

ITEM NUMBER: 5c

20/01754/MFA	Construction of 28 residential units with associated access, parking and landscaping	
Site Address:	Land off Tring Road, Wilstone	
Applicant/Agent:	Rectory Homes Ltd	
Case Officer:	Robert Freeman	
Parish/Ward:	Tring Rural Parish	Tring West & Rural
Referral to Committee:	The application has been referred to the Development Management Committee due to a contrary recommendation to the Parish Council and at the request of Councillor Hollinghurst	

1. RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 That this application be **DELEGATED** with a view to **APPROVAL** subject to the completion of a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended).

2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 The proposed development is considered to deliver significant social and economic benefits in the form of housing and affordable housing and would support the sustainable development of the village of Wilstone in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). These benefits are considered to weigh in favour of the grant of planning permission in this case.
- 2.2 The development is considered to be a high quality and accessible residential scheme and would support the planning objectives under Policies CS8, CS11, CS12, CS17, CS19 and CS20 and CS29 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendices 3 and 5 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

- 3.1 The application site is located beyond the northern edge of the village of Wilstone and in the designated Rural Area. The site extends to 1.57 ha of largely level agricultural fields between the residential units at Grange Road, Wilstone and the development at Wilstone Wharf.
- 3.2 The site is accessible from an agricultural field gate located at the south western corner of the site and providing a gap in an existing mature hedgerow demarcating the boundary of the site from Tring Road.
- 3.3 Two storey residential units at Grange Road back onto the southern boundary of the application site and there are a number of single storey dwellings opposite the western site boundary marking the northern extent of the village. To the east of the application site are further agricultural fields in arable use with allotments beyond. The site is physically constrained to the north by the Aylesbury Arm of the Grand Union Canal.

4. BACKGROUND

- 4.1 A current application by Rectory Homes for the provision of 15 houses on land to the rear of Grange Road has not been determined (4/00024/19/MFA)
- 4.2 This live application (4/00024/19/MFA) seeks to secure planning permission for 15 'entry level' homes on a proportion of the current application site and utilising the provisions under paragraph 71 of the NPPF.
- 4.3 Paragraph 71 of the NPPF states that:
- “Local planning authorities should support the development of entry-level exception sites, suitable for first time buyers (or those looking to rent their first home) unless the need for such homes is already being met within the authority’s area. These sites should be on land which is not already allocated for housing...”*
- 4.4 This planning application seeks to capitalise on the Councils lack of a five year housing land supply and the encouragement towards entry-level homes in the NPPF which has left sites adjacent to settlements and not subject to statutory protection (Green Belt and AONB) subject to development proposals.
- 4.5 The NPPF provides that units provided under paragraph 71 of the NPPF should be subject to the affordable housing definitions in Annex 2 thereto. This extends to the provision of Starter homes or Discounted Market homes where the units may be sold at a rate up to 20% below local market value.
- 4.6 The applicant’s assumption is that they can pursue an affordable housing proposal delivering entry level homes in this location in accordance with Policy 71 of the NPPF. It is argued that such housings would meet a Borough wide housing need for this form of dwelling. It is contended that these properties are not required to meet a local/Parish housing need.
- 4.7 The case officer does not agree that the provision of the entry level homes under 4/00024/19/MFA would be suitable for first time buyers and would comply with other policies in the NPPF regards Rural Housing (paragraphs 77-79). These entry level homes would not address the requirement for rural housing to address local needs under the Framework and would fail to meet the requirements under Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy.
- 4.8 The Tring Rural Parish Housing Needs Assessment clearly identifies that the needs of the village are for smaller units of housing for social rent in line with more general affordable housing requirements under Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy. The Local Housing Needs assessment goes further and suggest that discounted market homes (as provided under 4/00024/19/MFA) would be unaffordable for local residents and would do little to address local need and although the applicants claim that this is not required to do so under paragraph 71 of the NPPF, would be a clear conflict with paragraph 77 thereto.
- 4.9 Pre-application advice has been sought in relation to both the current and previous applications.

5. PROPOSAL

- 5.1 The current proposals seek planning permission for the construction of 28 units on a larger site (1.5ha) to that previously considered and bounded by the Grand Union Canal to the north.

- 5.2 The proposals would comprise a mix of 1 bed flats, 2, 3 and 4 bed homes in terraced, detached and semi-detached form with access from Tring Road. These would be two storeys in height.
- 5.3 The scheme would provide a total of 7 units for affordable rent, 3 units of shared ownership, 4 units available at a discounted market rate and 14 open market units. A total of 50% of the units to be secured would meet with the definition of affordable housing within Annex 2 of the NPPF.
- 5.4 Residential development of the site would be constrained to an area some 1.13 ha in size with the remaining land comprising an area of public open space between the residential units and the boundary of the application site within which there would be a modest attenuation basin. This public open space will be landscaped and safeguarded for use by the general public. The open space also contains an attenuation basin.

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 at Appendix B.

7. 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
CS7 – Rural Area
CS8 – Sustainable Transport
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS13 - Quality of Public Realm
CS17 - New Housing
CS18 - Mix of Housing
CS19 - Affordable Housing
CS20 – Rural Sites for Affordable Homes
CS23 – Social Infrastructure
CS26 - Green Infrastructure
CS27 – Quality of the Historic Environment
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

CS30 – Sustainability Offsetting
CS31 - Water Management
CS32 - Air, Soil and Water Quality
CS35 - Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Hertfordshire County Council Waste Core Strategy

Policy 1: Strategy for the Provision for Waste Management Facilities.
Policy 2: Waste Prevention and Reduction: &
Policy 12: Sustainable Design, Construction and Demolition.

Saved Policies of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan

Policy 10 - Optimising the use of urban land
Policy 12 - Infrastructure Provision and Phasing
Policy 13 - Planning Conditions and Obligations
Policy 18 - Size of New Dwellings
Policy 21 - Density of Residential Development
Policy 51 - Development and Transport Impacts
Policy 54 - Highway Design
Policy 58 - Private Parking Provision
Policy 99 - Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland
Policy 118 - Important Archaeological Remains.
Appendix 3 - Layout and Design of Residential Areas

Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

Affordable Housing (Jan 2013)
Car Parking Standards (November 2020)
Energy Efficiency & Conservation (June 2006)
Water Conservation & Sustainable Drainage (June 2005)

Advice Notes and Appraisals

Affordable Housing Advice Note
Sustainable Development Advice Note (March 2011)

8. CONSIDERATIONS

Policy and Principle

- 8.1 Wilstone is an identified settlement within the Rural Area where there would be support for the provision of small scale housing schemes in accordance with Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.2 There is no definition of small-scale within the Core Strategy and as such each case will need to be judged on its own merits. The NPPF allows for the provision of entry level housing sites under paragraph 77 of the Core Strategy up to a hectare in size and/or representing a 5% increase in dwellings. The proposed scheme would only just exceed 1ha in developable area however it does amount to an approximate increase in the housing stock of Wilstone by around 10%. In this context, the scheme may not be considered to be small scale.
- 8.3 The key planning objectives in relation to the extension of any settlement would be:

- a) to make an effective use of land in accordance with Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 10 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011,
- b) to ensure that the proposals would be accessible in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy,
- c) to ensure that the proposals would be a high quality design in accordance with Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy
- d) to safeguard or mitigate for the impact on environmental assets in accordance with Policy CS26, CS27 and CS28 of the Core Strategy and
- e) to ensure that the infrastructure associated with the development of the site is appropriate in accordance with Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy.

Housing Land Supply

- 8.4 The housing target in Policy CS17 sets a level of housing which the Council expects to achieve and exceed of the Core Strategy. As members will be aware this target is for the provision of an average of 430 dwellings per annum between 2006 and 2031. This is anticipated to increase as progress is made on a new Single Local Plan (SLP) and as a result of the governments housing projections.
- 8.5 The Council is not at present able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites as required by the NPPF and as a consequence must consider the proposal against the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11) The Council is obligated, under paragraph 11, to grant planning permission unless the policies in the Framework provide a clear reason for refusal or the adverse impact of doing so would out-weigh the benefits when assessed under the framework.
- 8.6 This requires a balancing exercise of the economic, social and environmental impacts of development.
- 8.7 The site would not comprise designated land (Green Belt or AONB) within the NPPF and as such is susceptible to residential development under paragraph 11. Furthermore paragraph 77 of the NPPF would encourage the development of unallocated sites on the edges of settlements to meet a need for starter or entry level homes.

Affordable Housing

- 8.8 Policy NP1 of the Core Strategy requires the Council to take a positive approach to the consideration of development proposals and work pro-actively with applicants to find solutions for development proposals that help to improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in Dacorum.
- 8.9 This scheme attempts to resolve the impasse between the applicant and the case officer referred to in paragraphs 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8 regarding the provision of affordable housing in the scheme. The proposals have been negotiated having regard to the provisions in the NPPF, Policy CS18, CS19 and CS20 of the Core Strategy to provide an acceptable alternative to scheme 4/00024/19/MFA, thus avoiding the need to debate the requirements within the NPPF and to provide a more sustainable form of residential use of the site. It is anticipated that scheme 4/00024/19/MFA will be withdrawn in the event of a successful outcome.

- 8.10 The proposed scheme provides a greater mix of housing types and affordable tenures in accordance with Policies CS18 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and specifically seeks to address the issue of local need for affordable units as set out in Policy CS20, that would not be provided if an entry-level housing scheme only was constructed.
- 8.11 The scheme, as distinct from application 4/00024/19/MFA will provide a number of units of the type and tenure identified as being required through the Tring Rural Parish Housing Needs Survey (June 2018) and with the local connection required under Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.12 The Tring Rural Parish Housing Needs Survey was produced by CDA Herts. CDA Herts work with rural communities to explore the issue of affordable housing and identify whether there is a need for affordable local housing and how to meet that need. CDA Herts concluded that there was a need¹ to provide 3 x 1 bed units, 9 x 2 bed units and 1 x 3 bed units. The greatest need was for affordable rental units although there is also a demand for shared ownership tenures recognised through this work.
- 8.13 Amongst the gross number for affordable housing units a need for 4 x 1 bed flats and 6 x 2 bed houses was identified. This proposal will provide 7 units for affordable rent including, the 4 x 1 bed flats (gross) needed at this tenure, 3 shared ownership units and 4 discounted market homes. 8 x 2 bed units and 2 x 3 bed units will also be secured for affordable housing purposes reflecting the size of property required in the Parish. Larger units would be provided at a discounted market rate. This split of tenures is considered to reflect the tenure requirements identified in the CDA Herts report on local housing need and in particular the communities preferred split between rental and shared ownership properties in Figure 13 thereto (60:40).
- 8.14 The delivery of housing to address and identified local need is afforded significant weight in the decision to recommend the grant of planning permission in this case.
- 8.15 The need to support the delivery of these tenures of affordable homes in this locality through the inclusion of open market units within the scheme has support in paragraph 77 of the NPPF and Policies NP1 and CS19 of the Core Strategy. This has been considered with the benefit of an appraisal of the overall scheme viability of both this application and the undetermined proposals at 4/00024/19/MFA.
- 8.16 Policy CS19 would normally expect the mix of affordable tenures to reflect a 75:25 split between rental and shared ownership tenancies. However, Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy is clear that judgements about the level, mix and tenure of affordable homes should have regard to housing need and overall scheme viability. Paragraph 77 of the NPPF suggests that rural housing schemes should primarily address local needs and be supported by the provision of open market units where necessary to support scheme viability.
- 8.17 Although open market housing would not normally be supported under Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy, in this case, the inclusion of open market housing is considered necessary to support the viability of the proposals and to provide a commensurate (lower) scheme value per hectare to that pursued under the alternative proposals (400024/19/MFA) The alternative use value is a material consideration in considering the viability of development and in the judgement of affordable housing requirements.

¹ The gross need is halved in order to provide greater certainty that there will be an unmet future local demand for any projects that come forward (CDA Herts 2018)

- 8.18 It should be noted that in overall terms, the provision of 50% affordable housing across tenures is a significant level of affordable housing which should be supported.

Layout and Design

- 8.19 The scheme is considered to represent a high quality residential scheme in accordance with Chapter 12 of the NPPF, Policies CS10, CS11, CS12 and CS13 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan.
- 8.20 The layout and arrangement of residential units, landscaping and amenity space is considered to strike an appropriate balance between the need to make best use of land and provide a soft, landscaped, natural and defensible boundary at the northern edge of the settlement of Wilstone.
- 8.21 The density of the proposed development, equating to 24 dwellings per hectare² falls between the low density residential bungalows in Tring Road (13 dph) and higher density housing at Grange Road (27dph) whilst around 25% of the application site area would be provided as public open space. The relatively low density of the proposed development, nature of boundary treatment and limited number of properties to Tring Road would not result in a significant urbanisation of Tring Road nor result in significant wider harm to the character and appearance of the rural area. This is considered appropriate for the edge of village location and given the range of different house forms utilised within the layout.
- 8.22 The layout of the scheme allows for a continuation of the strong linear frontage of properties to Tring Road and will infill a gap in built form between Grange Road/Tring Road and Wilstone Wharf. The internal layout allows properties to address either the principal access route or private drives. Dual frontages and 'L' shaped buildings are used in sensitive locations to increase active frontages to the street and open space areas. Back to back distances between properties are often significantly in excess of the 23m distance within Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan, whilst the arrangement of properties also allows generous private external amenity spaces.
- 8.23 The proposed dwellings would be of a traditional design and reflect the local vernacular of residential buildings within the location. They have been amended through the course of this application in accordance with the advice of the Conservation and Design team and further drawings have been submitted to fully address the comments in the associated representations below. As such they are now considered to be appropriate in terms of their design, bulk, scale, height and mass in accordance with Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy. A modest material palette would be used comprising brick, render, timber weatherboard cladding and tile/slate roofs in accordance with the recommendations of the Conservation and Design section. These are set out in drawing P220 SP 03 Revision B (Proposed Materials Plan).
- 8.24 Although a high level of on-street parking is to be provided to the rear of plots 4-11 the provision of soft landscaping would break up the amount of hard standing and provide visual relief to this street. There is still a need to consider amendments to the boundary treatment of this area in accordance with the comments of the Conservation and Design team and given some concerns with regards to the appearance of fencing in this location. This could be relieved by the inclusion of walls or hedges to provide a more satisfactory appearance. It is recommended that such details are secured in accordance with condition 10 to this report. An element of surveillance to the car park at the rear of plots 4-11 would be provided from fenestration in the flank elevations of plots 12 and 18, with unrestricted views provided from the front elevation of plot 19 along the associated access. To a lesser

² Based on the developed site area of 1.18ha.

extent the occupants of 90 Tring Road may also be aware of activity within this area. It is therefore considered that, despite the concerns of the Crime Prevention Officer, sufficient measures are incorporated in the scheme within the interests of crime prevention and security.

Impact on Heritage Assets

8.25 The submitted Archaeological Assessment indicates that the development identifies that there is negligible to low potential for the site to incorporate archaeological remains or heritage assets. No concerns have been raised by the Conservation and Design team in relation to heritage assets within the vicinity of the application site including the grade II listed Wilstone Bridge, whose setting will not be adversely affected by the proposals in accordance with Policy CS27 of the Core Strategy.

Impact on Residential Amenity

8.26 The proposed residential units have been arranged in broad accordance with Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011 in order to ensure a satisfactory level of residential amenity for future occupants.

8.27 The buildings have been carefully sited to ensure that there is also no significant adverse impact upon the residential amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.

8.28 The main impact of development will be upon the residential amenities of properties in Grange Road. The proposed terrace at plots 12-14 would be two storeys in height and would be located some 24.8m from the main rear elevation of properties in Grange Road. This distance significantly exceeds the recommended back to back distance in Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan and is considered to provide an acceptable relationship to ensure that there is no significant loss in privacy, daylight or sunlight thereto.

8.29 The relationship between 90 Tring Road and plots 8-11 is also considered to be satisfactory in view of the distance and juxtaposition of properties.

Access, Parking and Movement

8.30 The proposals include a new priority T junction with a kerbed entrance leading to an internal access road and a series of private driveways. The proposed access design is of an acceptable width to enable two vehicles to pass one another and the general designs are in accordance with design criteria as laid out in Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide.

8.31 The T junctions been designed with appropriate visibility splays for the speed and juxtaposition of Tring Road and is considered to be a safe and convenient access onto Tring Road for the level of use by both future occupants and service providers including refuse and fire vehicles in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy. Within the site, the highway layout allows sufficient space for the access and circulation of larger vehicles with designated refuse stores provided within acceptable distances for refuse tenders. Each residential unit would be accessible by fire tenders in the event of an emergency. As such the internal layout of the estate is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy

8.32 Vehicular parking will be provided through a combination of garages, on-plot driveway parking and off-road street parking or parking courts. The level of parking complies with the standards contained within the Car Parking Standards SPD (November 2020), based on an

analysis of parking provision being provided on an allocated basis. Furthermore, 6 visitor spaces are to be provided in accordance with this SPD. The provision of active EV charging points is also in accordance with this SPD in respect of the houses and visitor spaces. Active EV charging points will be provided to all houses with additional charging points provided on-street at a general ratio of 1 per dwelling. (The visitor spacing identified in purple on drawing Proposed Parking Plan will not be provided with a charging point). The one bedroom flats forming plots 8-11, will be provided with a total of two charging points. Whilst this 50% provision is on the basis of unallocated spaces, the SPD also allows such provision for allocated spaces on a case by case basis. In this particular case, the level of provision is considered to be acceptable given that this affordable housing is being provided as social rented units to address a local housing need, which typically has lower car, and in particular lower EV vehicle, ownership levels.

- 8.33 The accessibility of both the main village and the canal towpath will be improved through the extension of the existing footpath network and with the provision of new footpath connections through an area of public open space in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 and utilising the provisions under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended). Cycle stores will also be provided within the curtilage of each dwelling and communally elsewhere to encourage the use of alternative means of travel to the private car.
- 8.34 There is no objection from the highway authority to the proposals on either a highways capacity or safety perspective and as such there would be no objection to the proposals under Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies 51 and 54 and Appendix 5 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.

Ecology and Landscaping

- 8.35 A detailed Preliminary Ecology Assessment (PEA), Tree Survey and detailed soft landscaping plans (REC22889-11 Sheets 1 and 2) have been submitted with the application.
- 8.36 The PEA concludes that the arable field itself is of negligible ecological value, whilst the field margins and surrounding hedgerow are not currently managed to provide any notable benefits for wildlife. The most significant hedgerows are those to the Tring Road frontage and alongside the Grand Union Canal with the hedgerow at the frontage of the site meeting the 'important' threshold within the Hedgerow Regulations 1997.
- 8.37 The Tree Survey and layout plans show that three trees (H1, H3 and G4) will need to be removed to enable development of the site to occur. A further tree adjacent to the canal is recommended for removal irrespective of development on safety grounds. The trees to be removed are classified as C2 tree, being low quality trees with limited life or immature tree species.
- 8.38 The proposed development seeks to retain all of the existing hedgerows around the site with the exception of a narrow area to be removed to facilitate access to the site through a T junction. This loss is off-set by supplementary planting both to the existing hedgerow at Tring Road and through additional soft landscaping along the remaining boundaries to the site. The PEA also concludes that the proposed development is unlikely to result in any significant impacts on protected species including, amphibians, invertebrates, plants and badgers. This is due to the fact that these species are likely to be absent from the footprint of the proposed development and the immediate surrounding areas

- 8.39 The Tree Survey concludes that there would be no detrimental impact upon any trees of significance upon or surrounding the site and with careful planning and the provision of tree protection measures that these should not prevent the development of the site.
- 8.40 The improvement of existing landscape features through native planting together with the provision and sensitive management of field margins and public open space are considered to have potential to provide biodiversity gains in accordance with Policy CS26 of the Core Strategy. The attenuation pond could provide good habitat and biodiversity enhancements to the site.
- 8.41 Further details of the soft landscaping and ecological improvement measures should be conditioned and should build upon those plans already provided and recommendations in the PEA. This should also cover the provision of a detailed lighting scheme designed to target and minimise light spill beyond the built up areas of the site.

Sustainable Construction

- 8.42 The application does not set out specifically how the requirements of Policies CS28 and CS29 are to be addressed by this submission. Sustainable building design and construction are an essential part of the Council's response to the challenges of climate change, natural resource depletion, habitat loss and wider environmental and social issues.
- 8.43 Whilst we would anticipate that buildings will be constructed to achieve or exceed the Building Regulation requirements for thermal efficiency, energy consumption and water consumption and would note the inclusion of landscaping, biodiversity measures and EV charging points. It is recommended that further details in relation to sustainable design and construction be secured by a planning condition.

