

**ITEM NUMBER: 5b**

<b>20/03821/FUL</b>	<b>Demolition of 34 residential garages and construction of 2 no dwelling houses and 6 no apartments</b>	
<b>Site Address:</b>	<b>Garage Court Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire</b>	
<b>Applicant/Agent:</b>	<b>Mr Ian Johnson</b>	<b>Mr I Morrison</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Martin Stickley</b>	
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	<b>Hemel Hempstead (No Parish)</b>	<b>Highfield</b>
<b>Referral to Committee:</b>	<b>The application is referred for the consideration of the Development Control Committee as the site is owned by the Borough Council.</b>	

**1. RECOMMENDATION**

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

**2. SUMMARY**

2.1 The application site is located within the residential area of Hemel Hempstead. It is not an allocated housing site and is a 'windfall site'. Dacorum's Core Strategy directs residential development to the towns and established residential areas (see Policy CS4 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013)).

2.2 This application proposes eight new dwellings on land currently occupied by four rows of terraced garages. These Council-owned garages served the local residents, however, over time the garages have become either disused or underused. The garages have limited widths and are unsuitable for most modern vehicles. This application offers the opportunity to create high quality affordable housing in their place, improving the local environment and security through new landscaping and increased natural surveillance.

2.3 The redevelopment of this site provides Dacorum Borough Council (DBC), as a provider of housing, with the opportunity to complement the existing housing stock in the area and to meet its own objective of providing affordable housing. DBC's affordable housing studies have identified a strong need for new homes for local people. As such, and given that the development would be located in a sustainable location (being near to local facilities and public transport links), the proposal is found to be in accordance with Policies CS1, CS4, CS17 and saved Policy 10 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004).

**3. SITE DESCRIPTION**

3.1 The application site relates to four blocks of garages situated at Sleddale and Wensleydale, Hemel Hempstead. The northern garage court hosts two of the garage blocks, comprising 14 garages. This area is accessed from Sleddale. The other two garage blocks to the south, contain the remaining 20 garages. This part of the site is accessed directly from Wensleydale. The land levels drop as you move in a north-easterly direction, meaning that garages generally sit lower than the properties on Ribblesdale to the west. There are two areas of grassed amenity land that separate the garages from Wensleydale. These areas both comprise one mature tree.

3.2 The Highfield residential area is a large New Town neighbourhood comprising typical 1960's housing. However, there are also subsequent developments from later periods. The area is characterised by its regular, angular spatial layout. Design is varied throughout the Highfield area but parts do have distinct identity and character. The application site is located in an area primarily characterised by terraces of two-storey dwellings and three-storey townhouses, all with flat roofs.

#### **4. PROPOSAL**

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of 34 residential garages and the construction of eight residential units made up of two 3-bedroom semi-detached units and an apartment block comprising 3 x 1-bedroom and 3 x 2-bedroom units with associated, balconies, amenity areas and parking. This application forms part of a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) that encompasses seven garage sites.

#### **5. PLANNING HISTORY**

None

#### **6. CONSTRAINTS**

CIL Zone: CIL3

Parish: Hemel Hempstead Non-Parish

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)

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

Residential Character Area: HCA20

Smoke Control Order

Parking Standards: New Zone 3

Town: Hemel Hempstead

#### **7. REPRESENTATIONS**

##### Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

##### Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

#### **8. PLANNING POLICIES**

National Policy Guidance (2019)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

Dacorum's Core Strategy (2006-2031)

NP1- Supporting Development

CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS2 - Selection of Development Sites

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages

CS8 - Sustainable Transport

CS9 - Management of Roads

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS17- New Housing

CS18 - Mix of Housing

CS19 - Affordable Housing

CS26 - Green Infrastructure

CS29- Sustainable Design and Construction

CS31 - Water Management

CS32 - Air, Soil and Water Quality  
CS35 - Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Dacorum Borough Local Plan (Saved Policies) (1999-2011)

Policy 10 - Optimising the Use of Urban Land  
Policy 18 - The Size of New Dwellings  
Policy 21 - Density of Residential Development  
Policy 51 - Development and Transport Impacts  
Policy 99 - Preservation of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands  
Policy 100 - Tree and Woodland Planting  
Policy 111 - Height of Buildings  
Policy 129 - Storage and Recycling of Waste on Development Sites  
Appendix 1 - Sustainability Checklist  
Appendix 3 - Layout and Design of Residential Areas

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Area Based Policies: HCA20 (Highfield) (May 2004)  
Manual for Streets (2010)  
Planning Obligations (April 2011)  
Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)  
Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)  
Affordable Housing (January 2013)  
Parking Standards (November 2020)

## **9. CONSIDERATIONS**

### Main Issues

9.1 The key considerations relating to this application include:

- The principle of development;
- The quality of residential development and living conditions of existing and future residents;
- Highway safety and car parking; and
- Any other material planning considerations.

