vicarage Close afforded me as a child in the 1970s and 80s. Since, by design, houses look onto the Close, vehicular movement was (and still is) relatively limited and there is a good amount of open space, I was able to play safely with friends in the fresh air, despite the majority of properties having relatively small back gardens. Although I do feel let down by the Council, Sunley Homes and the current owner of the deeds in the fact that the Close's extremely valuable amenity space at the rear of 16 Park Road was allowed to be sold off, I am pleased that my own children have also had access to a safe outside environment for play. I feel for the current (and future) households who have children whose recreational space (previously known as 'the white pavement') is threatened with replacement by property and whose opportunity for outside play in the cul-de-sac would be rendered unsafe due to the increased number of parked and moving vehicles. As someone who values our green/open space, I also ask that full consideration is given to the wildlife and particularly the bats that are regularly seen in this area, in environmental terms.</p> <p>I shall appreciate your close consideration of these 'costs' which I believe without hesitation, render this proposal highly inappropriate. I strongly urge you to prevent these plans from posing a risk to the local community and its environment and a negative impact that is both irreversible and sets extremely concerning precedent for future developments in this area.</p>
19 Vicarage Close	We at the above address, having lived here since we were one of the

first families to move into the close in 1966, vehemently object to this proposed development which is in complete contrast to the current Vicarage Close and Park Road developments and communities.

It is self-evident that the proposed development has paid no cognisance of the surrounding houses, the local community, the local residents or the loss of an amenity space (which we believe under current legislation should never have been sold off and furthermore the change of land use is detrimental to the local residents and community). Instead it is purely an attempt by someone who wishes to seize an opportunity by developing an existing house and its land, selling up and moving away from the area and with the sole aim is to make a significant amount of money, regardless of the social and environmental impact on the existing residents, local community and the surrounding roads, after they have left.

The opposition to this development and the reasons for the objections would be obvious to anyone who surveys the existing Vicarage Close, Park Road, the surrounding area or troubles to talk to the existing residents, because clearly the proposed development is totally out of keeping with the existing dwellings and surrounding space. We set out below our more specific objections to this development, as follows;

1. The proposal is deemed to be an overdevelopment of the site in accordance with the number of dwellings per hectare of the existing space. The proposals are not in keeping with the spacious character of the area, as the number of dwellings have been squashed into a relatively small space, in order to solely maximise the financial gain, rather than consideration of everything that a property developer and the local authority should consider when assessing a new development, in the middle of an existing residential area. This is conflict with the provisions of the Dacorum Borough Council Local Plan (Appendix 3) and Policy CS11a.

2. The proposals are at conflict with the Dacorum Borough Council Local Plan (Appendix 3) which states "Proposals should be guided by the existing topographical features of the site and its immediate surroundings. They should respect the character of the surrounding area, and in particular there must be adequate space for the proposed development without creating a cramped appearance". Clearly the proposals do not comply.

3. The proposals additionally conflict with the Dacorum Core Strategy Policy CS12 which states that the new development should "integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties....". The proposed development conflicts with the provisions of this strategy in every regard, and in particular the spacing between dwellings, and more importantly the existing spacious layout of the existing development.

Additionally the proposed development sites all houses very close to the road, unlike the existing Vicarage Close properties where the properties are set back from the road with a driveway and front garden, likewise the new proposed dwellings have less than 5m rear gardens which are less than half the size of the existing dwellings.

Accordingly this proposal cannot possibly be construed as integrating with the existing?

4. In addition we further note that these proposed new dwellings have first floor terraces and crown roofs, neither of which are either in keeping or an attempt to integrate into the existing streetscape.

5. We understand that a core principle of planning is to always secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of the land and buildings, a matter echoed in the Core Strategy Policy CS12(c) which states that a development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight, loss of privacy and disturbance to the surrounding properties.

It is self-evident that the proposed development is visually intrusive, will result in both the loss of natural daylight and sunlight to the properties which will be directly opposite both the front and the back of the proposed new house on what was always known as "the white pavement", along with those houses numbered 2, 4 and 6 Vicarage Close. Additionally the proposed new dwellings will impact on and provide direct disturbance to all of the surrounding properties in both Vicarage Close and Park Road.

6. It is furthermore noted that the proposed new dwellings provide insufficient spaces for the parking of vehicles and hence this will inevitably lead to cars being parked in the road causing traffic congestion and health and safety issues for pedestrians. This issue will become further compounded by the significant increase in vehicular activity in the Close with a minimum of five resident vehicles, and more likely 10nr, as the majority of households have two vehicles these days, along with all additional deliveries and visitors, generated by the 28% increase in properties in the close.

7. The proposed new dwellings increases the volume of properties within the close by 28% when clearly the original Close was planned and developed with character and spacing of properties in mind and hence so to just rip up this original development and cram 28% additional properties into significantly less than 20% of the area of the existing Close is completely out of context with the surrounding area and the existing development.

8. Lastly there is the issue of the amenity space at the rear of the existing 16 Park Road, which when the close was first built was known as the "white pavement" due to the white paving slabs, maintained by the local council. It was an area played on by young children, including our own three children right from the early 1970's, until they grew up and moved away. Since then it has been played on by all children living in the close until such time as it was sold off unbeknown to the local residents, and yet now the owner is proposing to change the use of this community space. Surely this must require its own planning application in its own right?

The proposed change of use from a children's play area on land all residents believed to be council owned land (particularly as the land has always been maintained by the local council) is wholly unjust and

against all planning legislation.

In addition and lastly there is according to the Close "Title Deeds" a right of way which exists across this piece of land, and this can only be from the footpath adjacent to the existing 16 Park Road fence, across the semi-circle piece of land to the footpath at the bottom of the close by Nr1 Vicarage Close. Clearly a right of way for pedestrian access cannot be built across. Equally a change of land use needs to comply with certain planning restrictions, and this proposed development fails to comply with any such restrictions.

We believe that taking into consideration all of the foregoing, along with the other complaints registered by all local residents coupled with the support provided by both local councillors and our Local Member of Parliament, it can only be viewed that this proposed development fails to comply with any local planning conditions, local authority planning requirements, social or environmental considerations and should be rejected as it is unjust and non-compliant with all local planning requirements in every respect.