Drainage and Flooding

- 8.44 The drainage of the site is a Sustainable Urban Drainage system incorporating an attenuation basin. This is generally considered appropriate in accordance with Policies CS26 and CS32 of the Core Strategy subject to detailed design.
- 8.45 The Lead Local Flooding Authority attended the site on the 28th October 2020 and issues relating to the flooding of the site have been discussed in detail during the course of November 2020. The Lead Local Flooding Authority have confirmed that their objections in principle have been overcome as a result of additional information provided by the applicants. The full comments from the LLFA, including the need to apply any planning conditions, will be provided in the addendum to this report.

Developer Contributions and Infrastructure

- 8.46 All new developments are expected to contribute towards the costs of on site, local and strategic infrastructure in accordance with Policy CS35 of the Core Strategy. The Council seeks to secure such infrastructure contributions through a combination of CIL and through an appropriate use of planning obligations under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended)
- 8.47 The Council has an adopted Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) under which financial contributions are secured from all new residential development towards on site, local and strategic infrastructure works necessary to support development. The site would be located within Zone 2 (Elsewhere) wherein a charge of £150 per square metre of new residential development (as increased by indexation) will be levied in accordance with the CIL

Charging Schedule. The Councils adopted Regulation 123 list sets out how such sums will be spent on infrastructure.

- 8.48 There are no objections to the scheme from associated infrastructure providers including the County Council and utility providers. Despite resident's concerns with the sewerage infrastructure for the village, the provider has indicated that there is sufficient capacity or that capacity may be increased to accommodate the development.
- 8.49 A planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended) will be required to ensure that the type and tenure of affordable housing may be secured in accordance with Policies CS19, CS20 and CS35 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.50 In addition, it will also be necessary to secure pedestrian access to the canal and bus stop improvements in accordance with the advice of the Highway Authority and to ensure that adequate provision is made to access the site by alternative means of transport to the private car. A contribution of £16,000 is required to improve local bus stops as set out in the advice of the highway authority. These obligations are considered to be reasonable and necessary in accordance with Regulations 123 and 124 of the CIL Regulations and as a result of our consideration of the submitted Transport Assessment and the requirements of Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy.
- 8.51 The Council will also seek to secure the use and management of open space in accordance with Saved Appendix 6 of the Local Plan 1991-2011, through the s.106 agreement.

Planning Balance

- 8.52 The only negative aspects to the scheme under consideration are the loss of open space and arable land at the edge of the village of Wilstone. According to the Agricultural Land Classification maps from Natural England, this land Grade 3, moderate quality, agricultural land. The subdivision of Grade 3 land no longer appears to be mapped by Natural England. Low quality agricultural land (Grade 4) is identified elsewhere at the edge of the village and beyond this towards Puttenham. This loss of open space is considered to result in slight environmental harm given its limited value for farming purposes and limited ecological value.
- 8.53 The scheme is considered to be a high quality and sustainable residential scheme providing a logical extension to the village of Wilstone and supporting its natural growth. The proposals will result in no significant harm to the character of the village and its surroundings.
- 8.54 The proposed development would provide housing and local affordable housing under paragraph 77 of the NPPF. This would be located in close proximity to the rural settlement of Wilstone where it can enhance and maintain the viability of the village in accordance with paragraph 78 thereto.
- 8.55 Some economic benefits should be experience in both the short and long term including the provision of construction jobs whilst the scheme is implemented and as a result of increased local expenditure within the village. Future residents of the scheme are likely to support local facilities and services. These facilities include the community shop, farm shops, public house and village hall.
- 8.56 The scheme is also considered to deliver social and environmental benefits through the delivery of public open space and improved access to the canal and surrounding countryside. It is possible to deliver improvements in the biodiversity value of the site,

through the creation of new habitat and through careful landscaping and site management. These environmental improvements would clearly out-weigh the loss of the poor quality arable field in this location.

Other Matters

Farm Access

- 8.57 Farmland to the north and east of the site is accessible from both Rosebarn Lane and Wingrave Road and could continue to be accessible from the main access road and turning head adjacent plots 16 and 26 with the agreement of the applicant. This access road could easily be extended to facilitate additional development should the need arise and as such I am satisfied that the proposals would not unduly prejudice the optimisation of other land in accordance with Saved Policy 10 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.

Noise

- 8.58 The Environmental Health Officer has expressed some concerns regarding the proximity of the site to a commercial units including that described as a scaffold yard. This yard is some distance from the application site and we are not aware that it has not been cause for concern by occupants of Wilstone Wharf on the opposite side of the canal nor residents to Grange Road or Tring Road. It is however recommended that a noise assessment be undertaken to consider the noise associated with commercial uses in the vicinity of the site and if necessary mitigation measures are provided to ensure a satisfactory residential environment for future occupants.

9 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed development will deliver significant planning benefits in terms of the delivery of affordable rural housing and this weighs significantly in favour of the grant of planning permission. The proposed development is a high quality sustainable residential scheme which is well designed and responds positively to its surrounding environment. Accordingly the proposals are considered to meet with the aims and objectives of the NPPF and must be granted planning permission in accordance with paragraph 11 of thereto.

10 RECOMMENDATION

- 10.1 That the application is **DELEGATED** with a **VIEW to APPROVAL** subject to the completion of a planning obligation under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended and subject to the conditions below:

That the following Heads of Terms for the planning obligation are agreed:

- The provision of 50% affordable housing comprising 7 units for social rent, 3 units for shared ownership and 4 units of low cost (discount market) housing,
- The provision and maintenance of a footpath and cycle link between the plot 1 and the Grand Union Canal,
- The provision and maintenance of a footpath link between the site and existing pavement to Grange Road and Tring Road, and
- A contribution of £16,000 towards the upgrade of existing bus stops serving the development.

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

Please note that additional planning conditions will be required to meet with the requirements of the Lead Local Flood Authority.

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:**

Plans

P220 BS 01 (Bike Store)
P220 DG 01 (Detached Garage)
P220 LP 01 Revision B (Location Plan)
P220 SP 01 Revision P (Proposed Site Plan)
P220 SP 02 Revision A (Proposed Surface Materials and Boundary Treatment)
P220 SP 03 Revision B (Proposed Materials Plan)
P220 SP 04 Revision A (Proposed Parking Plan)
P220 SP 05 Revision A (Proposed Tenure Plan)
P220 SS 01 Revision B (Street Scenes)
P220 T 553 01 Revision B (Elevations to Plots 8 to 11)
P220 T 553 02 Revision A (Floor Plans to Plots 8 to 11)
P220 T 754 851 01 Revision A (Elevations to Plots 6 and 7)
P220 T 754 851 02 (Floor Plans to Plots 6 and 7)
P220 T 754 1003.01 (Elevations to Plots 4 and 5)
P220 T 754 1003.02 (Floor Plans to Plots 4 and 5)
P220 T 851 01 Revision A (Elevations to Plots 12 to 14)
P220 T 851 02 (Floor Plans to Plots 12 to 14)
P220 T 851 03 Revision B (Elevation to Plots 17 and 18)
P220 T 851 04 (Floor Plans to Plots 17 and 18)
P220 T 953 02 Revision A (Elevations to Plots 19 and 20)
P220 T 953 03 Revision A (Floor Plans to Plots 19 and 20)
P220 T 974 01 Revision B (Elevations to Plots 2, 21 and 24)
P220 T 974 02 Revision A (Floor Plan to Plots 2, 21 and 24)
P220 T 974 03 Revision B (Elevation to Plot 15)
P220 T 974 04 Revision B (Elevation to Plot 16)
P220 T 974 05 Revision A (Elevation to Plot 25)
P220 T 974 06 Revision B (Floor Plan to Plots 16 and 25)
P220 T 974 07 Revision A (Floor Plan to Plot 15)
P220 T 1334 01 Revision A (Elevations to Plots 3 and 26)
P220 T 1334 02 Revision A (Floor Plans to Plots 3 and 26)
P220 T 1334 03 (Elevation to Plot 27)
P220 T 1760 01 Revision A (Elevation to Plot 1)
P220 T 1760 02 (Floor Plan to Plot 1)
P220 T 1760 03 Revision A (Elevation to Plots 22 and 23)
P220 T 1760 04 Revision A (Elevation to Plot 28)
P220 T 1760 05 Revision A (Floor Plans for Plots 22, 23 and 28)

Documents

**Arboricultural Report (May 2020) by Sylva Consultancy
Flood Risk and Drainage Statement (June 2020) and Technical Note (October 2020)
by Glanville**

Heritage Assessment (May 2020) by Albion Archaeology

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (June 2020) by Windrush Ecology Limited

Transport Statement (April 2020) by Glanville

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

Design

- 3. No development shall take place until 1:20 details of the new external joinery including glazing pattern, vertical and horizontal cross section details and finish. These drawings shall show the window set within the surround. These shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

Access and Highway Conditions

- 4. The development hereby approved, shall not be used, until the means of access, parking and circulation areas have been provided fully in accordance with drawings P220.SP.01 Revision P and P.220.SP.04 Revision A**

Reason: To ensure the provision and retention of adequate access and parking facilities for the site in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

- 5. No development shall commence until full details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to illustrate the following:**
 - Formalised pedestrian crossing point on Tring Road with an acceptable level of pedestrian to vehicular visibility in either direction, pedestrian dropped kerbs and tactile paving (designed in accordance with standards laid out in Guidance on the use of Tactile Paving Surfaces).**
 - Clarification of the highway boundary to clearly illustrate works which would be required on highway land (this is not specifically necessary as part of the planning process but would be needed prior to applying to enter into a Section 278 Agreement with the Highway Authority in relation to the highway works as outlined above)**
 - The provision of access to adjacent farmland from the turning head between plots 16 and 26 or such other access as may be agreed with the local planning authority**

Reason: In the interests of highways safety and in accordance with Policies CS8, CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy.

- 6. Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings no on-site works above slab level shall commence until a detailed scheme for the offsite highway improvement works as indicated on drawing number P.220.SP.01 Revision P have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard in the interest of highway safety and amenity and in accordance with Policy 5, 13 and 21 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

- 7. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the offsite highway improvement works referred to in Condition 6 shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: In the interests of highways safety and in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

- 8. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted visibility splays shall be provided in full accordance with the details indicated on the approved plan number 8180891/6101 B. The splays shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction between 600mm and 2m above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.**

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

- 9. No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Management Plan shall include details of:**

- a) Construction vehicle numbers, type, routing;
- b) Swept path analysis for the largest anticipated vehicle to use the temporary access;
- c) Traffic management requirements;
- d) Construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking, loading / unloading and turning areas);
- e) Siting and details of wheel washing facilities;
- f) Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway;
- g) Timing of construction activities (including delivery times and removal of waste);
- h) Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities; and
- i) Post construction restoration/reinstatement of the working areas and temporary access to the public highway.

Reason: In the interests of highways safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

Landscaping Conditions

- 10. 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:

- means of enclosure, including the materials and/or hedging plants to be used for any enclosures, together with the location of any hedgehog gates;

- soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs;
- finished levels and contours in relation to existing site levels, eaves and ridge heights of neighbouring properties;
- any exterior lighting works and
- the siting and design of any bird boxes, bat boxes and other habitat creation.

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

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

Reason: To ensure the adequate landscaping of the site in accordance with Policies CS12, CS26 and CS29 of the Core Strategy.

11. **No development shall take place until the measures for the protection of trees have been provided in accordance with the Tree Protection Plan within the Arboricultural Report by Sylva Consulting dated May 2020 Ref 20058. All protective measures shall remain in-situ and be free from the storage of construction material, plant and machinery for the duration of the construction period.**

Reason: To ensure the adequate protection of trees and landscaping features in accordance with Policy CS12 and Saved Policy 99 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.

12. **The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a plan for the management, maintenance and ecological improvement of the public open space and site boundaries has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The site shall thereafter be maintained and improvements implemented fully in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory management of open space in the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity and in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS26 of the Core Strategy.

Contamination

13. **No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to the submission to, and agreement of the Local Planning Authority of a written preliminary environmental risk assessment (Phase I) report containing a Conceptual Site Model that indicates sources, pathways and receptors. It should identify the current and past land uses of this site (and adjacent sites) with view to determining the presence of contamination likely to be harmful to human health and the built and natural environment.**

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

14. **If the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the report which discharges condition 14, above, indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination then no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site**

Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:

- (i) A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;**
- (ii) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.**

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

- 15. No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report; if required as a result of 15, above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.**

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

- 16. This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:**

- (i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition 16 above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.**
- (ii) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.**

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

Waterways

- 17. Prior to the commencement of the development, a Risk Assessment and Method Statement shall be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority which includes:**

- a) details of any proposed protective fencing to be erected to safeguard the waterway infrastructure and canal towpath boundary**
- b) a method of preventing pollution of the ditch and canal (if hydraulically linked) from overland flows or polluted groundwater and**
- c) an assessment of the risk to canal assets and if piling methods are to be used the need for vibration monitoring to protect the canal and lock infrastructure during the course of construction.**

All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To comply with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework as the ecological environment in this location is sensitive and should be protected from disturbance, dust, run off, waste etc entering the canal.

- 18. Piling and other deep foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be carried out other than with the written permission of the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To safeguard the structural integrity of the grade II canal bridge and to ensure that there is no pollution of the watercourse in accordance with Policies CS27 and CS31 of the Core Strategy

Noise

- 19. Plots 1, 22, 23 and 28 shall not be occupied until an assessment of noise has been undertaken to determine whether there would be any noise nuisance arising from commercial operations to the north of the application site and the need for mitigation measures has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The mitigation measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory level of residential amenity for future occupants of the scheme in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan 1991-2011.

Sustainable Transport

- 20. The development, hereby approved, shall not be occupied until full details of the Electric Vehicle Charging Points including the type of charger, power supply and a scheme for the maintenance and management of charging points has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation and shall thereafter be retained.**

Reason: In the interests of access and highways safety in accordance with Policies CS8 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and the Car Parking Standards SPD.

Permitted Development

- 21. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 1995 (As Amended) or any revisions thereto there shall be no development falling within the following schedules to the specified units without the express planning permission of the local planning authority**

Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A – Plot 18

Schedule 2 Part 1 Classes B and C - Plots 1, 2, 3, 15, 16, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26 and 27

Schedule 2 Part 2 Class A – All plots

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and residential amenity in accordance with Policy CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy.

HIGHWAY INFORMATIVES:

HCC recommends inclusion of the following highway informative / advisory note (AN) to ensure that any works within the public highway are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980:

AN) Extent of Highway: Information on obtaining the extent of public highway around the site can be obtained from the HCC website:

www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/changes-to-your-road/extent-of-highways.aspx

AN) Agreement with Highway Authority: The applicant is advised that in order to comply with this permission it will be necessary for the developer of the site to enter into an agreement with Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the satisfactory completion of the access and associated road improvements. The construction of such works must be undertaken to the satisfaction and specification of the Highway Authority, 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 and requirements. Further information is available via the website

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/development-management/highways-development-management.aspx>

CONTAMINATION

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

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Tring Rural Parish Council	<p>Tring Rural Parish Council objects to this application because the proposal runs contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) approach of development in the countryside.</p> <p>The Framework promotes an effective use of land in order to meet the need for homes, while safeguarding and improving the environment. It states that in rural areas, development should be responsive to local circumstances, reflect local needs and be supported where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.</p> <p>The Framework seeks to make efficient use of land and optimal use of the potential of each site and expresses the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the landscape, causing an urbanising encroachment into the countryside.</p> <p>The planning application proposes to introduce twenty-eight dwellings on a greenfield site, to the detriment of its verdant and open characteristics and resulting in the loss of arable land. Dacorum's Core Strategy clearly states that the countryside is an important part of the borough's heritage and is enjoyed by both residents and visitors. It is an area where primarily open uses such as farming and forestry should flourish. It is home and workplace to a diverse community in whose care the long-term future of the countryside rests. Development must be controlled to secure that future and prevent damage to the intrinsic quality and purpose of the countryside.</p> <p>Wilstone is a small village of approximately 280 homes, in a rural location that provides few facilities and services. There is a public house, a community shop, a farm shop, a recreation ground, a church and a village hall. These facilities and services are relatively narrow and considered to be unlikely to serve the day-to-day needs of potential future occupiers of the development.</p> <p>Wilstone is defined as a 'smaller village' in the Council's Settlement Hierarchy Assessment, these smaller settlements are considered not to be sufficiently sustainable to accommodate further significant development because of the limited range of services and facilities they provide.</p> <p>Although there would be an increase in local household spending and demand for services, importantly there is no evidence to confirm that local provision in Wilstone or settlements further afield would be under threat in the absence of the development.</p> <p>The development would prevent future access - confirmed by a local farmer, who currently cultivates crops on the site and the 2-hectare field behind the development field. The proposal will, in effect permanently cut off access for farm machinery and combine</p>

harvesters, to nearly 2 hectares of prime agricultural land into the rear of the development field and the field behind it. There is no alternative access.

The imposition of twenty-eight dwellings and associated hard landscaped areas would represent an uncharacteristic urban intrusion not reflective of the outer edge of a village in a rural area and not protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment. As a result, the proposal would be fundamentally at odds with the landscape qualities that define the site, causing harm to the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal also fails to accord with, the Council's Development Plan (DPD) which seeks to continue to safeguard the character of villages and the surrounding countryside. The Council's Strategic Objectives within the Core Strategy are;

- To enable convenient access between jobs, homes and facilities.
- Minimise the impact of traffic and reduce the overall need to travel by car.
- Conserve and enhance the function and character of the market towns, villages and countryside.
- Ensure the effective use of existing land and previously developed sites.

The application does not accord with The Settlement Hierarchy (which is a material consideration when determining planning applications) and Policies CS1, CS2, CS7, and CS8 of the adopted Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy, takes into account current population, historic role, level of services and the constraints and opportunities of each place in the Borough, to determine the main principles that are used to guide development in each location. Decisions on the scale and location of development are made in accordance with the Settlement Hierarchy. In the Settlement Hierarchy Wilstone is listed as a 'Small Village Within the Rural Area and an Area of Development Restraint.'

Policy CS7 states that small-scale development for housing, employment and other purposes will be permitted at Aldbury, Long Marston and Wilstone, provided that it complies with Policy CS1: Distribution of Development and Policy CS2 Selection of Development Sites. The proposed site represents a large parcel of pasture land fronting a narrow country lane on the outskirts of Wilstone. The local landscape is rural in nature and the proposal would not be infill or part of ribbon development; rather it would be development in the open countryside.

Although the bus service in the village offers direct services to several nearby settlements, including Tring, Leighton Buzzard and Aylesbury,

these services are severely limited and infrequent and future residents of the development would be heavily reliant on this inadequate provision should they wish or require to access surrounding facilities and services by means other than via private travel modes. With the service limitations, it would be unlikely that future occupiers of the development would seek to, or be conveniently able to depend on the bus services to serve their day-to-day needs. There is no public transport from Wilstone to Tring Station or to Cheddington Station.

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

Policy CS8 states that all new development will contribute to a well-connected and accessible transport system whose principles are to give priority to the needs of other road and passenger transport users over the private car in the following order:

- pedestrians
- cyclists
- passenger transport (buses, trains and taxis)
- powered two wheeled vehicles
- other motor vehicles;

The larger settlement of Tring with considerable facilities and services is located approximately 3 miles to the south/east of the site. It is connected via the Lower Icknield Way and Tringford Road which are not lit and not served by a footway for the majority of its extent between Wilstone and Tring. The roads do not provide specific facilities for cyclists, such as a defined lane for their use. Neither walking or cycling to Tring would be likely to represent an attractive option for future occupiers of the development.

The proposal's location would therefore promote private modes of transportation, which raises particular concerns about unsustainability due to the not insignificant extent of development that is proposed. The majority of journeys by future occupiers would be undertaken by private car and this conflicts with policies within the Framework taken as a whole.

Taking into account Wilstone's limited size and narrow array of facilities and services, the scale of development proposed would represent a significant addition to the settlement.

The Rural area is protected in Dacorum's Core Strategy by Policy CS7. "These are the least sustainable areas of the borough, where significant environmental constraints apply. These include areas of high landscape quality, such as the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and the countryside between settlements. This needs to be protected to ensure its rural character is retained and settlements keep their separate identities."