### The Principle of Development

9.2 The application site is located within the residential area of Hemel Hempstead. It is not an allocated housing site and is a 'windfall site'. Dacorum's Core Strategy directs residential development to the towns and established residential areas (see Policy CS4). The Area Based Policy HCA20 (Highfield) highlights that there is scope for the redevelopment of garage blocks but only if alternative provision is made for displaced vehicle parking.

9.3 The proposal would contribute to the Borough's housing stock (in accordance with Policy CS17). As such, and given that the development would be located in a sustainable location, the proposal is in accordance with Policies CS1, CS4, CS17, saved Policy 10. Considering this, there is no compelling objection to the principle of the proposed development.

### Quality of Residential Development / Living Conditions

9.4 The impact on the established residential amenity of neighbouring properties is a significant factor in determining whether the development is acceptable. Policy CS12 states that concerning

the effect of a development on the amenity of neighbours, development should avoid visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of privacy. Paragraph 127 (f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (henceforth referred to as the 'Framework') requires development to create safe, inclusive and accessible places that promote health and well-being and a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

9.5 HCA20 identifies a number of development principles for the area. These include:

*“Design: Should respect the characteristics and architectural themes of nearby and surrounding development. Alternative designs may be acceptable in cases where a clear distinction in design can be drawn from nearby and surrounding development, for example on sites clearly separated from other dwellings. Such alternative designs are unlikely to be acceptable on infill plots for single dwellings.*

*Type: All types of dwelling are acceptable.*

*Height: In most cases, should not exceed two storeys. Three-storey development may be permitted where adjacent to buildings of a similar or greater height, dependent on its impact on the character and appearance of the area.*

*Size: Small to medium sized dwellings are acceptable.*

*Layout: Development proposals are strongly encouraged to make use of the existing layout structure as a basis for new layouts. The feature of dwellings grouped around landscaped amenity greens is encouraged. Prevalent building lines should be followed. Spacing in the medium range (2 m to 5 m) is expected.”*

*Layout / Residential Amenity / Living Conditions*

9.6 The proposed layout is deemed acceptable. Garden spaces of approximately 10m x 5.5m would be provided for the proposed semi-detached units. These garden sizes are considered functional for the property sizes and commensurate with the surrounding plots. The balconies on the apartments are of a reasonable size, measuring 3.5m x 1.6m (around 4.8m<sup>2</sup>). It was requested that some defensible space be provided for the ground-floor flats. Amended drawings were received, which included hedging to provide an outdoor area for these flats, separating it from the public realm.

9.7 In terms of spacing between buildings, the proposed apartment block would be sited roughly 6.5m from the townhouses to the south (24, 26 and 28 Wensleydale). This separation distance would provide some visual relief between the buildings and would exceed the guidance set out in HCA20. There are no side-facing windows on these neighbouring townhouses that would be affected in terms of light or privacy.

9.8 There are a number of two-storey buildings sited to the front (east) of the proposed apartments. 25 Wensleydale is sited directly in front of the proposed block. The section plan (drawing 0200) reveals that there would be no breach of 25-degree lines drawn from the mid-points of the neighbouring ground-floor windows. This includes the neighbours at Ribblesdale to the rear. The building would be sited approximately 21.8m from No. 25. A three-storey building fronting this neighbour is likely to increase overlooking to some degree, however, there is no specific policy that would warrant a refusal due to this front-to-front relationship, as this is a common association seen between buildings in residential areas such as this. A similar relationship can be seen throughout Wensleydale e.g. between 16-22 (even) and 9-17 (odd). It should be noted that the mature tree to the south is being retained. This would act as a visual buffer between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floors of the proposed apartment building and No. 25. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan highlights an acceptable back-to-back distance of 23m. A distance of around 29m would be provided between the proposed block and main rear walls of the properties on Ribblesdale. The proposed building would

sit higher than some of the properties on Ribblesdale (around 1.4 above 37 Ribblesdale), but considering the distances between them, it is unlikely that this increased height would result in a significant adverse impact on privacy.