ESTABLISHING A PRECEDENT

Although in planning terms, each planning application must be considered on its own merits and facts and circumstances, this proposal, if granted may create a significant precedent for the locality, making it difficult to refuse future proposals for similar housing development on greenfield sites in Wilstone and Long Marston

EFFECT ON THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE AREA

The proposal would provide a sudden and uncharacteristic connection between the village and its surrounding rural landscape; the character, area, setting and appearance. The site is part of the surrounding field network of Grade 3 arable land, rather than a part of the settlement's edge and the proposal would have a significant adverse effect upon the landscape character of its wider surroundings. It would not contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment. It would also have a prominent harmful visual impact, particularly when viewed from The Grade 2 listed Bridge on Tring Road, which is an important and regularly used approach into the village.

The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and will represent an outward extension of the settlement boundary into the open countryside.

TRAFFIC WITHIN THE PARISH

Tring Rural Parish Council challenge the use of the Nomis Consus database, by the applicant as a projection of car ownership needs in the village. We do not consider the forecasts within the applicant's transport statement provide a realistic reflection of the likely highway intensification that the proposal would have and is contrary to the Framework's aim, to limit future car use.

Certainly, the starting point of less than 1 car per residence for Wilstone is incorrect. Most homes in the settlement have at least 1 car and the majority, 2 vehicles or more. We believe that traffic movements from the proposed development will be substantially greater than those predicted, will have an adverse impact on the settlement and will not enhance or maintain the vitality.

SUMMARY

Tring Rural Parish Council object to this application on the following grounds:

- It is conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework.
- It conflicts with Dacorum Borough Council's Core Strategy
- It is not sustainable development and prevents access

	<p>to agricultural land at the rear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area, including visual impact. • It establishes a precedent for further similar development on the Greenfield areas outside the development boundaries of the settlements within Tring Rural Parish. • It will have a considerable effect on traffic within the village. <p><u>Amended Plans</u></p> <p>Tring Rural Parish Council would reiterate its initial objection to the above planning application.</p>
Hertfordshire Constabulary	<p>In relation to crime prevention I would ask that not only the affordable housing but the whole development is built to the police minimum security standard Secured by Design.</p> <p><u>Amended Plans</u></p> <p>In relation to crime prevention and security I would ask that not only the affordable housing but the entire site is built to the police minimum standard Secured by Design.</p> <p>I do have some concerns with the lack of surveillance in the parking area at the back of plots 4,5,6,7 and 8-11, usually from a crime prevention perspective parking at the front or side of the property is preferable to aid natural surveillance. The surveillance is poor it also requires a walkway between plots 7 and 8-11, and how will this area be lit. If the parking spaces were at the front it would mitigate my concerns.</p>
Hertfordshire County Council – Ecology Unit	Comments awaited
Hertfordshire County Council – Growth and Infrastructure Unit	<p>Hertfordshire County Council's Growth & Infrastructure Unit do not have any comments to make in relation to financial contributions required by the Toolkit, as this development is situated within your CIL zone and does not fall within any of the CIL Reg123 exclusions.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, we reserve the right to seek Community Infrastructure Levy contributions towards the provision of infrastructure as outlined in your R123 List through the appropriate channels. We therefore have no further comment on behalf of these services, although you may be contacted separately from our Highways Department. Please note this does not cover the provision of fire hydrants and we may contact you separately regarding a specific and demonstrated need in respect of that provision</p> <p><u>Amended Plans</u></p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council's Growth & Infrastructure Unit do not</p>

	<p>have any comments to make in relation to financial contributions required by the Toolkit, as this development is situated within your CIL zone and does not fall within any of the CIL Reg123 exclusions. Notwithstanding this, we reserve the right to seek Community Infrastructure Levy contributions towards the provision of infrastructure as outlined in your R123 List through the appropriate channels.</p>
Hertfordshire Highways	<p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <p><u>CONDITIONS:</u></p> <p>1. No development shall commence until full details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to illustrate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formalised pedestrian crossing point on Tring Road with an acceptable level of pedestrian to vehicular visibility in either direction, pedestrian dropped kerbs and tactile paving (designed in accordance with standards laid out in Guidance on the use of Tactile Paving Surfaces). - Clarification of the highway boundary to clearly illustrate works which would be required on highway land (this is not specifically necessary as part of the planning process but would be needed prior to applying to enter into a Section 278 Agreement with the Highway Authority in relation to the highway works as outlined above). <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure suitable, safe and satisfactory planning and development of the site in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018)</p> <p>2a. Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings no on-site works above slab level shall commence until a detailed scheme for the offsite highway improvement works as indicated on drawing number P.220.SP.01 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard in the interest of highway safety and amenity and in accordance with Policy 5, 13 and 21 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).</p> <p>2b. Prior to the first occupation /use of the development hereby permitted the offsite highway improvement works referred to in Part A of this condition shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>3. Provision of Visibility Splays Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted visibility splays shall be provided in full accordance with the</p>

details indicated on the approved plan number 8180891/6101 B. The splays shall thereafter be maintained at all times free from any obstruction between 600mm and 2m above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

4. Provision of Internal Access Roads, Parking & Servicing Areas
Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed internal access roads, on-site car parking and turning area shall be laid out, demarcated, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.

Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory development and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

5. Construction Management

No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan.

The Construction Management Plan shall include details of:

- a. Construction vehicle numbers, type, routing;
- b. Any traffic management requirements
- c. Construction and storage compounds (including areas designated for car parking, loading / unloading and turning areas);
- d. Siting and details of wheel washing facilities;
- e. Cleaning of site entrances, site tracks and the adjacent public highway;
- f. Timing of construction activities to avoid school pick up/drop off times;
- g. Provision of sufficient on-site parking prior to commencement of construction activities;
- h. where works cannot be contained wholly within the site a plan should be submitted showing the site layout on the highway including extent of hoarding, pedestrian routes and remaining road width for vehicle movements.

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way in accordance with Policies 5, 12, 17 and 22 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

HIGHWAY INFORMATIVES:

HCC recommends inclusion of the following highway informative / advisory note (AN) to ensure that any works within the public highway

are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980:

AN) Extent of Highway: Information on obtaining the extent of public highway around the site can be obtained from the HCC website:

www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/changes-to-your-road/extent-of-highways.aspx

AN) Agreement with Highway Authority: The applicant is advised that in order to comply with this permission it will be necessary for the developer of the site to enter into an agreement with Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the satisfactory completion of the access and associated road improvements. The construction of such works must be undertaken to the satisfaction and specification of the Highway Authority, 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 and requirements. Further information is available via the website

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/development-management/highways-development-management.aspx>

COMMENTS / ANALYSIS:

The proposal comprises of the construction of 28 residential dwellings on land off Tring Road, Wilstone. Tring Road is designated as an unclassified local access road, is highway maintainable at public expense. Tring Road is subject to a speed limit of 30mph to the south of the site through the village and subject to a speed limit of 60mph fronting most of the site and at the location of the proposed vehicle access.

A Transport Statement (TS) has been submitted as part of the application.

ACCESS:

The proposals include a new priority "T" junction with a kerbed bellmouth entrance leading to an internal access road, the layout of which is shown on submitted drawing number P.220.SP.01. The proposed access design is of an acceptable width to enable two vehicles to pass one another and the general designs are in accordance with design criteria as laid out in Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide.

Visibility splays of 2.4m by 80m (to the north of the access) and in excess of 43m (to the south of the access) have been illustrated on the submitted plan number SK01. Following consideration of the location and nature of the highway, HCC as Highway Authority considers that these levels are acceptable and in accordance with Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide and Manual for Streets. These levels were also previously approved as part of the

pre-app meeting with HCC as Highway Authority.

The proposals include a 2m wide pedestrian footpath linking the internal site footpaths/footways and the existing footway close to the junction of Tring Road and Grange Road, which is considered to be acceptable to facilitate a pedestrian route into the village centre via Grange Road and Rosebarn Lane. There is an existing highway footway on the west side of Tring Road (the opposite side to the application site). A dedicated crossing point on Tring Road with pedestrian dropped kerbs and tactile paving on either side would be recommended to ensure that pedestrian access to and from the site to the village hall and recreation ground is maximised for all users and to ensure that the proposals are in accordance with LTP4 and NPPF.

It is unlikely that HCC as Highway Authority would agree to adopt any of the proposed roads as the route would not be considered as being of utility to the wider public. However the works would need to be built to adoptable standards to be in accordance with guidelines as documented in Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide. The developer would need to put in place a permanent arrangement for long term maintenance. At the entrance of the development, the road name plate would need to indicate that it is a private road. The proposed development would need to make adequate provision for drainage on site to ensure that surface water is disposed of on site and does not discharge onto the highway.

SECTION 278 WORKS:

The applicant would need to enter into a Section 278 Agreement with HCC as Highway Authority in relation to the approval of the design and implementation of the works that would be needed on highway land including:

- Works to create the vehicle bell mouth access from Tring Road.
- Works to create the proposed footpath across the existing highway verge directly to the north-east of the junction of Tring Road and Grange Road.
- Dedicated crossing point for pedestrians on Tring Road with tactile paving and pedestrian dropped kerbs.

Prior to applying to enter into a Section 278 Agreement with the Highway Authority, the applicant would need to provide the extra information as requested and obtain an extent of highway plan to clarify the works which would be within the existing highway. Please see the above conditions and informatives.

It is recommended that a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit is carried out and submitted as part of the Section 278 application, which would indicate whether any provisions or Traffic Regulations Orders may be required from a road safety perspective.

PARKING

The proposal includes the provision of 70 car parking spaces, which is higher than the current standard of 49.25 spaces as outlined in Dacorum Borough Council's (DBC's) parking standards (the TS refers

to draft parking standards). HCC as Highway Authority would object to a level of car parking that is higher than the maximum as outlined in the parking standards and would recommend that the level of parking is reduced accordingly. However it is considered that this reason on its own would not be significant enough to recommend refusal from a highways perspective and DBC as planning and parking authority would ultimately need to be satisfied with the level of parking.

Furthermore electric vehicle charging provision is included as part of the proposals, the details of which are supported by HCC as Highway Authority to ensure that the proposals are in accordance with Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan.

Provision has been made for cycle parking through a mixture of garages, sheds and cycle stores, the provision of which is considered to be acceptable by HCC as Highway Authority.

TRIP GENERATION & DISTRIBUTION:

Following consideration of the expected trip generation (which have been submitted in Section 4 of the TS), the development would not have a significant enough impact on the local highway network to recommend refusal from a highways perspective.

ACCESSIBILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY:

The site is located on the northern edge of the village of Wilston within a reasonable walking distance from the village amenities. HCC as Highway Authority would not have any specific objections to the location of the proposals from an accessibility perspective with the potential to act as an extension to the existing village curtilage. The town of Tring is approximately 5km from the site and within an acceptable distance to promote cycling as a travel option.

The nearest bus stops are located along Tring Road approximately 270m to the south of the site and therefore within an acceptable accessibility distance (generally accepted to be within 400m) to encourage travel by bus to and from the site. The bus stops are served by services to Aylesbury and Tring six times a day in addition to less frequent services to Hemel Hempstead, and Leighton Buzzard.

The nearest railway station at Cheddington is located 5.7km north of the site and therefore within a reasonable cycling distance.

PLANNING OBLIGATIONS:

DBC has adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and therefore contributions towards local transports schemes as outlined in HCC's South West Herts Growth & Transport Plan would be sought via CIL if appropriate.

Nevertheless in order to make the proposals acceptable in planning terms to promote and maximize sustainable travel options, it is recommended that a 106 planning obligation is sought towards improvements at the two nearest bus stops on Tring Road, which are

	<p>the nearest public transport provision. Developer contributions for the provision of improved hardstanding and easy access Kassel kerbing at both stops would be required to ensure that the bus stops are accessible to all (£8000 per stop, £16,000 total).</p> <p>REFUSE & SERVICE VEHICLE ACCESS:</p> <p>Swept path analysis (drawing no.s 8180891/6202 and 8180891/6203) have been submitted as part of the TS to illustrate that a refuse and delivery vehicle would be able to utilise the proposed access, internal access road and egress to Tring Road in forward gear, the arrangements of which are considered to be acceptable by HCC as Highway Authority. The collection method must be confirmed as acceptable by DBC waste management.</p> <p>EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS:</p> <p>The access arrangements would enable emergency vehicle access to within 45 metres from all dwellings. This adheres to guidelines as recommended in MfS, Roads in Hertfordshire; A Design Guide and Building Regulations 2010: Fire Safety Approved Document B Vol 1 – Dwellinghouses.</p> <p>CONCLUSION:</p> <p>HCC as Highway Authority considers that the proposal would not have an unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the surrounding highway. The applicant would need to enter into a Section 278 Agreement with HCC to cover the technical approval of the design, construction and implementation of any highway and access works. Therefore HCC has no objections on highway grounds to the application, subject to the inclusion of the above planning conditions and informative and request for a pedestrian crossing point on Tring Road.</p> <p><u>Amended Plans</u></p> <p>Supplemental information has been submitted in relation to the application. HCC as Highway Authority has no specific comments in relation to the submissions.</p> <p>HCC as Lead Local Flood Authority would need to be consulted on the submitted drainage details.</p>
<p>Hertfordshire County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority</p>	<p>Amended Plans</p> <p>Following our letter dated 01 September 2020 the applicant has submitted amended plans and additional information in support of the application. However, these plans are not related to surface water drainage or flood risk. Therefore, they do not address our outstanding objection as detailed within comments in our previous letter. We therefore maintain our objection as detailed in our letter dated 01 September 2020. Please see that letter for full detailed comments.</p> <p>Informative to the LPA / applicant</p>

	<p>It is acknowledged that this application follows an earlier submission by Rectory Homes on the southern part of the site for a development of 15 dwellings (9 x 2-bed houses and 6 x 3-bed houses) with associated access, car parking and landscaping. The applicant has detailed within the FRA how the application number in respect of this earlier application is 4/00024/19/MFA. As LLFA we were not consulted on the other application at this site. We would therefore request that the LPA has regard of the comments made in this letter in relation to the earlier application at this site.</p> <p>We would like to highlight how the entire site is at Reservoir Flood Risk, and the applicant may wish to seek advice from the Environment Agency.</p> <p>As there is a Section 19 Flood Investigation due to historical flooding in Long Marston and the surrounding area, we would recommend that detailed design of the drainage scheme is provided prior to approval at planning.</p> <p>We ask to be re-consulted with the points detailed in our letter dated 01 September 2020 addressed. We will provide you with bespoke comments within 21 days of receiving formal re-consultation. Our objection will be maintained until an adequate surface water drainage assessment has been submitted.</p> <p><u>Additional Information:</u></p> <p>Further comments will be provided in the Addendum to this report.</p>
<p>Conservation and Design</p>	<p>We welcome the revised proposals which have addressed our previous concerns. There are some minor points which should however be reviewed.</p> <p>a) It would be recommended that the proposed pedestrian link to the canal be constructed rather than show as possible on the proposed site plan.</p> <p>b) The boundary treatment to units 7,8, 15-17 still appears to be close boarded fencing rather than other options of brick or hedging as previously discussed.</p> <p>c) House 2 should have a chimney added to enhance the visual interest of the scheme from the roadside.</p> <p>The principle issues in relation to the houses are now the proposed materials in relation to the roof tiles. It would be recommended that ideally the roofs, particularly to the roadside, be clay tiles rather than the proposed forcrete tiles. These tiles are a brown colour and are not reflective of those red/orange tiles used in the locality. The use of a sunrise blend tile might be more appropriate than the autumn red proposed although we would need to see samples of this material to confirm this is acceptable. The proposed brick choice is acceptable. Any windows, in particular to the street frontage should have a set-back rather than appearing flush with the elevations to ensure that</p>

	<p>they sit comfortably with the architectural style.</p> <p><u>Additional Comments</u></p> <p>In relation to the grade II listed canal bridge.</p> <p>The canal bridge dates to the construction of the canal and is a typical pattern book example of its type. The setting of the bridge has changed over time due to the construction of the coal wharf and later the housing approved recently. It derives its main importance in relation to the canal. The proposed housing is set back from the bridge and there is some landscaping which will limit its impact. The Materials have been chosen to be in keeping with those seen in the area.</p> <p>The setting must be considered in the round and when viewed from the most important relationship, the canal, as it forms a way marker there would be minimal noticeable change. To the road approaches there would be a very limited change but it would not impact on the appreciation of the bridge. The landscaped buffer would reduce the harm and retain the feeling of a rural canal bridge.</p> <p>Overall we therefore believe that the impact on the setting of the bridge is less than substantial and at a very low level.</p> <p>As such we would not object.</p>
<p>Environmental Health - Contamination</p>	<p>Having reviewed the application documents I am able to confirm that there is no objection to the proposed development, however, it will be necessary for the developer to demonstrate that the potential for land contamination to affect the proposed development has been considered and that where found to be present it will be remediated.</p> <p>This recommendation reflects the introduction of housing on the site and the possibility of elevated concentrations of contaminants to be present either naturally, or through their introduction to the ground via the formal or informal uses of the application site and neighbouring land.</p> <p><u>Contaminated Land Conditions:</u></p> <p>Condition 1:</p> <p>a) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced prior to the submission to, and agreement of the Local Planning Authority of a written preliminary environmental risk assessment (Phase I) report containing a Conceptual Site Model that indicates sources, pathways and receptors. It should identify the current and past land uses of this site (and adjacent sites) with view to determining the presence of contamination likely to be harmful to human health and the built and natural environment.</p> <p>b) If the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the report which discharges condition (a), above, indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination then no development</p>

approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:

- (iii) A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;
- (iv) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.

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

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

- (iii) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (c) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.
- (iv) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.

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

Condition 2:

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

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

Having reviewed the application documents I am able to confirm that

	<p>there is no objection to the proposed development, however, it will be necessary for the developer to demonstrate that the potential for land contamination to affect the proposed development has been considered and that where found to be present it will be remediated.</p> <p>This recommendation reflects the introduction of housing on the site and the possibility of elevated concentrations of contaminants to be present either naturally, or through their introduction to the ground via the formal or informal uses of the application site and neighbouring land.</p>
<p>Environmental Health – Noise and Pollution</p>	<p>I note that there are commercial units close to the application site. This appears to be a scaffold business.</p> <p>This may be a potential source of noise for future residential occupiers from early morning and weekend operations. We require further information on this premises, whether it is likely to represent a source a noise and if this is the case most likely we will require a noise assessment to determine suitability of the proposed site.</p>
<p>Canal and River Trust</p>	<p><u>Amended Plans</u></p> <p>We are a charity who look after and bring to life 2000 miles of canals and rivers. Our waterways contribute to the health and well-being of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time. These historic, natural and cultural assets form part of the strategic and local green-blue infrastructure network, linking urban and rural communities as well as habitats. By caring for our waterways and promoting their use we believe we can improve the well-being of our nation. The Trust is a statutory consultee in the Development Management Process</p> <p>The main issues relevant to the Trust as statutory consultee on this application are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Possible mitigation measures as a result of flooding from Startops Reservoir b) Drainage c) Accessibility <p>Based on the information available our substantive response (as required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) is to advise that suitably worded conditions and/or a legal agreement are necessary to address these matters. Our advice and comments are as follows:</p> <p>The site falls within the inundation zone of Startops Reservoir, which is located to the south west of the site rather than Wilstone Reservoir as mentioned in the FRA. The possible breach of the reservoir therefore represents a flood risk that must be properly considered by the developer under paragraph 163 of the NPPF which states that the development should be appropriately flood resilient with any residual risk safely managed.</p> <p>The applicants flood risk assessment acknowledges that the site is at</p>

risk from overtopping or a breach but considers the risk to be very low as the site is some distance from the reservoir with agricultural land in between.

It may be possible to make the development more appropriately flood resistant and resilient by alterations to the proposed landscaping to include a low bund around the eastern perimeter of the site to deflect the flow of any flood water towards the canal. This could be incorporated into the landscaping, however to be most effective this would require the removal of access from the site into fields to the east. If the Council feel that this is necessary or appropriate then the matter could be dealt with by the submission of a reserved landscaping scheme and the Trust would request that this is duly considered. The access could be reinstated at a later date if access across the surrounding land is formalised and if appropriate alternative measures to minimise the impact of flooding are provided.

Drainage

The proposal includes the discharge of water from roofs and roads via an attenuation basin to the ditch running along the boundary with the canal. We welcome the clarification that the ditch does outfall into the canal. The trust confirms that the detail provided is acceptable and we are pleased to note that the ditch and headwall will be cleaned out and maintained in future.

Accessibility

The Trust encourages the use of waterways and towpaths for leisure, recreation and sporting activities as part of the natural [national] health service acting as blue gyms and supporting physical and healthy outdoor activity. The County and Borough Council are working with the Trust to secure improvements to sustainable transport routes in the area and the canal towpath is recognised in the Core Strategy as an important movement corridor. As well as towpath improvements there is a need for other wide ranging improvements such as signage and seating and improvements, particularly for cyclists such as widening the towpath and providing improved access ramps at certain locations.

It is noted that the site lies adjacent to the canal towpath, which provides a free public resource for walking and cycling and provides access to green infrastructure, both of which can benefit the well-being of the local community and future residents. The towpath forms part of the Grand Union Triangle, a sustainable transport route and leisure route promoted by Buckinghamshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council.

There is a towpath access point at the nearby canal bridge. However the applicant has contacted the Trust to discuss a more direct access point. This may be acceptable subject to a detailed assessment of the location of the access point, the design of the access route and its means of adjoining the towpath as well as payment of a small license fee to make the connection. This should be discussed with the Trusts Estates and Engineering team. The possible increased usage of the

canal towpath as a sustainable transport route serving the site may result in the degradation of the towpath surface.

The Trust can provide numerous examples of similar situations where developers have made accessibility improvements as a form of mitigation to either offset additional usage of the towpath to reach the site or to improve access links onto the towpath for the benefit of both future residents and existing users. This is considered necessary for the scheme to comply with Policy CS8 (Sustainable Transport) and CS35 (Developer Contributions) of the Core Strategy.

It is recognised that this development is small scale and thus any proportionate contribution may be unable to meet the cost of improving a significant length of towpath however it may be possible to pool contributions to provide a meaningful improvement to the canal towpath in the vicinity of the site.

The Canal and River Trust therefore requests that further discussions take place on this matter to determine if there is support for a contribution to be requested and what this may be in line with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (As Amended)

Conditions:

1) Prior to the commencement of the development, a Risk Assessment and Method Statement shall be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority which includes:

a) details of the proposed protective fencing to be erected to safeguard the waterway infrastructure and canal towpath boundary

b) a method of preventing pollution of the ditch and canal (if hydraulically linked) from overland flows or polluted groundwater and

c) an assessment of the risk to canal assets and if piling methods are to be used the need for vibration monitoring to protect the canal and lock infrastructure during the course of construction.

All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To comply with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework as the ecological environment in this location is sensitive and should be protected from disturbance, dust, run off, waste etc entering the canal.

2) Further details of the proposed surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development and thereafter implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To comply with paragraph 170 of the National Planning

	<p>Policy Framework and to determine if any surface water will enter the canal and if so the potential for pollution of the waterway and volume of water.</p> <p><u>Additional Comments:</u></p> <p>It may be possible to create a new access from the site to the towpath. The access will require an agreement from the Trusts Estates Team, who make a charge for the agreement to use our land. They would only enter into an agreement if the location, design etc was considered acceptable. In this case, due to the change in levels this is slightly more complicated than just a gate onto the towpath and it would be expected that the applicants agree the design with us, and carry out the work to create the new path and maintain it in the future. This work and the design and position of the access would need to be agreed with our Infrastructure Services Team and would need to comply with the Trusts' Code of Practice for work affecting the Canal & River Trust'.</p> <p>If there is no 'in principle' objection to this then you would need to enter into the Trust Code of Practice process to agree the position, design details etc.</p> <p>Please see: https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/business-and-trade/undertaking-works-on-our-property-and-our-code-of-practice</p> <p>As the drainage ditch does end up flowing into the canal this will need to be looked at by our Water Engineers.</p>
<p>NATS Safeguarding</p>	<p>The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.</p> <p>However, please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NATS (that is responsible for the management of en route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly consulted.</p> <p>If any changes are proposed to the information supplied to NATS in regard to this application which become the basis of a revised, amended or further application for approval, then as a statutory consultee NERL requires that it be further consulted on any such changes prior to any planning permission or any consent being granted.</p> <p><u>Amended Plans</u></p> <p>NATS no objection remains as submitted.</p>

Thames Water	<p>Thames Water would advise that with regard to foul water sewerage network infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.</p> <p>The application indicates that surface water will not be discharged to the public network and as such Thames Water has no objection, however approval should be sought from the Lead Local Flood Authority. Should the applicant subsequently seek a connection to discharge surface water into the public network in the future then we would consider this to be a material change to the proposal, which would require an amendment to the application at which point we would need to review our position.</p> <p>Water Comments</p> <p>On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water network infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application. Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to this planning permission. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.</p> <p>There are water mains crossing or close to your development. Thames Water do not permit the building over or construction within 3m of water mains. If you're planning significant works near our mains (within 3m) we'll need to check that your development doesn't reduce capacity, limit repair or maintenance activities during and after construction, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes. https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes</p> <p>The proposed development is located within 15m of our underground water assets and as such we would like the following informative attached to any approval granted. The proposed development is located within 15m of Thames Waters underground assets, as such the development could cause the assets to fail if appropriate measures are not taken. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings are in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures. https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes.</p>
--------------	--

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Address/Neighbour	Comments
Ward Councillor Nick Hollinghurst	Wilstone is a small village and is well known to me as the local Dacorum Borough Councillor.

	<p>The location is not appropriate for development before other land holdings within the village core are developed and there are no mitigating factors, e.g. brownfield land, replacement dwellings.</p> <p>The local plan sets Wilstone into the Rural Area as a village subject to development restraint.</p> <p>The access onto the highway will be difficult due to the proximity of a hump back bridge with poor visibility.</p> <p>The proposed development does not use up the full area of the field in which it is situated and is an inefficient use of the available land insofar as it will compromise any further development adjacent to it.</p> <p>The village has recently accommodated a canal side development nearby but another 28 dwellings close by will strain the services, facilities and amenities of what is at the moment a balanced and harmonious rural community.</p> <p>I request that this controversial development be dealt with by the full Planning Committee.</p> <p><u>Additional Comments</u></p> <p>My objection is based on the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is outside the village envelope located on previously undeveloped land contrary to DBC policy on development in the Rural Area. 2. The access from Tring Road between a blind bridge and a 75 degree curve in the road is at a point of poor visibility in both directions 3. The development is in a village with poor public transport provision and as such it fails to demonstrate sustainability 4. It does not feature in the emerging Local Plan with which it conflicts. 5. It represents an inefficient use of land insofar as it blocks off other plots and hampers access to a farm to the rear and to the north of Grange Road.
CPRE Hertfordshie	<p>CPRE Hertfordshire object to this proposal for residential development in the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt which is contrary to policies in the National Planning Policy Framework and The Dacorum Core Strategy, 2006 – 2031.</p> <p>This proposal appears to be an extension of application 4/00024/19/MFA for 15 dwellings submitted by the same applicant, which has not yet been determined by the Council. That application was put forward as an entry level exception scheme under paragraph 71 of the NPPF. The provisions of para. 71 do not apply to this application.</p> <p>Wilstone is defined in the Dacorum Core Strategy as a small village within the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt. These are described as “the least sustainable areas of the borough”.</p>

It is acknowledged that some development will be required within the countryside. "In order to ensure that rural communities continue to thrive there may be the need for specific rural sites for affordable housing ...The location of these sites will be considered through the Site Allocations DPD."

The identification of local needs will be informed by village appraisals. This is not a site allocated through the DPD.

Policy CS7 says that small-scale development for housing will be permitted at Aldbury, Long Marston and Wilstone, provided that it complies with Policy CS1: Distribution of Development and Policy CS2 Selection of Development Sites.

Policy CS20 will only permit small scale schemes for local affordable housing in and adjoining the selected small villages where they meet an identified local need the scheme is of a scale and design that respects the character, setting and form of the village and surrounding countryside.

The NPPF says that the size of a development must be proportionate to the size of the settlement. The scale of development has to be considered in context. In a large town or city 28 houses would be small scale. There are currently approximately 280 houses in Wilstone. This development would increase its size by 10%. That is not small scale. This site, though immediately adjoining, is outside the settlement boundary. Consequently it will result in an outward extension of the settlement into the open countryside.

While there appears to be no specific affordable housing needs appraisal for Wilstone itself, in 2018 an assessment of housing need in Tring Rural Parish, covering all six villages, was carried out. That identified a need for 13 affordable housing units. Based on the demand figures in Table 6 of that assessment, Wilstone has a need for 4 affordable homes.

The Planning Statement accompanying this application states that the site has "a number of local facilities and services accessible on foot and public transport to local services and facilities". That is a little disingenuous. The village has a village hall, a pub and a part-time convenience shop.

Employment, educational, health, recreational and retail facilities are all located in Tring, some 5 kilometres away. The nearest railway stations are at Tring (7km.) and Cheddington (5.7km.)

In the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation 'Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot' the acceptable walking distance is 1km and the desirable 800m. (The absolute maximum distance for a fully mobile person is 2km.) Department of Transport 'Policy LTN1/04 on Walking and Cycling' says "The mean average length for walking journeys is approximately 1 km and for cycling, it is 4 km."

Consequently all significant services are significantly over an acceptable walking distance (Not the 'acceptable' 2 km. mentioned in the Transport Assessment). The Redline 164 bus service only runs once an hour to Tring, with a break midday for 2 hours and stops at 6:00pm. Star travel 167 to Leighton Buzzard has one bus per day and 207 to Hemel Hempstead once a week. This is not conducive to sustainable commuting.

	<p>Given that the majority of units on the site are for family housing, it is inevitable that those households will be car dependent. NPPF para 103 says that “development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.” In our view, this development is not sustainable.</p> <p>The site is currently in arable cultivation. There is no reference in the application to the agricultural land classification of the site. The Agricultural Land Classification Map for the Eastern Region (ALC008) shows that the site is classified as Grade 3. Both the NPPF and Saved Policy 108 of the Dacorum Local Plan give protection to Grades 1, 2 and 3a. Policy 108 says that development on Grade 3a land will be refused. The Council will have to satisfy itself on the classification of this site before determining the application.</p> <p>On the proposed design and layout of the development, we note that in the Statement of Entry Level Housing Needs prepared for application 4/00024/19/MFA Rectory Homes stated that “flats are not proposed on the site in Wilstone due to the nature of this development site and its location.” Consequently we are surprised that 28% of the affordable housing in this application, less than a year later, are flats. There is no explanation for the fundamental change.</p> <p>It is not clear that the proposed public open space will integrate and connect with walkers along the Grand Union Canal, for wider public benefit; in fact the whole relationship of the built form to the Canal feels poorly considered and an opportunity missed. The layout and built forms generally are quite arbitrary lacking a coherent approach to the site or context.</p> <p>We are also concerned that the proposed layout indicates the potential for both vehicular and pedestrian access to the adjacent field, facilitating future development. Should the Council be minded to approve this application this potential should be removed.</p> <p>This unsustainable development will clearly have an adverse impact on the openness of the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt and extend the village beyond its settlement boundary. In our view, this application does not meet the requirement of the policies in either the NPPF or the Dacorum Core Strategy and should be rejected</p>
1 Chapel Fields	<p>The comments relating to a previous application for 15 houses on the above site, number 4/00024/19/MFA still apply.</p> <p>Policy CS1 Wilstone is identified in the Core Strategy as a small village within the rural area and in order to protect it, it is an area of development restraint.</p> <p>Policy CS2 the site is outside the village boundary and building outside the development boundary is contrary to the general planning policy. Wilstone has been rated as poor in its accessibility audit outcome in Dacorum's Settlement Hierarchy Study.</p> <p>Wilstone has no key services, i.e. NO primary school, post office, NO surgery, Children's Centre. The closest higher tier settlement is Tring.</p>

	<p>This current application is for the development of land on a non-brownfield, previously undeveloped green field site outside the village boundary and does not sit with previous granted permissions for housing development. Development of this site would set a precedent and make it difficult to refuse future proposals for similar or adjacent housing development in Wilstone and Long Marston</p>
<p>3 Chapel Fields</p>	<p>This development directly goes against the needs of village residents, as well as the research carried out for the developer ("Tring Road, Wilstone Entry-Level Housing Needs" for Rectory Homes by Lichfield's) and by Tring Rural Parish ("Housing Needs Survey: 2018").</p> <p>These studies showed a significant need for smaller, affordable homes; suitable for single occupants/parents and young families. The Parish Council study identified a need for 2 bedroom houses (63% of recipients), as well as 1 or 3 bedroom houses. This application is proposing 15 more big houses that won't be affordable to villagers that are in need of housing. These 15 houses, which are additional to the 13 'affordable' properties, appear to be 4-5 bedroom houses on large plots of land. These will be vastly unaffordable to the villagers in need of housing. We have just had 8 large properties built in the village in the last year, starting at £650,000 upwards, none of which were bought by those 'in need' that live in the village. The Lichfield's study states that in order for the houses to be of use to the village, the values need to be around £316,000 (without H2B) or £354,000 (with H2B) a discount of up to 20% on a 2 bed or 20-30% on a 3 bed.</p> <p>As well as the unsuitability of the housing proposed, I object to the quantity. The village already has too many people driving through it on a daily basis. The majority of drivers fail to adhere to the speed limit. 28 new houses will bring at least 56 new cars through the village; based on the size of the houses, you can guarantee at least 2 cars per household. There needs to be a review of the traffic calming strategies in the village before any more houses can be built.</p> <p>There is no need at present for any more large houses in the village. The village needs smaller, affordable homes that are in reach of those on lower incomes. The developer seems to have completely ignored their own research, the needs of the villagers and the local plan</p> <p>Amended Plans</p> <p>Further to my comments on 4th August 2020 and in response to the amended drawings uploaded on 8th Sept 2020:</p> <p>The comments and concerns of the village residents have not been acknowledged in the updated proposals. The development still fails to address the needs of the village or contribute to the local population in a positive way.</p> <p>Referring to the response by highway officer, Adam Whinnett (signed 22nd July 2020, uploaded 23rd July 2020), whose observations clearly indicate the impact the development would have on the village's existing infrastructure. The response suggests substantial investment and alterations would be required in order to accommodate the impact of the development on the</p>

village. There are conditions to be met concerning the highways, pedestrian use through the village, pedestrian crossing points, and bus services. However no indicative plans have been submitted to show intention of meeting these conditions yet.

Mr Whinnett also comments on the number of parking spaces allocated to residents of the proposed site. The original allocation was for 70 spaces, which has been reduced to 68 in the new amended drawings and following Mr Whinnetts comments. The current standard is for 49.25 spaces, outlined in DBCs parking standards. A reduction of 2 spaces shows little regard for the authority of the highway officer, a lack of willingness to meet the highway standards, and raises concerns that the other observations and conditions will not be sufficiently met.

Further, the development is proposing just 6 visitor parking spaces for the 28 proposed dwellings. This will not provide enough space for visitors to park and will encourage parking outside the t-junction, along Tring Road and elsewhere in the village.

The proposed t-junction is located in close proximity to a dangerous corner on Tring Road. The speed limit from the north is 60mph but reduces to 30mph for the village. However this is only after the corner turns, meaning cars regularly pass this corner in excess of 30mph. Furthermore, the road width narrows after the corner (visible on plan), meaning cars regularly cross onto the other side of the road at speed. The late speed limit change, poor visibility and difference in road width make this a very dangerous section of road in the village. There is no designated footpath either, so pedestrians are forced to walk on the road. With the added complications of a t-junction here, it will only be a matter of time before there is a road collision or a pedestrian is knocked over.

This is a substantial development being carried out next to a grade II listed canal bridge. Access to the site will not be possible via this bridge. Therefore it is assumed that all construction traffic will need to come through the village. Not only will this cause significant noise pollution for the village residents, but it will pose a danger to the pedestrians who walk through the village. There are a number of sections of road through the village which don't have footpaths so pedestrians regularly walk on the road and will be put at risk by the use of this road by construction traffic. Further, the section of Tring Road by the village hall is a blind corner, the visibility of which is blocked by a 10ft+ fence. The residents of the adjacent terraced houses park on the road, which they are fully entitled to do, so the passing width of the corner is reduced significantly from what is shown on standard maps. Large construction vehicles will not be able to turn this corner with ease and could cause damage to the residents cars, pose danger to the pedestrians walking here and obstruction to other road users.

This is a case of building houses for the sake of building houses to make a profit. The development is too vast and disproportionate to the village, the houses are too big and are unaffordable to village residents in need of housing, and there has been little consideration for the surrounding area; the site blocks neighbouring fields rendering them inaccessible to farmer's vehicles and the site has no relationship to the adjacent footpaths or the canal.

	<p>It is clear that the developer has little regard for the village's existing residents, their way of life or the character and beauty of the village.</p>
<p>4 Chapel Fields</p>	<p>I object to this planning application in the strongest terms and for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 28 additional houses in the small village of Wilstone represents a 10% increase in its size and would substantially change the character of the village and very negatively impact the community - the level of traffic through the village would increase substantially and increase the noise, pollution and risk of accidents. There is only one road through the village and no alternative routes for traffic. The main road already has no footpath through the village posing a danger to pedestrians and substantial extra traffic would increase the risk of accidents and reduce willingness of people to walk. - the bottle neck for traffic coming over the canal bridge would worsen increasing the risk of accidents on an already weak bridge. - the development is proposed on green field land ruining the character of that end of the village. All other recent developments have been on brownfield land and this should continue rather than spoiling the countryside - the development clearly contradicts policies CS7, CS1 and CS2 - the village does not have amenities nor jobs for the proposed extra residents meaning they would have to travel out of the village constantly with the consequent negative impact on the environment. <p>I also wish to complain about this process. A public consultation meeting should be held and if Covid 19 restrictions prevent such a meeting taking place the whole process should be stopped until it is possible to do so. This affects the whole community and they must be allowed to have their opinions heard.</p> <p><u>Amended Plans</u></p> <p>My objections to the plan remain and are unchanged as a result of revised documents posted by the developer. Added to this, the area is prone to flooding as recent rainfall has more than adequately demonstrated and covering green field land with more concrete and tarmac will increase run off further and add to an already chronic problem. This development must not go ahead!</p>
<p>10 Chapel Fields</p>	<p>Can you tell me how to make an objection on the grounds that this is a major development on a green field site which would expand this small rural village by approximately 10%</p> <p>This is despite there being no facilities in Wilstone like doctors, supermarket/shops or school. I believe this would contravene your own policies concerning development. This development is outside the village boundary and thus contravenes policy CS2</p> <p>I would also like to object strongly about increased noise and light pollution</p>

	<p>this development would bring with approximately 60 extra vehicles using the village roads</p>
<p>15 Cheddington Lane/ Wilstone Allotments Association</p>	<p>1. Ref Transport Statement Appendix C Page 23: Proposed Site Plan. 'A new pedestrian access formed through existing hedge'. This access is onto land owned by Tring Charities and includes Wilstone Allotments. All tenants of the allotments are very concerned that this access will add to our ongoing security problems. We have had numerous incidents of trespass, vandalism, theft, damage to sheds and greenhouses since the allotments were set up in 2011. The site location is difficult to monitor despite tenants vigilance and residents support. Why is the gate on the plan? What is it for? There is no explanation given.</p> <p>2. Ref Planning Statement Wilstone June 2020: Page 27 - 6.66 'It is accepted that the development will have an impact and thus create a need for financial contributions for certain services to mitigate its impact and make it acceptable in planning terms....'</p> <p>Wilstone Community Shop provides a vital and essential range of services to the wider as well as local community (as seen during the Covid 19 pandemic when it stayed open throughout), but it is due to close in 2021 unless funds can be raised to purchase the property from the owners of the building who are retiring.</p> <p>£300,000 is needed to be raised. A substantial donation towards this purchase from the developers would be generously received by the Wilstone Community Shop Management and Fund Raising Committee.</p>
<p>17 Dixons Wharf</p>	<p>This proposal is significantly too large for the village and sets a dangerous precedent in relation to development on greenfield land within the context of a small village in a rural environment. The environmental considerations have been substantially underplayed, including the ecology of the area. The ecology report glosses over resources not found (on a single survey occasion) and uses the absence of historical records to suggest that species are absent, when in fact they are regularly present in the fields in this area, such as barn owl, skylark, lapwing and scarce breeding species including yellow wagtail. In addition to all of the other planning policies that would be breached by this application, there is no suggestion of the requirement to deliver biodiversity net gain (soon to become mandatory under the Environment Bill) and the plans reflect that with their tokenistic approach to landscaping, where significant and genuine gains are in fact needed to address the widely acknowledged climate and biodiversity crises. The infrastructure of the village is not in a condition or of a scale that would allow for the effective absorption of this many new residents and vehicles and should not be permitted. The many recent developments on brownfield land within and adjacent to the village have amply demonstrated the success of that approach to reinvigorating the village and allowing for small-scale expansion without threatening the character of the area, which it is vital to maintain.</p> <p><u>Amended Plans</u></p> <p>There is nothing in the revised planning application that has sought to offer genuine concession or allay the concerns of the majority of commentators on the previous plans, namely the scale of the proposed development and the</p>