9.9 Turning to the proposed semi-detached units, no concerns with regards to the relationship with the adjacent townhouses i.e. 19-23 (odd) Wensleydale, as the front-to-front distance would measure around 21m to protect privacy. There is a flank window at first-floor level on 16 Sleddale to the rear of these proposed units that would give views towards the proposed windows and gardens. Although the proposed properties would sit slightly lower than 16 Sleddale, the window is sited close to the rear walls of the proposed properties, some 11.3m. The window appears to serve a landing hallway (non-habitable room) and therefore it is unlikely that the existing residents would spend a large amount of time looking out of it. The existing residents are likely to pass this window on a daily basis and therefore some harm is identified. However, it is not felt that the harm is significant and therefore the proposal would not warrant a refusal on privacy grounds.

9.10 The proposed semi-detached units would not conflict with the Building Research Establishment's (BRE) guidance with regards to site layout planning for daylight and sunlight. The site section (drawing 0200) shows that there would be a breach between a first-floor flank window in the proposed semi-detached units and the proposed block of flats. However, it is noted that the 25-degree line is taken from an obscure glazed bathroom window and therefore the slight reduction in light is considered acceptable to this room.

9.11 In terms of demolition and construction, if this application were approved, these aspects would be controlled by Dacorum's Environmental Protection Team. Various informatives would be added regarding construction hours, etc. if the application is approved. The proposal would provide a high quality living environment for future occupiers and would not result in significant adverse impacts on the neighbouring properties. The quality of residential development and the impact on the living conditions is considered acceptable in accordance with the aforementioned policies.

#### *Quality of Design / Impact on Character and Appearance of Area*

9.12 Wensleydale and the surrounding estate hosts uniform sets of buildings. The vast majority of buildings are characterised by flat roofs, red/green tile hanging and simple fenestration. The street scenes comprise rows of two-storey terraced properties and rows of three-storey townhouses.

9.13 The overall scale and shape of the proposed semi-detached properties and their plots is similar to the surrounding area. The height of the apartment block would exceed the neighbouring townhouses by roughly 1.7m. This would increase the prominence of the building, however, it is not felt that it would appear overtly prominent within the context of its surroundings, noting the number of three-storey buildings present on the road. The designs would differ to some degree, for example, the use of standing seam cladding and the window details. However, it is not felt that these modern additions would add an unpleasing aesthetic to the streetscape. The original proposals (now superseded) included pitched roofs on the buildings. These were considered as alien additions to the street scene. Dialogue with Dacorum's Principle Urban Designer lead to some design improvements, including the removal of the pitched roofs; balancing of the heights/levels of the buildings; including of a brick 'set back' to show a visual divide between the semi-detached properties; and other improvements such as a parapet wall to mask the plant on the apartment block roof.

9.14 The proposed external materials comprise red/brown brick, standing seam cladding, grey windows, timber doors and timber effect cladding. The drawings highlight that some of the materials are still to be confirmed e.g. the roof tiles. Therefore, it is considered necessary to condition materials if the application is approved.

9.15 In summary, the proposed scheme would have a high quality of design that would preserve the attractive streetscape and contribute to local character in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS13, subject to the imposition of the materials condition.

#### Impact on Trees

9.16 There are a number of trees within close proximity to the site that must be considered. The submitted Arboricultural Report (ref: S236-J1-IA-1) identifies that no trees of significant landscape value or amenity would be detrimentally affected by the development. Dacorum's Trees and Woodlands Department have reviewed this document and raised no objections to the application.

9.17 The drawings found in the Appendices of the Arboricultural Report illustrate the root protection area of the sycamore tree (T1) and measures to protect it during the preparation, demolition, construction and landscaping phases (see S236-J1-P1 Rev 2 and S236-J1-P2 Rev 3). These details would be conditioned if the application were approved. It is likely that the sycamore tree would need to be heavily pruned and thereafter maintained to ensure no significant encroachment on the apartment block building. Fortunately, the main living areas in the apartments are triple-aspect and therefore future residents would not suffer from an unacceptable loss of light due to the tree.