	<p>resultant strain to existing community facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>I note the indication of a 'potential connection to the canal' through the site, which suggests that the proponent has no real interest in, or commitment to, providing it. The increase in size of attenuation basin, whilst making more of the site impermeable, is not a sustainable solution for localised flooding impacts either.</p> <p>Unfortunately for the proponent, they can do nothing about the fact that the site remains a greenfield one and is consequently wholly inappropriate for development of this nature in this village location and context.</p>
21 Dixons Wharf	<p>This application seems to me to possibly breach Policy CS1 and certainly to breach policy CS2 as it is on a green site outside the village boundary.</p> <p>As there was already considerable objection to the earlier 15 house proposal (4/00024/19/MFA), this 28 house proposal would seem to be totally out of keeping with the village's supposed protected status.</p>
22 Dixons Wharf	<p>I would like to please strongly object to this development for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is green field and therefore I struggle to understand how this development is even being contemplated in the first instance. There are plenty of brown field sites in the area without digging up farmland / grassland. This alone should be enough to refuse this application in itself. 2. Wilstone has no facilities to support a 10% increase in the population that this development constitutes. 3. The roads are unfit for more traffic 4. The development will be overcrowded, and (like every new build development these days) there won't be enough parking or enough green space built in, and the space will be 'rammed full' of identikit characterless houses. 5. The area has already had sizable developments in Dixons Wharf (where I live) and Lukes Lane. This is enough for this area 6. I am aware that developers have in the past 'tipped the balance' on getting planning approval by offering additional money for local services, which seemingly helps to get planning applications through. I find this behavior unacceptable / unfair as individuals such as myself who would love to build our own house on a plot find that it is impossible to locate a plot with planning permission as green field sites for are non-starters and as individuals we cannot afford to make the monetary contributions that corporate developers do. There should be a level playing field between commercial developers (who build awful, soulless houses designed to maximize profit) and individuals who would build much more appealing houses given the opportunity.
51 Ellingham Road, Hemel Hempstead	<p>This would be over-development in a village, increasing housing by 10%, Previous development has only been allowed on brown sites or previously</p>

	<p>developed areas; this would be on agricultural land and the site is outside the developed area of the village.</p> <p>The site would bring approx. 50 plus cars to the area where road access is poor. The sewerage system in the area is overloaded and this would worsen conditions.</p> <p>The site is often waterlogged and subject to flooding.</p> <p>There is no public schooling available in the village and shops consist only of a farm shop and a community shop which has a threatened future.</p>
Hornbeam House, 2 Lendon Grove	<p>This would be a great shame for this unspoilt rural community. The roads surrounding this are already far too busy to cope with additional traffic from a development of this kind. There is also limited local infrastructure to cope.</p> <p>With new developments cropping up all over, it would be a great shame to lose yet more much needed green land that supports rural communities and wildlife in the area.</p>
1 Grange Road	<p>We object to this proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>Wilstone is classed as a Rural Area and an Area of Development Restraint</p> <p>It would set a precedent for the conversion of arable land to housing and could lead to or encourage further development along Tring Road particularly to the south and in the fields to the south of the site. Government data shows that rural housing is now growing at much greater rate than urban which has largely been stable over the last few years</p> <p>Dacorum policy for rural areas allows for small scale development for housing, employment and other purposes at Aldbury, Long Marston and Wilstone (CS7)</p> <p>Over the last 20 years or so the housing stock in Tring Rural PC has increased by over 20% with the majority being open market housing. If the current proposals are included this will represent an increase of 25%. The size of developments is increasing and the proposal is the largest to date. The trend is to build exclusive developments which Herts CC will not adopt on the edge of villages. These do not represent logical extension to the villages.</p> <p>The developer does not explain how social rent housing will fit in with an unadopted development that will require some form of management organisation and additional fees to cover maintenance, insurance etc.</p> <p>The cost of rural open market housing is reckoned to be 20% above urban land so a 20% reduction for affordable in a rural setting is unlikely to make it truly affordable. In addition there are management fees and hidden costs associated with living in a rural area. The net result is that these developments will only attract those from outside the local area who can afford to live in the countryside and commute to work.</p> <p>Rectory Homes suggest that the village is well served by bus and rail routes and make much of walking and cycling. It is true that there is a choice of stations with routes to London or the Midlands, but whether you use Tring,</p>

	<p>Cheddington or Wendover, they are all difficult to get to and have limited parking. The bus routes are limited and run at times that are not generally suitable for commuting. Some services only run during Bucks school terms.</p> <p>Wilstone has more amenities than many villages but for access to services such as Post Offices, banks, senior schools, medical facilities and recycling centres requires a trip to a local town.</p> <p>There are no pavements in the centre of Wilstone so school children cannot walk from the proposed site to the bus stop by either route without walking some way on the highway. Children and parents then have to wait on the highway dodging cars and vans going to the village shop. Senior children have to make their own way too Tring as there is no room on the school bus.</p> <p>Walking using the many footpaths is great in the summer for leisure but as a means of getting to places like Tring on a daily basis is simply not a realistic option for most people.</p> <p>The road routes from Wilstone are not cycle friendly and often highly dangerous.</p> <p>All of these residents will be very dependent on the car and most multi-occupancy households will have 2 cars. This leads to significant numbers of car trips than might occur in an urban area.</p>
23 Grange Road	<p>I object to the plans on the following grounds:</p> <p>Policy CS1 points out that Wilstone is an area of development restraint.</p> <p>Policy CS2 of building outside the village boundary therefore encroaching onto green countryside, this site is outside the village boundary, therefore will be encroaching onto countryside.</p> <p>Changing the character of the village and the months/years of misery for the community during yet more construction.</p> <p>The local school is full to capacity as are the local doctor's surgeries.</p> <p>We already have issues with speeding and heavy traffic through the village, where this site is proposed means that all the works traffic will have to travel all the way through the village to site, damaging roads and causing risk to lives (very few footpaths) and property.</p> <p>The wildlife that occupy the field would be a sore loss to the community and area.</p> <p>The damage and pollution to the neighbouring area</p> <p>These properties still won't be 'affordable' for first time buyers in this area because of house prices being so high across the parish.</p> <p>There are two brown field sites identified close by in Tring, there's no need to take away any green field</p> <p>There are real concerns about flooding and over use of an already stretched</p>

to its limits sewerage system

As for transport/vehicle movements, the bus service to and from the village is sporadic at best.

Commuting using a bus would be impossible as the last bus gets into the village before 5 o'clock and that's only in Bucks school term time.

There's no real local employment, the village shop is run by volunteers and the local pub and farm shop have low staff turnover and it's a long way to Tring or Aylesbury with no footpath on the road to either, so we could expect another 50+ vehicle movements per day in the village should all dwellings be filled.

Agricultural vehicles would also be forced to access the remaining area via Rosebarn Lane rather than through the gate on Tring Road. Rosebarn lane is a foot path, clearly unsuitable for agricultural vehicles and used daily by children going to and from the bus stop.

We are aware that it will not be taken into consideration but we are expecting, should planning be granted that provisions have been made for parking of construction workers other than using Grange Road and Tring Road to dump their vehicles. The top of Grange road is used 4 times daily by the school coach as it is the safest place to turn around, it would also hinder the residents being able to park near their homes

We are mostly concerned that this development, if granted, will open the flood gates for development of the rest of the green space within the village, ruining the character of it and causing many years of misery during construction, ending with loss of privacy for us all.

Amended Plans

I object to the plans on the following grounds:

Policy CS1: Distribution of development. Wilstone is identified in the core strategy as a small village within the rural area and in order to protect it, Wilstone is an area of development restraint.

The proposed development does not satisfy Policy CS2: Selection of Development Sites. The site is not located within the defined Wilstone village boundary. In the Dacorum Borough Council Settlement Profiles Paper (October 2017), Wilstone is identified as settlement number 14. On the accompanying map in that document, it is evident that the site location of the proposed development is outside the village boundary.

In Dacorum's Settlement Hierarchy Study (October 2017), Wilstone has been rated as poor in its accessibility audit outcome. Today as then, Wilstone has no higher order services (as defined in that study i.e. no secondary school, supermarket, employment, indoor sports facilities, library, dentist or pharmacy).

Wilstone has no key services (as defined in that study i.e. no primary school, post office, GP surgery, Children's Centre). It has a village hall, food shop

(part time hours) a pub and a children's play area. The study also identified that the closest higher tier settlement, Tring, is 5 km away and has limited public transport provision.

There is a lack therefore of existing services and facilities in Wilstone. Furthermore, residents of the proposed development will be reliant on cars as a main means of transport to use nearest services and facilities.

The study on Wilstone in the Dacorum Settlement Profiles Paper (October 2017) identifies average vehicles per household as 1.7 (based on a 2011 statistical survey). With the proposal seeking 28 new dwellings, this will equate to some 47.6 new vehicles in the village. This is likely to have a significant impact on the local highway network at peak hour and other times. The applicant's supporting planning statement estimates there being 15 vehicles additional to morning peak hour and 16 for the afternoon peak hour. It would be useful to know how these figures have been determined.

In the applicants supporting planning statement it is stated (6.67) that "the site is located in an area suitable for small-scale growth with a number of local facilities and services accessible on foot and public transport to local services and facilities". It is evident from Dacorum's own settlement hierarchy study (October 2017) when referring to Wilstone (and as mentioned above) that this is not so.

Further, in the supporting planning statement, 6.73 states "the associated construction jobs and local investment during it's build out as well as longer term expenditure in the local economy will be of economic benefit to the local area, helping to sustain local services and facilities within the village". As mentioned previously, there are no higher order services in the village (secondary school, supermarket, indoor sports facilities, library, dentist and pharmacy) to be supported. Of the services available, there is the opportunity to support the village shop (part time hours) and the pub, the latter also patronised by customers who travel in from outside the village (walkers and car drivers). Other key services such as a primary school, post office and children's centre do not exist. In making these observations, we do not believe they afford "positive weight in the planning balance" (applicants planning statement 6.73) and ask whether members and officers are of the same opinion.

The change to the character of the village and the months/years of misery for the community during yet more construction, destroyed verges hedgerows and litter as there was during the construction of Wilstone Wharf.

The local primary school is full as is the secondary school they had 517 applications for 240 places last year, as are the local doctor's surgeries, dentists and other services.

We already have issues with speeding and heavy traffic through the village, where this site is proposed means that all the works traffic will have to travel all the way through the village to site, damaging roads and causing risk to lives (very few footpaths) and property.

The wildlife that occupy the field would be a sore loss to the community and area.

	<p>The damage and pollution to the neighbouring area</p> <p>These properties still won't be 'affordable' for first time buyers in this area because of house prices being so high across the parish.</p> <p>There are two brown field sites identified close by in Tring, there's no need to take away any green field</p> <p>There are real concerns about flooding and over use of an already stretched to its limits sewerage system</p> <p>Our objection under Policy CS2 therefore is that the proposed development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does not use previously developed land and buildings; 2. Is not in an area of high accessibility; 3. Does not have good transport connections; 4. Does not have full regard to environmental constraints; 5. Does not respect local character and landscape <p>We are aware that it will not be taken into consideration but we are expecting, should planning be granted that provisions have been made for parking of construction workers other than using Grange Road and Tring Road to dump their vehicles. The top of Grange road is used 4 times daily by the school coach as it is the safest place to turn around, it would also hinder the residents being able to park near their homes</p> <p>I am concerned that this development, if granted, will open the flood gates for development of the rest of the green space within the village, ruining the character of it and causing many years of misery during construction, ending with loss of privacy and any green land around for us all.</p>
24 Grange Road	<p>This application 20/01754/MFA, does not appear to supersede the previous application 4/00024/19/MFA for 15 dwellings, which is pending consideration.</p> <p>This application for 28 dwellings represents a 10% increase in the total number of dwellings in the village of Wilstone, a significant increase for a small village within the rural area.</p> <p>The village offers no amenities other than a pub and a volunteer run village shop for a village in excess of 300 households</p> <p>The development, based on a recent statistical survey, would increase the number of vehicles in the village by approximately 50. The resulting increase in traffic through the village and demands for parking places disproportionate strains on the infrastructure and an increased risk for pedestrians, especially on the bend by the village hall</p> <p>The development on a green field site, sets a dangerous precedent for future builds, given that previous developments to date, have been on brown field sites.</p>

	<p>The planning application states that the site is not at risk of flooding. However there have been various recent flood events in Wilstone.</p> <p>The Parish council has closely liaised with the Herts County Council Environment Resource Planning, Flood Risk Management team since 2014, whom it would be prudent to consult given their familiarity with the local area.</p> <p>The village needs more smaller and genuinely affordable properties</p>
27 Grange Road	<p>The precedent of allowing development of this type in a small village, on a greenfield site, in an area that is supposedly subject to the CS1 policy for developmental restraint is not one I support and the increase by 10% of the current village size in a single development seems completely contrary to the policy. It will add major strain on the few public amenities Wilstone has. It also contradicts Policy CS2 in that the development is outside of village boundaries and as such encroaches into the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>This development is simply ridiculous in many ways and is incompatible with the small rural village community that Wilstone is.</p>
29 Grange Road	<p>I object to this application.</p> <p>The following are my objections to the application number 4/00024/19/MFA which wasn't even validated, never mind determined. These objections still stand, for the same reasons, even though some of the documents I refer to aren't included in the current application.</p> <p>There was a Pre-application (4/000427/18/PRE) associated with the above application which mentioned a similar number of dwellings to the current proposal. I can only assume the advice wasn't positive for the developer.</p> <p>My observations, objections and points of note are as follows:</p> <p>Requirement for Affordable Housing in this Location</p> <p>On the applicant's own admission, they do not have the data to support the level of evidence required to meet the NPPF exception test. Quoting from the Litchfield Report - Exception Site Evidence document in para 2.34 "the stage 2 projections are not yet published (and) are needed to determine the number of potential first-time buyers by type, which is needed for this assessment". The entire document is based on assumptions drawn from data which is, by their own admission, required but unavailable.</p> <p>The NPPF (2018) para 71 states "unless the need for such housing is already being met within the authority's area". Para 4.7 of the same Litchfield Report states "it is possible that some affordable houses for sale are already committed in the 5-year housing supply. We have not reviewed all recent permissions." This shows the applicant has not taken the Adopted Local Plan into account.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the Adopted Local Plan in that the Dacorum Site Allocations written statement identifies Wilstone as a 'Small Village' and therefore an 'area of development restraint'. The same document identifies three allocated sites within Tring as well as LA5 for potential development</p>

within the area. There should be no requirement to develop a green field site over the two brown field sites already identified within Tring.

Para 5.7 states "between 2001 - 2017 substantial fall in younger working age adults and young children". In Grange Road alone there are 31 children born within this time frame and approx. 20-30 more across the wider village.

Traffic Statement

Para 2.12 Pedestrian access - "...connecting to the footway network..." - this land is outside the boundary of the proposed development site (the red line) as indicated by the site location plan thereby making connection, as a part of this development, impossible and leaving pedestrians to cross a 60mph road on a bend in order to reach the nearest available footpath. The applicant appears to have not understood this issue.

Para 4.2 Walking & Cycling states "...influenced by perception and prejudices of... local topography and attitudes towards particular travel modes." - There are very few footpaths in the village as a whole, none in the centre of the village and none on the roads leading into or out of the village. There are also no cycle paths on any of the surrounding 60mph roads. This development is aimed at first-time buyer families meaning a high potential for small children and pushchairs. I would suggest that common sense and safety is more likely to be a factor to preventing people walking or cycling to local areas than 'perception, prejudices and attitudes'.

The minimum acceptable distances for walking and cycling are stated as being 2km and 5km respectively. Whilst Tring is 4.5km away by road, these roads are, in the main, 60mph narrow country lanes with no footpath or cycle path making the journey very dangerous, particularly for younger children/inexperienced cyclists.

It is possible to walk to Tring using footpaths however it means using the canal towpath network and results in a approx. 5.8km walk one way - outside the minimum distance stated.

Para 4.7 Bus services - Circular 164 route provides 6 buses per day from the village. The timetable does not work for commuters to Aylesbury as the last bus returns to the village at 16:42. It is also important to note that the 07:27 and 16:42 only operate during Buckinghamshire school term times. Wilstone is in Hertfordshire so term times can differ to Buckinghamshire and children can and do attend both Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire schools.

Traffic Impact

TRICS data analysed is not like for like - data was taken from surveys in Shropshire, Staffordshire, North Yorkshire, Cheshire and Greater Manchester

Selected location for surveys is 'Edge of Town' - Wilstone is a rural village

Sub-category selected is 'residential' where 'village' is an option

Car ownership shown as 1.1 - 1.5 avg per dwelling - Dacorum has previously been identified (within Exception Site Evidence document) as being 'Affluent

Rural' and "have high levels of car ownership" therefore TRICS data is showing less traffic generated than will actually take place.

Compare to Grange Road

- Approx 45 dwellings avg 2 cars per property = 90 vehicles
- Over 50% leave the road between 07:30 and 09:00 weekdays
- Scale down to 15 properties for comparison and this equates to 15 am outbound vehicle movements as opposed to data suggesting 7 am outbound movements. The proposal will therefore result in significantly (double) the traffic movements currently identified.

Sustainability

Village shop

- Is a community shop run by volunteers. It is only open in the mornings (07:30 to 14:00 (Mon - Fri) 07:30 to 13:00 (Sat) and 09:00 to 12:00 (Sun))
- Premises are on a 3-year lease only and villagers are currently actively trying to find ways to keep it open. If the lease is not renewed there will be no village shop. This happened some years ago when the Post Office moved out and the shop shut. It is only open now because the community took it on.