9.18 A smaller whitebeam tree (T2) would be removed. This tree is a category U tree due to its poor form and bark loss, with an anticipated life expectancy of under 10 years. As compensation, the proposed site plan includes three new semi-mature trees around the site. As the site is limited in scale, it is not felt that any further tree planting is required. If approved, details of the tree sizes and species will be conditioned. The Trees and Woodlands Team would be consulted at discharge of condition stage to ensure that the proposed trees are suitable for the location.

9.19 Taking all of the above into account, it is concluded that there would be a limited impact on existing vegetation in accordance with saved Policy 99 and new trees would be provided as per Policy CS29.

#### Parking and Highway Safety

9.20 Policy CS12 seeks to ensure developments have sufficient parking provision. The Framework states that if setting local parking standards authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport, local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles. The Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides policy guidance for the amount of parking provision required for new developments. It highlights the following (per residential unit) in this area:

- 1 bedroom dwellings – 1.25 allocated spaces or 1 unallocated spaces
- 2 bedroom dwellings – 1.5 allocated spaces or 1.2 unallocated spaces
- 3 bedroom dwellings – 2.25 allocated spaces or 1.8 unallocated spaces

9.21 The proposed layout provides 12 allocated spaces (two per unit) and six visitor spaces (total of 18). This meets the parking standards for allocated spaces and provides six additional spaces for visitor parking. The proposal is therefore acceptable in this regard.

9.22 The SPD requires the provision of electric vehicle (EV) charging points. As illustrated on the proposed site plan (drawing 0100), all parking spaces except the two roadside visitor spaces would be provided with EV charging points. In line with the SPD, 50% of the points would be active (8) and 50% passive (8). A condition would be imposed, if approved, to ensure that these are installed prior to the occupation of the units.

9.23 Policies CS8, CS9 and saved Policy 51 seek to ensure developments have no detrimental impacts in terms of highway safety. Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') states, "*Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.*"

9.24 Concerning highway safety, the access and turning areas are considered sufficient and safe. The buildings are situated within close proximity to the road and could therefore be easily accessed by refuse and emergency vehicles. Hertfordshire County Council as the Highway Authority have assessed the highway impacts and raised no objection to the proposals.

9.25 In summary, it is felt that the proposed parking and access arrangements are considered acceptable and policy compliant.

### Other Considerations

#### *Loss of Garages*

9.26 HCA20 states that the redevelopment of garage blocks will only be acceptable if alternative provision is made for displaced vehicle parking. The widths of the existing garages are generally unsuitable for modern vehicles except motorcycles. It appears that residents mainly park on their driveways, on the street, or on the garage forecourt (between Nos. 23 and 25 Wensleydale). These areas would generally not be impacted by the development proposals. The strip of road fronting the proposed apartment block would be converted into two parking bays. These spaces would be unallocated and could potentially be used for existing residents, although it would be preferable if these were used as visitor spaces for the apartments.

9.27 Dacorum's Verge Hardening Team have been contacted to determine whether there would be scope to enhance existing parking areas or provide further parking areas in the area. They responded with the following: "*It has been agreed with Trees and Woodlands that we could extend the existing parking in Ribblesdale down onto the amenity green removing 1 tree stump but keeping away from the large mature tree in the centre of the green providing a net gain of 8 additional bays. Subject to planning permission approval.*" At this stage, these details have not been finalised, but it is worth noting that additional parking on Ribblesdale may be brought forward in the future.

9.28 Dacorum Borough Council's garage management team will provide the appropriate notice to each garage tenant if the planning application is approved. As per Agenda Item 14 (Page 3 of 6) of Cabinet dated 16th September 2014 (Update on Garage Disposal Strategy), all of those residents who currently rent a garage in a block earmarked for disposal will be offered an alternative garage. An informative would be added to the decision notice if this application is approved to ensure that letters are sent out in this regard.

#### *Landscaping*

9.29 The proposed site plan details planting around the site, which should help to soften the visual impact of the development and create an attractive site. The boundary treatment (1.8m timber fencing) and surfacing materials (block paving and bound gravel) is considered acceptable. Full details of landscaping would be requested by condition if the application is approved.

#### *Ecology*

9.30 An Ecological Survey and Bat Report has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority as part of the application submission. The report provides an adequate assessment of the impact of the proposals and is based on appropriate survey methods. The likelihood of an adverse ecological impact is negligible-low. Hertfordshire County Council's Ecology Department have raised no

objection but advised that a precautionary approach is taken and informatives relating to birds and bats be added if consent is given.

9.31 The planning system should aim to deliver overall net gains for biodiversity where possible as laid out in the Framework. As such, the County Ecologist requested that a 'Landscape and Ecological Management Plan' (LEMP) is secured by planning condition if approved. Simple measures to achieve this could be put forward in this plan, for example, the planting of native trees, fruit/nut trees, hedgerows; sowing of wildflower areas for pollinators and species diversity; provision of roosting opportunities through the integration of bat bricks/units within the design of the buildings; and the inclusion of bird boxes for common garden bird species and/or nest box terraces on buildings for swifts and house sparrows. This condition would be added if approved and can subsequently be monitored/signed off by the County Ecologist.

#### *Refuse*

9.32 Developers are expected to provide adequate space and facilities for the separation, storage, collection and recycling of waste (see Dacorum's 'Refuse Storage Guidance Note').

9.33 The site plan indicates where bin storage for the properties is located. A large bin store would be provided to the rear of the apartment block, next to the car park. A separate area has been provided to the front of the semi-detached units, behind the hedging. These areas would be somewhat obscured from Wensleydale. If the application is approved, the landscaping plan will capture details of bin stores to make sure the bins are satisfactorily disguised from the public realm. Taking the above into account, no concerns are raised about refuse storage and collection.

#### *Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)*

9.34 Policy CS35 requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. The Charging Schedule clarifies that the site is in Zone 3 within which a current charge of £131.50 per square metre is applicable to this development.

9.35 Depending on the tenure of any affordable housing units, these may be exempt from the payment of CIL. It is recommended that any exemption requirements are discussed with the CIL team prior to the submission of the proposals and that relevant paperwork is completed expediently upon any issue of planning permission.

#### *Contamination*

9.36 The Environmental and Community Protection Team have confirmed that they have no objection to the proposed development. However, it is judged that the recommendation for an intrusive land contamination investigation is made. As such, it has been recommended that two conditions be included in the event that permission is granted.

#### *Drainage*

9.37 The drainage strategy comprises of unlined permeable paving for car parking areas with an outflow into the proposed network. It is noted that surface water drainage calculations have been provided to support the scheme and ensure sufficient storage has been provided for the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event. Based on the information, the Lead Local Flood Authority have confirmed that the site can be adequately drained, raising no objection subject to the inclusion of a final drainage scheme condition.

#### *Crime Prevention and Security*

9.38 Hertfordshire County Council's Crime Prevention Design Advisor was consulted and has raised no concerns. However, they suggested a number of recommendations to improve crime prevention and security on the site. These are listed in their consultation response in Appendix A. These were passed to the Applicant and they highlighted that *"Our landscaping design and Employers Requirements will address the comments from the Crime Prevention Officer. These will be included in the contract requirements."*

### Response to Neighbour Comments

9.39 The majority of the concerns raised have been discussed previously in this report. However, as these concerns were raised by numerous neighbours, it is felt that they should be expanded on. The key points will be discussed in turn below.

#### *Parking Stress*

9.40 Numerous residents have highlighted that they are often unable to park near their homes. In particular, the residents at Ribblesdale raised concerns that there is not enough parking on the surrounding roads. As discussed earlier, the Verge Hardening Team are looking to enlarge the Ribblesdale parking area by an additional eight bays. The proposed site plan also identifies that the existing access (through Sleddale) to one of the parking areas used by Ribblesdale residents would be retained. It appears that the existing issue is caused by the number of properties on Ribblesdale without private off-street parking areas. Many of the properties on Wensleydale, on the other hand, have driveways. This proposal would remove around 4-5 on-street spaces from Wensleydale, but it would not have an adverse impact on the Ribblesdale parking areas. This application has prompted the Verge Hardening Team to help resolve the current issue at Ribblesdale and drawings are currently being commissioned by Ringway to provide the additional parking bays.

#### *Road Safety*

9.41 Several of the residents raised concerns over highways implications that could arise from the development. The proposal would make use of an existing access road and would provide adequate visibility splays. Hertfordshire County Council, as the Highway Authority, have assessed the scheme and do not feel that there would be an unacceptable impact on the surrounding road network. The proposal is therefore deemed to comply with the Framework, Paragraph 109.