Bus Service

- 6 buses per day
- Timings unsuitable for commuters to Aylesbury or Hemel Hempstead
- Timings unsuitable for school hours in Tring
- 07:27 and 16:42 services do not operate during Buckinghamshire school holidays
- Buckinghamshire school holidays do not necessarily coincide with Hertfordshire school holidays

Local employment

- Village shop is volunteer run, therefore does not offer an employment opportunity
- The Half Moon Public House has a very low staff turnover
- Other businesses in the village are mainly sole-trader/self-employed/work from home
- Main commuter towns are Aylesbury (7 miles) and Hemel Hempstead (10 miles) and both would require private transport e.g. a car to access

Other points to consider should the application be granted:

	<p>Access to Remaining Field</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where is this proposed to be? - Rosebarn Lane is not accessible to vehicles - It is a public footpath - There is a drainage ditch running the full length of the lane down one side - This needs to be addressed as part of the application to avoid highway safety issues resulting from large tractors with attached equipment using unsuitable access points/tracks. <p>Construction Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full construction plan to be put in place - Canal bridge is 10T MGW and a listed building - Construction traffic over 10T will have to come through the village - No construction traffic should be allowed to park in Grange Road before 09:00 and after 15:00 to allow residents access to their properties and parking - No deliveries to the site should be allowed before 09:00 - Parking for construction workers should be identified away from Grange Road e.g. a temporary car park on the construction site or adjacent to it - - Grange Road is a cul de sac with a high % of school age children, full risk assessment of any construction traffic using Grange Road should be undertaken and safety action taken to ensure children can still play safely in and around the area. <p>Future Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The application form states that 'pre-application advice was sought on a large residential proposal for the application site and adjoining land (4/00427/18/PRE)'. Presumably the outcome wasn't favourable resulting in this revised application. The concern is that, should this be granted planning permission, it would be setting a precedent for future development of the remaining field and those adjoining. The pre-application advice indicates this is highly likely to be part of the developer's future plans. By proposing to site the new access road to the north of the development, rather than leaving it where it is currently, they are providing themselves with easy future access to any further development of the site in the future.
31 Grange Road	<p>Wilstone does not need a new development with existing developments already being built in Tring.</p> <p>The increase in the size of the village spoils the nature of the village. The village is enjoyed by 100s of people from local towns and communities as a</p>

	<p>tourist spot because it is an attractive village.</p> <p>Wilstone can't cope with the increase in size by 10%. Parking in the village, especially Grange road is terrible and with an extra 50 cars would be even worse.</p> <p>Local schools and doctors would struggle to offer places especially with huge developments already in Tring. Parents could even find themselves having to send children to schools out of the local community.</p> <p>The sewage system in the village is poor and there is definitely a stench in certain parts of the village.</p> <p>Local traffic is already very high with roads and bridges often needing repair due to the heavy traffic.</p> <p>There is a lot of wildlife in the area that would also suffer as a result of the development.</p>
38 Grange Road	<p>Wilstone has seen significant brown field development recently at Dixons Wharf, Wilstone Wharf and Tring Road.</p> <p>This additional proposal would increase the village size by 10% and is to be developed on a green field site in a rural countryside location and outside of the small village boundary. This would set a precedent that would leave our small community at further risk of overdevelopment.</p> <p>There is also the proposed houses at the end of Grange Road to be included.</p> <p>The potential increase of up to 2 cars per household would increase the strain already felt on the local roads. At the end of the village where the development is proposed is a blind bend straight onto a weight restricted, listed canal bridge. The other direction is a 90 degree blind bend where the road narrows, cars park all along one side and there is not footpath for pedestrians going to and from the hall/recreation ground/shop. This is already a danger with people often ignoring the no right turn sign into the village hall car park.</p> <p>Parking is at capacity in the village and there would be no overflow along adjoining roads</p> <p>There are few buses, the shop is small and closes at 1pm and there are no continuous footpaths through the village.</p> <p>The local school is often oversubscribed. The playground is inadequate for children older than toddlers.</p> <p>There must be other sites that would be more suitable for development and not on a greenfield site?</p>
40 Grange Road	<p>Proposal contradicts Dacorum's Core Strategy identifying Wilstone as a small village in a rural area with development restraint. The site is a green field site falling outside of the village boundary thus contradicting general planning policy protecting rural settlements from overdevelopment or encroachment.</p>

	<p>There are no higher order services or key services in the village. To facilitate these services necessitates driving to Tring or using limited public transport.</p> <p>The site is prone to surface water run off which pools at the top of Grange Road. The groundwater monitoring submitted dates from 2018 following severe drought and compromised levels.</p> <p>Groundwater levels have only recently recovered to normal levels rendering supporting data as invalid.</p> <p>All recent developments in the village have been on brown field sites, not land that has been in agricultural use.</p>
<p>7 The Green, Lower Icknield Way</p>	<p>28 New homes in a village of only 280 homes is a 10% increase with around 47 extra cars.</p> <p>Wilstone is identified in the core strategy as a small village and is protected.</p> <p>Wilstone has NO schools, library, GP surgery, pharmacy, post office, limited public transport and a part time shop which is under threat of closure. This is a green field site outside the boundary of the village and not like the last development which was brown field.</p> <p>The go ahead on this site would set a precedent and make future developments hard to stop. This development is way out of proportion to the size of Wilstone.</p> <p>100's and 100's of new homes are being built right now in Tring and Aylesbury and surrounding areas so this development is not needed and will make the village too big with no supporting services.</p> <p><u>Amended Plans</u></p> <p>Wilstone has 280 houses already. 28 more is an increase of 10% with an extra 48 vehicles.</p> <p>Wilstone has had 10 houses built in the village already over the last 2 years.</p> <p>Wilstone has no school, GP, library, dentist, or pharmacy and only a small part time shop which is under threat of closure. Tring is the closest higher tier settlement. Houses in Wilstone are not needed as Tring, Long Marston, Cheddington and Aylesbury all have large developments being built now.</p> <p>The sewage system cannot cope now with 280 houses we have.</p> <p>Other developments in Wilstone were brown field sites, this one is not.</p> <p>All the construction traffic would have to come through the whole of the village as the other end has a 10 ton max humped back bridge over the canal</p> <p>Wilstone has been rated as poor in its accessibility study.</p>

<p>2 The Mill</p>	<p>This opportunistic and speculative application must be refused.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overdevelopment of rural location. 2. Road safety - the site is on a blind bend near a canal bridge, totally unsuitable for access. 3. Drainage - it is known that the water table is very high in this site and there is insufficient drainage already for the surrounding properties. 4. Insufficient infrastructure - this is blatant overdevelopment of a village already spoiled by numerous recent developments 5. Traffic - there are already safety concerns re site traffic, the school bus service will be adversely affected. <p>Please refuse this application, there is no need for further unaffordable housing in this village as seen by the number of unsold recently built properties which have blighted the village.</p> <p>The application conflicts with the following local policies: CS1 and CS2 outside village boundary</p> <p>Poor Accessibility</p> <p>Greenfield site</p> <p>A totally inappropriate development all round.</p> <p>Stop the decimation of this village by greedy property speculators who have totally ruined its character and spirit.</p>
<p>9 New Road</p>	<p>I wish to object to this development. Wilstone is a fantastic community, however, the reality is that it is poorly served by local amenities and transportation links. All new dwellings will require ample parking for at least a family of 2+, however, without any suggested investment in local transportation - these new dwellings will simply add to local traffic related pollution and congestion - eroding the character of this village.</p> <p>In addition, there is no evidence that either developers or Dacorum / Herts plan to invest in any of the infrastructure to support this large development - eg. the Wilstone pumping station supporting management of sewage is already over capacity, continually requires maintenance and clear out from tankers, etc.</p> <p>In addition, Wilstone is served by a local pub and volunteer run village shop, however offers no employment which allows individuals to be supported without the necessity of a private car to leave the village.</p> <p>I strongly object.</p>
<p>13 New Road</p>	<p>First a comment on process. Why were so few villagers consulted on this</p>

huge development?

Wilstone is a rural community, subject to development constraint. A development that proposes increasing the size of the village by approximately 10% is not small scale. (and is therefore not compliant with CS1).

The proposed development is outside the village boundary (and is therefore not compliant with CS2).

The development of a Greenfield site would result in loss of habitats and would set a precedent for other developments of greenfield sites.

In their planning statement the developers state

'1.3 Wilstone is 2km from Tring.'

In fact it is 2.5 miles. However and importantly, it is 4 miles from Tring station. Whilst cycling and walking are possible, the roads are too busy for many people to be comfortable cycling for 30 minutes in rush hour and although it is a lovely walk along the canal, most people would not tag on a more that 2 ½ mile walk to their working day even in summer.

A significant number of Wilstone residents are commuters and it is anticipated that many residents of the proposed development would also commute. It is highly likely that people travelling to Tring station in order to get to work will drive; parking at Tring station is beyond capacity already and is full before 8am.

The developers also state:

2.3 ' Bus stops are available along Tring Road offering services to the local service centres of Tring and Aylesbury'.

However there are few buses. .

They number;

Monday- Friday: 5/day to Aylesbury (via Tring)

Saturday: 6/day to Aylesbury (via Tring).

Friday: 2/day to Hemel Hempstead (via Tring)

Tuesday: 1/day to Ivinghoe

Services start at about 7.45am and end at about 4.30pm. There is no evening service.

There are NO direct buses to Tring station.

With such limited public transport, it is not a viable option for going to work or many routine activities for most people; they will drive. This will result in the increased emission of greenhouse gases.

The developers also state:

'2.4 In light of the extent of local services and facilities in the village and within walking and cycling distance, and public transport links to larger settlements, Wilstone is considered to occupy a sustainable location for development.'

The above data demonstrate that this is not true. This is not a sustainable development in a sustainable area.

The developers also state:

'5.5 At paragraph 8, the NPPF identifies three dimensions to sustainable development which include economic, social and environmental considerations. It states that these roles should not be undertaken in isolation as they are mutually dependent'

IN fact:

NPPF para 8 states

'a) an economic objective - to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;'

In this application, the development of Greenfield land outside a village boundary is not considered suitable in an area of low sustainability. There is no attempt to identify, coordinate or provide infrastructure.

' b) a social objective - to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being;'

Dacorum policy CS1 states that the identification of housing need is informed by village appraisal. The TRPC housing needs survey demonstrated need for 15 houses not 28. Accessible services are limited within the village comprising a part time village shop, a farm shop, a pub and a church.

and 'c) an environmental objective - to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.'

The use of agricultural land for development does not protect or enhance our natural environment and increased numbers of cars necessitated by poor transport links is not compatible with moving to a low carbon economy.

Therefore this development does not comply with NPPF para 8.

	<p>The developers also state:</p> <p>'6.36 The majority of the vegetation on site (which is largely limited to the site boundaries) will be retained and extensive new landscaping is proposed across the site to help assimilate the development into its surroundings, including strengthening all site boundary vegetation as well as across the site generally. A new area of public open space will be created in the northern section of the site which will comprise grassland, wildflower areas and areas of mixed native shrubs.'</p> <p>The proposed area of public open space is adjacent to one of the wettest parts of the canal towpath: the towpath itself and the adjacent field are often flooded and is more likely to be a bog garden.</p> <p><u>Amended Plans</u></p> <p>I have seen the amended plans and would like to reiterate my previous comments. The proposed development does not comply with either the NPPF or Dacorum Core Strategy. It is on agricultural land and is not sustainable.</p> <p>In addition I would like to add that the recent flooding demonstrates that this area is not suitable for development. This will be exacerbated by the removal of the vegetation from the nearby field.</p>
19 New Road	<p>We have just had one development and I think Wilstone is becoming over developed leading to loss of village.</p> <p>Traffic will be a lot worse as only one way to A41 through Wilstone. More cars will create a noisy road and with more cars coming through at speed there is a higher incidence of accidents.</p> <p>We don't need another development. Loss of more open space in Wilstone. Far too many houses to be built on the small plot.</p> <p><u>Amended Plans</u></p> <p>I think the number of dwellings is far too high for the area. Currently the sewage plant cannot cope with the number of houses already in Wilstone. It would create a further run off of water increasing the chance of flooding. Access onto the road would increase The danger of public walking along the land as there is no pavement. For the area the number of houses in the development is far too high.</p>
The Threshing Barn, 45 New Road	<p>I wish to object to this proposal because it is simply too big for a small, rural village of only 280 dwellings - another 28 dwellings increases this total by 10%.</p> <p>I understand the proposal contravenes Dacorum's core strategy policies CS1 and CS2.</p> <p>Wilstone has no key services such as a GP surgery, dentist, pharmacy, post office, primary school etc and only a limited public transport service to access these services for those who do not have a car.</p>

	<p>This will inevitably lead to an increase in traffic through the village where some properties are literally just a few feet from the main road as there's no pavement.</p> <p>Building on an undeveloped green field site outside the village boundary runs counter to recent other developments in the village where they have been restricted to brown field sites, such as Dixon's Wharf, Wilstone Wharf and no 17 Tring Road.</p>
<p>Garden Cottage, Rosebarn Lane</p>	<p>Wilstone does not have the infrastructure to support this scale of building. The sewers are already under enormous pressure, the electricity supply is subject to regular power cuts and the only road through the village is increasingly busy making it unsafe for pedestrians. In parts there aren't even pavements leading to construction vehicles passing within 2m of cottage windows.</p> <p>The old canal bridge is already under extreme pressure and will not withstand the extra demands from the increased traffic caused by the development</p> <p>The schools are already over subscribed</p> <p>The doctors surgeries in Tring are struggling to serve the growing number of people accessing its services</p> <p>Parking in the village is already a huge problem</p> <p>Wilstone is designated to be a village but its character is slowly being eroded. There is already considerable building work for new homes taking place in all the surrounding areas and I don't see the need to push Wilstone beyond the limitations of a village.</p>
<p>Kingfishers, Sandbrook Lane</p>	<p>Wilstone is a small village of about 280 dwellings - the proposed plan of 28 dwellings would increase this by 10%.</p> <p>Wilstone has no key services such as a GP surgery, dentist, pharmacy, post office, primary school etc and only a limited public transport service to access these services for those who do not have a car. In addition there is no direct public transport to Tring railway station.</p> <p>There is bound to be a significant increase in traffic (a minimum of 47 extra vehicles) and the sharp bend on Tring Road opposite the village hall is a blind turning with no pavement and is an obvious danger to pedestrians.</p> <p>The sewage pumping station in Sandbrook Lane is apparently at almost full capacity resulting not only in frequent odours which spread across the village but also has had a recent cracked pipe which led to an approximate week long convoy of lorries down Sandbrook Lane to solve the problem.</p> <p>It is also understood that the proposed development contravenes Dacorum's core strategy policies CS1 and CS2</p> <p>Building on an undeveloped green field site outside the village boundary runs counter to recent other developments in the village which have been restricted to brown field sites such as Dixons Wharf, Wilstone Wharf and 17</p>

	Tring Road.
The Old Cowhouse, Sandbrook Lane	<p>Greenfield development.</p> <p>Outside village boundary</p> <p>Contrary to general planning policy protecting rural settlements in an area of development restraint.</p>
Buckingham Lodge, Tring Road	<p>I object to this development on several grounds:</p> <p>The proposed development is out of proportion to the size of this small village. It would constitute a 10% increase in size, which is too large for the already stretched local services. The nearest school is in Long Marston and is over-subscribed. The doctor's surgeries in Tring and Aston Clinton are already stretched.</p> <p>Wilstone is identified in the Core Strategy as a small village within the rural area and in order to protect it, it is an area of development constraint.</p> <p>The proposed development is on a green field site and outside the village boundary.</p> <p>The development would increase traffic with the introduction of approximately 50 extra cars into the village. It would also lead to parking congestion and put more strain on parking in nearby Grange Road.</p> <p>Contractors parking on roads and verges during construction would cause major problems, and hazards to other road users and pedestrians.</p> <p>It sets a precedent, making it difficult to refuse future proposals for similar or adjacent housing development in Wilstone and Long Marston.</p>
10 Tring Road	<p>Those of us who have noticed the application have had insufficient time to consider it and look at all the documents in detail. However, I have noticed that one of the associated documents attached to the application under the heading "application details" is 20_01754_MFA-APPLICATION_DETAILS-1091285.pdf.</p> <p>This is the wrong file and relates to a large development in West Hemel Hempstead for "up to 1,100 dwellings...including a "gypsy travellers site" [sic.]</p> <p>What this means is that we do not have the correct application documents attached to this application and therefore the application cannot be determined: For our community to be able to consider it we need the correct documents. This application should never have passed validation.</p> <p>I have already commented that the flood risk assessment is grossly inadequate because the flood risk assessment considers only the site and not Wilstone or Long Marston.</p> <p>However, I have just noticed that document WILSTONE_JUNE_2020-1091280.pdf states under 6.47 that foul flows will be discharged to an</p>

existing sewer in Tring Road, and that 6.48 states that "The submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy demonstrates that the site is at low risk of flooding and the proposed drainage design will replicate greenfield conditions, taking account of climate change, such not to increase the risk of flooding elsewhere."

This is complete nonsense; there is no way in which this application replicates "greenfield conditions".

The existing sewer network in Wilstone is already overloaded; the pumping station already cannot cope adequately with peak flows and regularly overloads the village with its stink. The proposed site also has inadequate drainage and it will increase the risk of flooding in both Wilstone, and Long Marston, which is downstream of Wilstone.

Furthermore, this application is contrary to Policy Cs7 of Dacorum's cores strategy to permit only small scale development, contrary to Policy Cs1 as Wilstone is a small village and is an area of development restraint; contrary to Policy CS2 as it is outside the village boundary.

This represents the loss of a greenfield site, it would have a very significant on a small community, despite what the planning documents claim, nobody within the community benefits from this proposal, and it should not go ahead.

Amended Plans

The applicant has provided a report by Glanville consultants which concerns the increased flood risk posed by the site.

The report claims in 5.2 that it has been "proven" that the site drains towards the headwall located in the north west of the site.

The report also claims in 2.5 that a 3D model was generated [not available] *claiming* to show that the site drains towards the north west of the site and in 2.7 that there is a pipe connecting the ditch to the grand union canal. There may well be a pipe connecting the ditch to the grand union canal however, these claims do not support the assertion that the site drains to the north west, or that it does so during periods of heavy rain; and the report certainly does not prove that it does, or that the proposed drainage provisions are adequate.

Land drains carry water in both directions depending upon where the water has accumulated and where the flow of rain water is easier. The grand union canal frequently overflows during periods of heavy rain as water from the levels between the higher locks move down the canal. The ordnance survey map for the area shows that the proposed development site is broadly flat but slopes towards Tring Road. The natural flow of the water in this location is towards the old stream bed which Wilstone Church and the Long Row Cottages are built along and which runs down the back of the recreation ground.

On the 4-5th October 2020 we had a weekend of exceptionally heavy rain. Water flowed up through the manholes and grids on Tring Road where the road turns sharply at the Village Hall. The depth of water in the Village Hall car park was above 8 inches in depth. The ditch in front of the proposed

	<p>development site was full and so was the Grand Union Canal. This kind of event happens in Wilstone and we know that it has been happening for a long time, even before the current concerns about climate change: There is no way during periods of heavy rain that water can move in the direction claimed by the applicant's report without it being pumped there, and even if it were to be pumped there it would probably drain back.</p> <p>This report does <i>*not*</i> adequately address the risk of flooding: The proposed development of this site would significantly increase the risk of flooding in Wilstone during periods of heavy rain and the proposed remedies are grossly inadequate.</p> <p>The recent clearance of trees on the plot of land at the junction of Tring Road and Wingrave Road is further exacerbating the problem because trees are one of the factors that are known to slow down the run off of water and remove excess water from the ground.</p>
13 Tring Road	<p>Wilstone is a small rural village that is already struggling to cope with the number of developments that have already been granted. The school bus provision is already full and spills out into a taxi service. The existing nearby infrastructure - doctors, schools, parking etc. are already being pushed to the limit.</p> <p>Wilstone is identified in the Core Strategy as a small village within the rural area, and it is an area of development restraint. The development site is outside the village boundary. Building outside the boundary was one reason why another planning application, much more in keeping with the village (4/04008/15/FUL), was refused. Allowing a large scale development by a developer obviously looking to profit instead of a single development by an active member of the village community would appear to be contradictory and unfair.</p> <p>Additionally, all recent developments (eg. Dixons Wharf and Wilstone Wharf) were on sites of existing buildings. This application is to develop on a fully greenfield site, which are surely another reason why Wilstone has been identified as an area of development restraint.</p> <p>Overruling any of these objections sets a dangerous precedent that would make it much more difficult to refuse further development in local greenfield sites.</p>
17B Tring Road	<p>This development is not fitting for a village of only 280 dwellings.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wilstone does not have the infrastructure or key services to support this increase in population or vehicle traffic 2. This proposal is for development on a green field site outside the village boundary. This does not fit with the recent approvals and developments which have all been on brown field sites. 3. I understand it contradicts local planning policy CS1 of Dacorum's Core Strategy. This identifies Wilstone as a small village within a rural area, which is placed under development restraints in order to protect it. A new development of the proposed nature does not protect the integrity of the village.

21 Tring Road	<p>We object to the above application and are of the opinion that it contradicts local planning policy objectives.</p> <p>Policy CS7 of the Adopted Core Strategy (September 2013) applies. Therein, "small-scale development for housing...will be permitted at...Wilstone, provided it complies with Policy CS1: Distribution of Development and Policy CS2: Selection of Development Sites". However, when referring to Policy CS1: Distribution of development, Wilstone is identified in Dacorum's settlement hierarchy as a small village within the rural area (Core Strategy, table 1, page 41). The village is an area of development restraint:</p> <p>"These are the least sustainable areas of the borough where significant environmental constraints apply. These include areas of high landscape quality, such as the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and the countryside between settlements. This needs to be protected to ensure its rural character is retained and settlements keep their separate identities". Dacorum's own settlement hierarchy is defined as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Areas where development will be concentrated: Hemel Hempstead 2. Areas of limited opportunity: Berkhamsted, Tring, Bovingdon, Kings Langley and Markyate and; 3. Areas of development restraint: of which Wilstone is named as a small village within the rural area amongst other small settlements <p>In the Dacorum Settlement Hierarchy Study October 2017, the following comments were made: (paragraph 2.2.10):</p> <p>"In the Inspectors' report on the Core Strategy it was noted that he fully supported the settlement hierarchy (paragraph 41) in finding this element to the plan sound. He was satisfied that Hemel Hempstead should continue to be the focus for development given it's sustainability credentials and it was therefore reasonable for the market towns and larger villages (Wilstone is identified as a selected small village within the rural area) to accommodate lower levels of growth. He remarked "However, it must be remembered that many of these settlements are more constrained than Hemel Hempstead, for example by the Chilterns AONB (which should be afforded the highest status of protection) and therefore more weight should be attached to securing sustainable growth in the Borough's main town (paragraph 39)". To what extent have officers and members explored and exhausted all development opportunities following the hierarchical approach as adopted by Dacorum Borough Council as part of the decision making process when considering this planning application 20/01754/MFA?</p> <p>The proposed development does not satisfy Policy CS2: Selection of Development Sites. The site is not located within the defined Wilstone village boundary. In the Dacorum Borough Council Settlement Profiles Paper (October 2017), Wilstone is identified as settlement number 14. On the accompanying map in that document, it is evident that the site location of the proposed development is outside the village boundary. In Dacorum's Settlement Hierarchy Study (October 2017),</p>

Wilstone has been rated as poor in its accessibility audit outcome. Today as then, Wilstone has no higher order services (as defined in that study i.e. no secondary school, supermarket, employment, indoor sports facilities, library, dentist or pharmacy). Wilstone has no key services (as defined in that study i.e. no primary school, post office, GP surgery, Children's Centre). It has a village hall, food shop (part time hours) a pub and a children's play area. The study also identified that the closest higher tier settlement, Tring, is 5 km away and has limited public transport provision.

There is a lack therefore of existing services and facilities in Wilstone. Furthermore, residents of the proposed development will be reliant on cars as a main means of transport to use nearest services and facilities. The study on Wilstone in the Dacorum Settlement Profiles Paper (October 2017) identifies average vehicles per household as 1.7 (based on a 2011 statistical survey). With the proposal seeking 28 new dwellings, this will equate to some 47.6 new vehicles in the village. This is likely to have a significant impact on the local highway network at peak hour and other times. The applicant's supporting planning statement estimates there being 15 vehicles additional to morning peak hour and 16 for the afternoon peak hour. It would be useful to know how these figures have been determined. In the applicants supporting planning statement it is stated (6.67) that "the site is located in an area suitable for small-scale growth with a number of local facilities and services accessible on foot and public transport to local services and facilities". It is evident from Dacorum's own settlement hierarchy study (October 2017) when referring to Wilstone (and as mentioned above) that this is not so

Further, in the supporting planning statement, 6.73 states "the associated construction jobs and local investment during its build out as well as longer term expenditure in the local economy will be of economic benefit to the local area, helping to sustain local services and facilities within the village". As mentioned previously, there are no higher order services in the village (secondary school, supermarket, indoor sports facilities, library, dentist and pharmacy) to be supported. Of the services available, there is the opportunity to support the village shop (part time hours) and the pub, the latter also patronised by customers who travel in from outside the village (walkers and car drivers). Other key services such as a primary school, post office and children's centre do not exist. In making these observations, we do not believe they afford "positive weight in the planning balance" (applicant's planning statement 6.73) and ask whether members and officers are of the same opinion.

Our objection under Policy CS2 therefore is that the proposed development:

1. Does not use previously developed land and buildings;
2. Is not in an area of high accessibility;
3. Does not have good transport connections;
4. Does not have full regard to environmental constraints;
5. Does not respect local character and landscape.

We further object to the planning application as development of this site

would set a precedent and make it difficult to refuse future proposals for housing development in this area of the village. We note on the site plan that there is a road head (adjacent to plots 16 and 26) with the potential to access the adjoining field and which also incorporates the village allotments.

Is it the intention of the local authority to consider this for future housing development?

The precedent for granting permission for housing development in and around Wilstone in recent years have all recognised that the sites have previously been developed and we draw your attention to these applications in particular:

1. Planning application: 4/01533/12/MFA - Dixon's Wharf, Dixon's Gap, Wilstone.

Change of use from B1 (business) to C3 (dwelling house) and construction of 21 dwellings.

Granted permission 08/11/12 recognising a previously developed "isolated location within the designated rural area"

2. Planning application: 4/02833/16/MFA - Victory House, Wilstone Bridge, Tring Road

Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 7 houses and 1 live/work unit with associated parking and access arrangements.

Granted permission 16/03/17. Planning officer's report to committee highlighted the brownfield status of the site and to grant permission would "improve the appearance of a previously developed, derelict site".

3. Planning application: 4/01331/17/FUL - 17 Tring Road, Wilstone
Demolition of house and garage and construction of 3, 3 bedroom dwellings

Granted permission 14/09/17. Planning officer report to committee highlighted the NPPF policy on the "effective use of land previously developed". It was considered that "the development would satisfactorily integrate with the street scape character"

.
This current application for the development of land on a non-brownfield, previously undeveloped green field site outside the village boundary does not sit with previous granted permissions (as above) for housing development. We request that council members defer the application and undertake a site visit and to also include the applications granted above.

A previous planning application for development (15 dwellings) on half this site 4/00024/19/MFA remains undetermined. In making an objection to this current application, we noted a difference in the number of local residents consulted (as evident from the online portal). For application 4/00024/19/MFA, 163 residents were consulted, raising 31 comments, 28 objections and no comments supporting the proposal. On this application, 20/01754/MFA, we note 58 residents were consulted and at the time of writing no public comments were on the online portal. I have written to the Lead Planning Officer who assured me that those who participated

	<p>previously would be contacted and have the opportunity to comment. We understand that there are minimum statutory requirements to publicise applications for planning permission.</p> <p>However, our concern remains that the public consultation for the current planning application (with twice the number of dwellings to that previously applied for and as yet undetermined) has not reached as many residents of Wilstone due to a reduced number of consultation letters being sent out.</p> <p>We trust this will be addressed and taken into consideration as part of council member discussions and decision making.</p>
22 Tring Road	<p>I object to the the planning application based upon the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 28 new homes is a dramatic increase of 10% of the village. - The application contradicts Policy CS7 of Dacorums Core Strategy. - The site is outside of the village boundary and therefore contradicts CS2 and does not protect Wilstone as a small rural village. - It is a greenfield site and should be protected. - This will pave the way for further developments on the outskirts of the village. When will it stop? - Traffic through the village would increase dramatically with an average of 1.7 cars per household, causing more noise and air pollution as well as over-crowded roads. <p>I would strongly urge the council to consider the negative impact that such a development would have on the local village and its community.</p>
24 Tring Road	<p>We object to the development of the 28 new dwellings and echo the comments of all other current villagers. From a personal viewpoint, we especially support the below points:</p> <p>This development directly goes against the needs of village residents, as well as the research carried out for the developer ("Tring Road, Wilstone Entry-Level Housing Needs" for Rectory Homes by Lichfield's) and by Tring Rural Parish ("Housing Needs Survey: 2018").</p> <p>These studies showed a significant need for smaller, affordable homes; suitable for single occupants/parents and young families. The Parish Council study identified a need for 2 bedroom houses (63% of recipients), as well as 1 or 3 bedroom houses. This application is proposing 15 more big houses that won't be affordable to villagers that are in need of housing. These 15 houses, which are additional to the 13 'affordable' properties, appear to be 4-5 bedroom houses on large plots of land. These will be vastly unaffordable to the villagers in need of housing. We have just had 8 large properties built in the village in the last year, starting at £650,000 upwards, none of which were bought by those 'in need' that live in the village. The Lichfield's study states that in order for the houses to be of use to the village, the values need to be around £316,000 (without H2B) or £354,000 (with H2B) a discount of up to 20% on a 2 bed or 20-30% on a 3 bed.</p>

	<p>As well as the unsuitability of the housing proposed, I object to the quantity. The village already has too many people driving through it on a daily basis. The majority of drivers fail to adhere to the speed limit. 28 new houses will bring at least 56 new cars through the village; based on the size of the houses, you can guarantee at least 2 cars per household. There needs to be a review of the traffic calming strategies in the village before any more houses can be built.</p> <p>There is no need at present for any more large houses in the village. The village needs smaller, affordable homes that are in reach of those on lower incomes. The developer seems to have completely ignored their own research, the needs of the villagers and the local plan</p>
28-30 Tring Road	<p>We object to the above application and are of the opinion that it directly contradicts local planning policy objectives.</p> <p>In reference to Dacorum's Adopted Core Strategy (September 2013), Wilstone is clearly identified and named as a "Small Village within the Green Belt and Rural Area" and thus, based on the outlined settlement hierarchy, "significant environmental constraints apply in this 'fourth tier' of small villages and their rural character will continue to be protected." A 10% increase on the existing number of village dwellings is neither small scale or protecting the rural character of this village</p> <p>"The Inspectors' report in the Core Strategy also duly notes that for such villages, such as Wilstone, falling in to these third and fourth tier settlements the highest status of protection should be afforded and weight should be attached to securing sustainable growth in the Borough's main towns. This proposed development conflicts with policy CS1.</p> <p>The proposed development also does not satisfy Policy CS2: Selection of Development Sites. The site is not located within the defined Wilstone village boundary, identified as settlement No 14 in the Dacorum Borough Council Settlement Profiles Paper (October 2017). On the accompanying map in that document, it is evident that the site location of the proposed development is outside the village boundary and therefore is not protecting the village from over-development and encroachment on to the existing open countryside.</p> <p>Moreover, Wilstone was identified as 'poor' in its accessibility audit outcome, as identified in Dacorum's Settlement Hierarchy Study (October 2017). Wilstone remains with no higher order services (as defined in that study i.e. no secondary school, supermarket, employment, indoor sports facilities, library, dentist or pharmacy).</p> <p>Wilstone has no key services (as defined in that study i.e. no primary school, post office, GP surgery, Children's Centre). It has a village hall, a part time, volunteer run shop, a pub and a children's play area. The study also identified that the closest higher tier settlement, Tring, is 5 km away and has limited public transport provision.</p> <p>In the applicants supporting planning statement it is stated (6.67) that "the site is located in an area suitable for small-scale growth with a number of local facilities and services accessible on foot and public transport to local services and facilities". Given the above, this position is clearly not the case.</p>

	<p>Furthermore, in the supporting planning statement, 6.73 states "the associated construction jobs and local investment during its build out as well as longer term expenditure in the local economy will be of economic benefit to the local area, helping to sustain local services and facilities within the village". As mentioned previously, there are no higher order services in the village (secondary school, supermarket, indoor sports facilities, library, dentist and pharmacy) to be supported. Of the services available, there is the opportunity to support the volunteer run village shop and the pub, the latter also used by customers who travel in to the village (walkers and car drivers). Other key services such as a primary school, post office and children's centre do not exist.</p> <p>The study on Wilstone in the Dacorum Settlement Profiles Paper (October 2017) identified average vehicles per household as 1.7 (based on a 2011 statistical survey). With the proposal seeking 28 new dwellings, this will equate to a minimum of 47.6 new vehicles in the village with if fair to assume and increase on the average 1.7 cars per household in line with 9 years of change. This is likely to have a significant impact on the local highway network at peak hour and other times. This surely has a direct impact on the rural integrity of the village and its environmental status?</p> <p>We further object to the planning application as development of this site would set a precedent and make it difficult to refuse future proposals for housing development in this area of the village. We note on the site plan that there is a road head (adjacent to plots 16 and 26) leaving the potential to access the adjoining field for further developments. Some thinking ahead on future developments and how this would further sit with CS2 policy would be good to understand from officers?</p> <p>Any previous granting of permission for housing development in and around Wilstone in recent years has recognised that the sites have previously been developed on site already occupied. This current application for the development of land on a non-brownfield, previously undeveloped green field site outside the village boundary does not sit with this approach for housing development, nor with policies as already outlined.</p> <p>As such, it is hard to see how this application supports Dacorum's six strategic objectives, as outlined in the core strategy document, or align with published policies on development and therefore why this application is appropriate for approval?</p> <p>We therefore object to this application and it's clear misalignment to Dacorum's Core Strategy and its supporting policies.</p>
36 Tring Road	<p>Wilstone is a small village (with no Post office, GP surgery , School and limited public transport)</p> <p>The villages existing sewage services are already strained (as demonstrated by the breakdown of the pumping station back in March 2020)</p> <p>Recent permitted developments have been built on previous designated "brown field sites"</p> <p>This proposed development would destroy farming land .(a greenfield site)</p> <p>The increased traffic , both during construction and subsequent building would place the already damaged roads under further strain.</p> <p>Access by large lorries could only enter and exit the village via the B489</p>

	<p>No suitable parking is available for construction workers etc No environmental trade off suggested. No enhancement or contribution to the villages existing amenities. ie upgrading of canal tow paths or large cash donation to village shop.</p> <p>An unacceptable increase in traffic through the village on completion of the development.</p> <p>The whole fabric and character of the village would be permanently altered to the detriment of current residents. (Both during construction and on completion)</p>
45 Tring Road	<p>I believe it to be too many houses and is on a green field site. Also it is outside the village boundary. I understand that Wilstone is identified in Dacorums Core Strategy as a small village and thus is in an area of development restraint.</p>
50 Tring Road	<p>I wish to object to this planning application based on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I consider the application contravenes the guidelines surrounding development in rural areas and Dacorum's own Core Strategy policies CS1, CS2 and CS7. 2. Wilstone is classified as a 'small village within the rural area' and therefore should be protected from overdevelopment. It currently has 280 houses so an increase of a further 28 amounts to a 10% increase, which I believe to be overdevelopment. 3. The site to be developed is a greenfield site, whereas NPPF guidelines support development of brownfield sites. 4. The land in question sits outside the village boundary, which is contrary to general planning policy which aims to protect rural settlements from overdevelopment. 5. Wilstone has no higher order services, i.e. schools, dentist, pharmacy or key services (GP surgery, Post Office) and limited public transport. The closest offering of these services is Tring, meaning a car or bus journey to access them. 6. Wilstone's infrastructure is already under severe pressure. The increase in people, cars and traffic from this development will exacerbate this further. Parking issues are already encountered with overspill parking on the surrounding roads from developments at The Mill and 17 Tring Road. 7. Development of this site would set a precedent and make it difficult to refuse future proposals both in Wilstone and surrounding rural areas.
55 Tring Road	<p>This application 20/01754/MFA, does not appear to supersede the previous application 4/00024/19/MFA for 15 dwellings, which is pending consideration.</p> <p>This application for 28 dwellings represents a 10% increase in the total</p>

	<p>number of dwellings in the village of Wilstone, a significant increase for a small village within the rural area. This proposed development appears to contravene policy CS7 in respect to being a small scale development and CS2 being outside the village boundary. The village offers no amenities other than a pub and a volunteer run village shop for a village in excess of 300 households. The development, based on a recent statistical survey, would increase the number of vehicles in the village by approximately 50. The resulting increase in traffic through the village and demands for parking places disproportionate strains on the infrastructure and an increased risk for pedestrians, especially on the bend by the village hall. An inevitable increase in traffic over the canal bridge will exacerbate the failing road surface already experienced from traffic over the bridge.</p> <p>The development on a green field site, sets a dangerous precedent for future builds, given that previous developments to date, have been on brown field sites.</p> <p>Whilst I am pleased that the HCC Lead Local Flood Authority have now had visibility of the proposed plans, their initial response was to object on grounds of flood risk and drainage concerns! I note that they have yet to comment on the revised plans. Whilst the revisions to this application state that they have addressed all of the concerns, I remain sceptical of the proposed mitigations given their reliance on water courses which remain unmaintained and the discharge into the Grand Union Canal which is prone to overtopping and with outflows into other unmaintained water courses outside of Wilstone.</p> <p>The water courses within the Parish are no longer fit for purpose with a devolved responsibility to Riparian Land Owners for their maintenance, which is clearly ineffective as is evident with several flooding events in Long Marston since 2014 and again as recently as 2020 which has flooded properties.</p>
57 Tring Road	<p>The proposed development, now almost 100% bigger than the original application, represents a 10% growth in this rural village. Yet there is already an inadequate bus service, local shopping, doctors and other facilities. Therefore it represents a significant increase in traffic through the village. Since the last survey on vehicles per households, 9 years ago, there has clearly been an increase and a sudden injection of even more vehicles will compound the problem. The village is accessed at two points, which for most of the time I have lived here, were a collection of huge pot holes. Even today, one access is still in a sorry state. I can't see how the council can grant planning that will add to the burden on our roads when the same council can't fix pot holes.</p> <p>The proposed site, unlike recent developments in or around the village, is on a green field site and therefore would set a precedent threatening our green spaces. In a world where someone can't put a fence up without incurring the wrath of the council, brazenly running roughshod over our green spaces is blatant hypocrisy.</p> <p>Taking up this green space is also building outside the boundaries of the village and thus runs contrary to policy concerning protection of rural</p>

	<p>settlements.</p> <p>Nothing about this planning application fits with existing planning policy concerning rural developments, green field sites or over stressing existing resources. For those reasons I object strongly to this planning proposal.</p>
58 Tring Road	<p>Objection</p> <p>Firstly, in light of Covid19 social distancing measures, and the restrictions on attending public meetings, we request that Dacorum Planning Authority extend the deadline for community response for a further week until August 11th 2020. This will give those who want to, the opportunity to constructively contribute and participate in the local planning process. This accords to Dacorum Borough Council's Strategy of Community Involvement for involving the community (in a meaningful and appropriate fashion) in the consideration of planning applications.</p> <p>We object to this planning application because we consider the application is contrary to the NPPF guidelines on the size of development in rural areas and Dacorum's Core Strategy, policies; CS1 Distribution of Development, CS2, Location and Management of Development, CS7 Rural Areas. The Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy, lists Wilstone as a Small Village Within the Rural Area. The policy goes on to say; "These are the least sustainable areas of the borough, where significant environmental constraints apply. These include areas of high landscape quality, such as the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and the countryside between settlements. This needs to be protected to ensure its rural character is retained and settlements keep their separate identities. Decisions on the scale and location of development will be made in accordance with the settlement hierarchy."</p> <p>The amount of properties proposed cannot be justified, is disproportionate to the number of homes in the settlement of Wilstone and are not of a scale commensurate with the size of the settlement.</p> <p>We note that a previous application on the same site was for 15 affordable units on an Entry Level Exception Scheme (ELES). The NPPF states that Entry-level exception sites should not be larger than one hectare in size or exceed 5% of the size of the existing settlement. It goes on to make it clear that the size of a development must be proportionate to the size of the settlement, not compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance in the NPPF and comply with any local design policies and standards. Although the proposed development in 20/01754/MFA is not an ELES. however in the amount of homes, it clearly contravenes both the NPPF guidelines and Core Strategy.</p> <p>Further, we object to the site location on the northern edge of Wilstone which will represent an outward extension of the settlement boundary into the open countryside.</p> <p>The site is greenfield, the NPPF supports the reuse of brownfield land.</p> <p>Crucially, development of this site would establish a precedent and make it difficult to refuse future proposals for similar housing development the parish</p>

	and other small villages in the Rural Area; Long Marston and Aldbury.
62 Tring Road	<p>We object to this proposal. We are also at a loss to understand how the application for a development of this size has not been communicated widely within the village for consultation.</p> <p>The site is greenfield rather than brownfield, on the edge of the village boundary. The 10% increase in dwellings is significant and disproportionate for the size of Wilstone. As we understand it, it would contravene Dacorum's core strategy policies CS1, CS2 and CS7.</p> <p>Wilstone has few existing services, with only a pub, limited bus service and a small community-run shop, which in itself is under threat of closure, without sizeable funding being raised. The village has no key services to support a development of this size.</p> <p>It will significantly increase the number of cars back and forth through the village, which is already struggling to cope with the current volume of traffic. Many of the existing properties in the village are also of any age, which necessitates on-road parking by many residents, thereby sometimes causing traffic congestion.</p> <p>We are also very concerned that the existing and old sewage infrastructure that serves the village will not be able to cope with this increase in dwellings (unless these properties are built with their own septic tanks). Only a few months ago during lock-down, the system overflowed and the village endured many days of multiple tankers coming into and out of the village, 24 hours a day, to collect untreated sewage.</p>
66 Tring Road	<p>Wilstone is a small village. The proposed new development will affect this small village through extra cars, extra people, extra demands on already over-subscribed local primary school in Long Marston and secondary school</p> <p>In Tring, extra demands on local doctors and dentist surgeries.</p> <p>The sewage system is already at full capacity with the other recent developments.</p> <p>This proposed development is just too big for this village.</p>
67 Tring Road	<p>The development is outside of village boundary on greenfield site.</p> <p>Development does not comply with Dacorum policy CS1 & CS2. Our objection under CS2 is that the proposed development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. does not use previously developed land and buildings b. is not in an area of high accessibility c. does not have good transport connections d. does not have full regard to environmental constraints e. does not respect local character and landscape

	<p>With respect to parking allocation within the development it must be taken into account that there is currently considerable road usage parking throughout the village and it is felt that the development would add to this via spillage outside of the development on to the existing village roads.</p> <p>In Dacorum's settlement hierarchy Wilstone is named as a small village and such a development would contradict the references made within this hierarchy structure.</p> <p>To grant such a development would set a precedent and make it difficult to refuse further housing development in this area of the village.</p> <p>We are concerned that publication of the application does not appear to have been communicated to as wide spread an audience as previous applications for development on this site.</p>
69 Tring Road	<p>We would object to this development</p> <p>I live in a bungalow opposite the proposed development, which will be a visual intrusion on the outlook of my property</p> <p>The housing is not in keeping with this section of Tring Road which are bungalows</p> <p>My bungalow is slightly opposite the entrance to Grange Road which is a very busy junction due to it being a turning point for traffic as there is a weight restriction to the canal bridge.</p> <p>The school buses use the junction of Tring Road and Grange Road as a turning circle four times a day as it collects children of Wilstone attending Tring Secondary School and Long Marston Primary School</p> <p>Tring Road is a cut through for traffic and is very busy at peak times. It can be difficult to reverse out of my drive due to the volume and speed of traffic. The entrance to the new development is on a dangerous section of road and would add to the problems currently experienced. The new development over the canal bridge of eight homes has added to the traffic along with no pavement from this site or cycle route.</p> <p>I believe that Dacorum's settlement strategy defines this as an "Area of development restraint: of which Wilstone is named as a small village within the rural area"</p> <p>Wilstone has already seen large developments in the past few years.</p> <p>I am also concerned regarding the water level. I have witnessed over the years the amount of surface water that lies at the junction of Tring Road and Grange Road and along the verge. Further down the road it floods regularly and I can only surmise that this will exacerbate the problems. There is also a sewerage problem in Sandbrook Lane where the pumping station cannot cope.</p> <p>I am concerned regarding the heavy vehicles and trade traffic that comes through the village if this development were to go ahead.</p>

70 Tring Road	<p>We object to the above application and are of the opinion that it contradicts local planning policy objectives</p> <p>Policy CS7 of the Adopted Core Strategy (September 2013) applies. Therein, "small-scale development for housing...will be permitted at...Wilstone, provided it complies with Policy CS1: Distribution of Development and Policy CS2: Selection of Development Sites".</p> <p>However, when referring to Policy CS1: Distribution of development, Wilstone is identified in Dacorum's settlement hierarchy as a small village within the rural area (Core Strategy, table 1, page 41). The village is an area of development restraint:</p> <p>"These are the least sustainable areas of the borough where significant environmental constraints apply. These include areas of high landscape quality, such as the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and the countryside between settlements. This needs to be protected to ensure its rural character is retained and settlements keep their separate identities".</p> <p>Dacorum's own settlement hierarchy is defined as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Areas where development will be concentrated: Hemel Hempstead 2. Areas of limited opportunity: Berkhamsted, Tring, Bovington, Kings Langley and Markyate and; 3. Areas of development restraint: of which Wilstone is named as a small village within the rural area amongst other small settlements. <p>In the Dacorum Settlement Hierarchy Study October 2017, the following comments were made: (paragraph 2.2.10):</p> <p>"In the Inspectors' report on the Core Strategy it was noted that he fully supported the settlement hierarchy (paragraph 41) in finding this element to the plan sound. He was satisfied that Hemel Hempstead should continue to be the focus for development given it's sustainability credentials and it was therefore reasonable for the market towns and larger villages (Wilstone is identified as a selected small village within the rural area) to accommodate lower levels of growth. He remarked "However, it must be remembered that many of these settlements are more constrained than Hemel Hempstead, for example by the Chilterns AONB (which should be afforded the highest status of protection) and therefore more weight should be attached to securing sustainable growth in the Borough's main town (paragraph 39)".</p> <p>To what extent have officers and members explored and exhausted all development opportunities following the hierarchical approach as adopted by Dacorum Borough Council as part of the decision making process when considering this planning application 20/01754/MFA?</p> <p>The proposed development does not satisfy Policy CS2: Selection of Development Sites. The site is not located within the defined Wilstone village boundary. In the Dacorum Borough Council Settlement Profiles Paper (October 2017), Wilstone is identified as settlement number 14. On the accompanying map in that document, it is evident that the site location of the</p>

proposed development is outside the village boundary.

In Dacorum's Settlement Hierarchy Study (October 2017), Wilstone has been rated as poor in its accessibility audit outcome. Today as then, Wilstone has no higher order services (as defined in that study i.e. no secondary school, supermarket, employment, indoor sports facilities, library, dentist or pharmacy). Wilstone has no key services (as defined in that study i.e. no primary school, post office, GP surgery, Children's Centre). It has a village hall, food shop (part time hours) a pub and a children's play area. The study also identified that the closest higher tier settlement, Tring, is 5 km away and has limited public transport provision.

There is a lack therefore of existing services and facilities in Wilstone

Furthermore, residents of the proposed development will be reliant on cars as a main means of transport to use nearest services and facilities. The study on Wilstone in the Dacorum Settlement Profiles Paper (October 2017) identifies average vehicles per household as 1.7 (based on a 2011 statistical survey). With the proposal seeking 28 new dwellings, this will equate to some 47.6 new vehicles in the village. This is likely to have a significant impact on the local highway network at peak hour and other times. The applicant's supporting planning statement estimates there being 15 vehicles additional to morning peak hour and 16 for the afternoon peak hour. It would be useful to know how these figures have been determined.

In the applicants supporting planning statement it is stated (6.67) that "the site is located in an area suitable for small-scale growth with a number of local facilities and services accessible on foot and public transport to local services and facilities". It is evident from Dacorum's own settlement hierarchy study (October 2017) when referring to Wilstone (and as mentioned above) that this is not so.

Further, in the supporting planning statement, 6.73 states "the associated construction jobs and local investment during its build out as well as longer term expenditure in the local economy will be of economic benefit to the local area, helping to sustain local services and facilities within the village". As mentioned previously, there are no higher order services in the village (secondary school, supermarket, indoor sports facilities, library, dentist and pharmacy) to be supported. Of the services available, there is the opportunity to support the village shop (part time hours) and the pub, the latter also patronised by customers who travel in from outside the village (walkers and car drivers). Other key services such as a primary school, post office and children's centre do not exist.

In making these observations, we do not believe they afford "positive weight in the planning balance" (applicants planning statement 6.73) and ask whether members and officers are of the same opinion.

Our objection under Policy CS2 therefore is that the proposed development:

1. Does not use previously developed land and buildings;
2. Is not in an area of high accessibility;

3. Does not have good transport connections;
4. Does not have full regard to environmental constraints;
5. Does not respect local character and landscape.

We further object to the planning application as development of this site would set a precedent and make it difficult to refuse future proposals for housing development in this area of the village. We note on the site plan that there is a road head (adjacent to plots 16 and 26) with the potential to access the adjoining field and which also incorporates the village allotments. Is it the intention of the local authority to consider this for future housing development?

The precedent for granting permission for housing development in and around Wilstone in recent years have all recognised that the sites have previously been developed and we draw your attention to these applications in particular:

1. Planning application: 4/01533/12/MFA - Dixon's Wharf, Dixon's Gap, Wilstone.

Change of use from B1 (business) to C3 (dwelling house) and construction of 21 dwellings

Granted permission 08/11/12 recognising a previously developed "isolated location within the designated rural area".

2. Planning application: 4/02833/16/MFA - Victory House, Wilstone Bridge, Tring Road

Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 7 houses and 1 live/work unit with associated parking and access arrangements.

Granted permission 16/03/17.

Planning officer's report to committee highlighted the brownfield status of the site and to grant permission would "improve the appearance of a previously developed, derelict site".

3. Planning application: 4/01331/17/FUL - 17 Tring Road, Wilstone

Demolition of house and garage and construction of 3 x 3 bedroom dwellings
Granted permission 14/09/17.

Planning officer report to committee highlighted the NPPF policy on the "effective use of land previously developed". It was considered that "the development would satisfactorily integrate with the street scape character".

This current application for the development of land on a non-brownfield, previously undeveloped greenfield site outside the village boundary does not sit with previous granted permissions (as above) for housing development. We request that council members defer the application and undertake a site visit and to also include the applications granted above.

	<p>A previous planning application for development (15 dwellings) on half this site 4/00024/19/MFA remains undetermined. In making an objection to this current application, we noted a difference in the number of local residents consulted (as evident from the online portal). For application 4/00024/19/MFA, 163 residents were consulted, raising 31 comments, 28 objections and no comments supporting the proposal. On this application, 20/01754/MFA, we note 58 residents were consulted and at the time of writing no public comments were on the online portal. I have written to the Lead Planning Officer who assured me that those who participated previously would be contacted and have the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>We understand that there are minimum statutory requirements to publicise applications for planning permission. However, our concern remains that the public consultation for the current planning application (with twice the number of dwellings to that previously applied for and as yet undetermined) has not reached as many residents of Wilstone due to a reduced number of consultation letters being sent out. We trust this will be addressed and taken into consideration as part of council member discussions and decision making.</p>
71 Tring Road	<p>We note that this application is for 28 dwellings along Tring Road, Wilstone opposite our bungalow. Our main objections to the development are: -</p> <p>1) At the beginning of the lockdown this year there where tankers operating 24/7 to remove effluent from the pumping station in the village because of the existing sewer had collapsed in several locations.</p> <p>With this application looking to increase the number of homes by 28 which is an approximate increase of 10% this will put additional strain on a system that is struggling with its current use.</p> <p>2)The proposed development is on a greenfield site and is outside the village boundary and is contrary to the general planning policy which ensures that rural settlements are protected from over development and encroachment in the countryside</p> <p>3) Dacorum Planning Policy CS1 (Distribution of Development) States that Wilstone is a small village within the rural area and in order to protect it, it is an area of development restraint. The only recent developments in the village have been on brownfield sites and this application is for a greenfield site.</p> <p>4) The existing road leading out of the village are bungalows and we would therefore request that the block of flats is changed to a bungalow so that the character of the road is maintained.</p>
86 Tring Road	<p>We would ask you to consider several valid points for objection contained within our letter of the 19th January 2019 and in relation to application 4/00024/19/MFA. We are not opposed to any development in the village but this disconnected, piecemeal development appears to be unbridled and must change the nature of this delightful village forever.</p> <p>Earlier comments on 4/00024/19/MFA</p> <p>There is far too much information to read and assimilate and provide an</p>

	<p>appropriate response within the submitted timescales.</p> <p>The application refers to the need for additional “affordable” housing in the village however cursory research indicates at least 6 affordable units in the village which are not sold.</p> <p>There are significant affordable housing developments in Aylesbury</p> <p>Is this development in addition or to replace those under consideration in Dacorums Schedule of Site Appraisals (October 2017)</p> <p>The above document makes reference to the possible inclusion of a village shop and other facilities – please advise how this document influences this decision.</p> <p>I am particularly keen to understand the position in relation to a village shop as the current shop in the village run by the community will need to be relocated as the lease on their premises is due to expire.</p>
90 Tring Road	<p>Our bungalow has two bedrooms and the front of our property with our lounge on the border of Grange Road and our kitchen/dining room and day room where we spend most of our day runs along the border in close proximity to the development.</p> <p>Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy states that small scale development will be permitted providing that it complies with the following policies....</p> <p>Policy CS1 Distribution of Development – Wilstone is identified in the Core Strategy as a small village in the rural area and is an area of development restraint.</p> <p>Policy CS2 Selection of Development Sites – The site is outside the village boundary. Building outside the village boundary is contrary to the general planning policy that ensures the rural settlements are protected from over development and encroachment on the countryside.</p> <p>This application is for the development of a non-brownfield site. It is agricultural land which a farmer rents annually to produce animal feed.</p> <p>Wilstone has a good mix of all age groups. The village has no school. The children of the village are provided with a school bus to travel to Long Marston and Tring. Both these schools are over-subscribed and some secondary pupils travel by taxi.</p> <p>There are currently around 250 homes being built in Tring which will be the catchment for these schools. Applications for admissions exceed supply and this is a similar situation for infant and primary places. Some children from Wilstone travel as far as Berkhamsted for educational needs.</p> <p>The road through Wilstone is narrow and surrounding roads make cycling unsafe on and outside the village surroundings. The bus service is infrequent and the majority of residents travel by car. There are very few pavements in the village and the pavement from Grange Road to the village hall is in very poor condition.</p>

There is also a development of 100 home currently being built in Cheddington, two miles from Wilstone which is in Aylesbury Vale. Although Cheddington has a small infant/primary school the overspill will put pressure on Long Marston school which will be approximately 1 mile from the new development.

Not shown on the location map is Wilstone Wharf, a new development of eight properties on the old brown site by the canal bridge by Victory House

There has been a development of three terraced cottages on Tring Road in the village along with new build detached houses in New Road. Planning consent has been given for a detached property opposite The Forge on Road, plus a further detached building in Chapel End Lane. This is 12 houses already completed within the last year along with two in progress.

If 28 houses are built, I feel that the village will be overdeveloped.

On planning application 20/01999/FHA at 36 Tring Road the planning notice is pinned to their side gate. Why is this application not on the gate leading into the proposed development where it would be more visible to residents than where it is placed further down the road opposite the site where it is only visible if you are walking?

I think residents of Wilstone should be given further time in which to respond to the application as very few residents were informed. There are also no comments to view on the portal.

Light and Overshadowing

The majority of properties at this stretch of Tring Road are bungalows and it is not in keeping to have a block of four flats with communal gardens so close to the boundary of our property. The flats will overshadow our bungalow and the roof height will be much higher dwarfing my home.

A bungalow would be more in keeping at this end of Tring Road. No.71 opposite runs further along the road. One bungalow would be more in keeping with this end of the road. There are also no disability living dwellings or senior citizens accommodation on the plan.

Overlooking/loss of privacy

Our driveway runs alongside the side of our property beside the boundary to the proposed development and our garage is situated at the back of our property on the boundary with the proposed development. We use this for storage and the drive we use as a patio in the summer months.

The development shows that the top flats 8-11 will have a lounge window overlooking our front bay room bedroom window. It will also take away our privacy as the window will look directly onto our front garden and front door from an elevated level and will take away privacy from this sitting out area.

There will also be a communal garden running along all the border of our living area. Who will ensure responsibility for the maintenance of the garden and hedges?

The boundary fence/hedge that runs along our property is a mismatch of old bindweed/ivy hedging and close board fence and needs replacing and

some large trees that run beside our garage we cannot access to cut. These trees are normally kept in check when contractors cut the hedge on tractors. These trees will not be maintained and I don't see any plans for replacement fencing only the planting of shrubs and trees.

Adequacy of parking and turning.

I am unhappy with the placement of the proposed parking. 20 parking spaces will run from the back dining room window through the development. These parking spaces will not have a village feel but one long service road which over time will not be maintained.

Noise and Disturbance

The impact of not only the building but how it would impact our life. Where will works traffic and staff park? If it is on site, there will not be enough space as the development progresses.

The while border of our property runs alongside the development. We will be overlooked by a two storey building.

I strongly object to the bin and bike store for the flats at 8-11 which overlaps our dining room/day room window and our side door. The bin store will cause smells coming into our living area and also the noise of rubbish being placed in the bins. I cannot see residents walking the distance from the property to the store as in is not a convenient distance. I expect bags of rubbish could be left in communal gardens – we have had rat infestations in the past being so close to the canal.

Vermin pest controllers from Dacorum have stressed that the canal is an ideal environment for rats and this has also been an issue for neighbours in Grange Road.

I appreciate that there will be vehicle charging points to every home but I doubt very much that owners at entry level will have an electric car nor would be a priority in their remit as there are currently only 352K electric cars in the UK.

I also object to the noise of twenty parking spaces that will run to my dining day room window. There will be extra pollution around our property and my husband is asthmatic. The noise and pollution will surround our property.

Why is the site plan designed so that the large row of 20 parking spaces is out our boundary and other residents of Grange Road? If the plans were flipped 180 deg the parking would run along the top end of the field near the proposed lake which would mean less pollution and noise for existing residents. It would also make the public amenity green available for the more densely populated housing giving children more freedom to play safely. I can only conclude that it is designed this way to achieve the highest market value possible for general home sales.

Visual Intrusion

Noise, fumes, pollution and intrusion of cars.

Proposed T junction and pedestrian access.

I have lived in the village over 13 years and can see first hand the issues with the T junction.

It is well documented that the amount of through traffic that comes through Wilstone has many drivers that are not adhering to the speed limits. The traffic will only become heavier with 100 dwellings at Cheddington as they cut through Wilstone to get to the A41.

The vision splay diagrams show a splay just outside our bungalow from the T junction but it does not display a splay line from a driver that would be in a vehicle in the middle of the road as you cannot see oncoming traffic until it has emerged near the bend near No.71.

Not only residents walk to the canal but dog walkers, fishermen and rambles walk through the village and visitors often park by the village hall for country walks. There is no pedestrian access connecting eight homes to the village from Wilstone Wharf and I was also surprised that a pavement was not put in place when Dixons Gap was built and followed by Wilstone Wharf. This section of Wilstone is crying out for a pavement. I see parents walking along with prams having to navigate speeding traffic.

Works Traffic

Wilstone Canal bridge has a weight restriction of 10T meaning deliveries would have to come through the village. There are a large number of children in the village who are transported to school by bus. There are no pavements from the village shop all the way down to the village hall. The road is narrow with many parked cars. Children also visiting the park have to walk on the road.

Whilst building Wilstone Wharf there was an overflow of workmens cars on Grange Road and also by the canal bridge. This has ruined the grass verges and caused significant disruption to village life.

Additional Comments

I would like to object to the proposed development.

I have lived beside the proposed site for thirteen years.

I am very concerned of the impact this development may have on our property knowing how high the water level on this site already impacts the land by our property.

When the groundwater levels were measured in October 2018 and three trial pits were sampled the water was just around one metre level underground. The summer of 2018 will be remembered for a six week spell from the end of June to the second week of August when daytime temperatures in parts of the country consistently topped 30c (86f) it was one of the hottest driest summers on record and even then the water level was around one meter.

Our water meter is located on the grass verge at the front of our property.

Thames water can only estimate our bill because the water level is always to the top of the cover. When we request a reading they have to send someone with a pump to clear the water in order to be able to reach the meter.

We normally have a large pool of water under our hedge on wet days and

	<p>also on part driveway/ road.</p> <p>Approximately around six weeks ago Highways inserted a kerb part way from the canal bridge along the perimeter of the proposed site in order to control the road having excess surface water. This resulted in all the run-off water running along the gully under the hedge on this proposed site and flooded the verge at the front of our property. In our thirteen years living in the property we had not experienced this before. On further investigation I walked to the canal bridge and the proposed land was very flooded and the water was running off the land at speed to the canal. Luckily the lock gate was partly open allowing the water to run further up the canal where the level was quite high the other side of the lock.</p> <p>The proposal to having a pathway to the canal from the development, where it is proposed to join the canal tow path at this point can also have a large amount of surface water.</p> <p>We recently had torrential rain and I understand several areas experienced flooding.</p> <p>The village suffered flooding in many areas off Tring Road, including some houses by the village hall (fire brigade in attendance), village hall car park and Tring Road by the park. Two households near the park would have been unable to leave their property without wearing wellington boots or by car.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed pumping station what is in place as back up should there be a power failure? We have numerous power cuts in the village having overhead cables & frequent when the weather is stormy. I would advise liaison with National Grid to confirm the frequency of power cuts in our area over the past number of years if relying on electrical power for the pump.</p>
<p>Goodspeeds, Watery Lane</p>	<p>My first comment is, that although I am a close neighbour of this proposed development I did not receive a direct communication about it, and only found out its existence from other neighbours.</p> <p>I have several reasons to object.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This development on a green field is outside the village boundary and contrary to the local plan. Not only is it outside the village boundary but it is next to the settlement of Wilstone which is classed as a small village, and one which should not attract large developments. 2. The infrastructure of the village is not such that it can support such a development. Local roads are already crowded with traffic, and dangerous for walkers and cyclists due to the speed of vehicles, lack of pavements and poor quality of roads. There is a very limited bus service and there have been ongoing issues with the sewage network. The local schools are full as are the doctors 3. Whilst Wilstone can support small developments, it cannot support one of 28 additional homes. I do not believe greenfield sites outside of current settlement boundaries within the rural area are the correct locations for such developments.

8 Wilstone Wharf	<p>I oppose the development of this application on Green field land for 2 reasons:</p> <p>Firstly, it sets a precedent for granting further development on Green field sites surrounding the village.</p> <p>Secondly, Brown field sites will become available due to the recent Pandemic when a number of businesses will unfortunately close. With regard to the application 50% of the site is scheduled for affordable housing.</p> <p>However this is misleading because this will not be 50% of the total area of the proposed properties but based only on the number of houses to be built ie 14 houses out of 28 which will no doubt be much smaller.</p> <p>A 10% increase in housing stock in Wilstone is not supported by the existing infrastructure. There will be more cars and a lack of key services eroding the village character of this beautiful village.</p> <p>This planning application should be refused.</p>
------------------	--