#### *Height of Apartment Block*

9.42 Residents have raised concerns over the height of the proposed apartment block, stating that it would look out-of-character and result in overlooking and loss of light. The building is policy compliant in terms of distances to protect privacy and light. There may be some loss of early morning sunlight to Ribblesdale, as the block would be sited to the east of these properties, and some afternoon sunlight to 25-31 (odd) Wensleydale (to the west). However, the proposal adheres to the Building Research Establishment's guidance in terms of light and it is not felt that it would therefore warrant a refusal on these grounds. Mutual overlooking to garden areas is common in residential areas and the proposed relationship would not be dissimilar from other properties on the street.

9.43 However, to alleviate the concerns raised, the height of the building was reduced by removing the pitched roof element (see superseded drawings). This reduced the height of the building from approximately 12m to 10m. This also reduced the height of the windows by around 0.6m. The proposed alterations would reduce the visual impact of the building and the impacts on the neighbours in terms of overlooking and loss of light.

## 10. CONCLUSION

10.1 The principle of redeveloping the garage blocks into affordable housing is deemed acceptable and in accordance with local and national policies. The proposals would satisfactorily integrate with the surrounding area. No significant adverse impacts are identified concerning residential amenity. The impact on trees is acceptable.

10.2 The redevelopment of this garage site would provide the Council, as a provider of housing, with the opportunity to complement the existing housing stock in the area and to meet its own objective of providing housing. The scheme would provide high quality affordable housing and provide other benefits such as improved landscaping and visual benefits. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

## 11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 It is recommended that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

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

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

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

2. **No development shall take place until the final design of the drainage scheme is completed and sent to the LPA for approval. The surface water drainage system will be based on the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy reference M03001-04\_DG04 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting. The scheme shall also include:**

1. **Limiting the surface water run-off rates to a maximum of 2l/s for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event with discharge into the Thames surface Water sewer.**
2. **Provide attenuation to ensure no increase in surface water run-off volumes for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.**
3. **Implement drainage strategy to include permeable paving and attenuation tank.**
4. **Detailed engineered drawings of the proposed SuDS features including their location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features including any connecting pipe runs and all corresponding calculations/modelling to ensure the scheme caters for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + 40% allowance for climate change event, with a supporting contributing area plan.**
5. **Demonstrate appropriate SuDS management and treatment for the entire site including the access road. To include exploration of source control measures and to include above ground features such as permeable paving.**
6. **Maintenance and management plan for the SuDS features**

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of and disposal of surface water from the site in accordance with Policy CS31 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

3. **(a) The Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the Preliminary Investigation Report submitted at the planning application stage (Document Reference: RSK Preliminary Risk Assessment 1921152-06(00) March 2020) indicates a reasonable**

**likelihood of harmful contamination and so no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:**

- (i) A full identification of the location and concentration of all pollutants on this site and the presence of relevant receptors, and;**
  - (ii) The results from the application of an appropriate risk assessment methodology.**
- (b) No development approved by this permission (other than that necessary for the discharge of this condition) shall be commenced until a Remediation Method Statement report; if required as a result of (a), above; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.**
- (c) This site shall not be occupied, or brought into use, until:**
- (i) All works which form part of the Remediation Method Statement report pursuant to the discharge of condition (b) above have been fully completed and if required a formal agreement is submitted that commits to ongoing monitoring and/or maintenance of the remediation scheme.**
  - (ii) A Remediation Verification Report confirming that the site is suitable for use has been submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority.**

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

- 4. All remediation or protection measures identified in the Remediation Statement referred to in Condition 3 above shall be fully implemented within the timescales and by the deadlines as set out in the Remediation Statement and a Site Completion Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted.**

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

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

- 5. No development (excluding demolition/ground investigations) shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Please do not send materials to the Council offices. Materials**

**should be kept on site and arrangements made with the Planning Officer for inspection.**

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

- 6. The dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied until the Electric Vehicle Charging Points and associated infrastructure has been provided in accordance with drawing DBC-IW-WEN-00-DR-A-0100 (Revision P1). The Electric Vehicle Charging points and associated infrastructure shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made for the charging of electric vehicles in accordance with Policies CS8, CS12 and CS29 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and the Car Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020).

- 7. No construction of the superstructure shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:**
- o soft landscape works including a planting scheme with the number, size, species and position of trees, plants and shrubs; and**
  - o minor artefacts and structures (e.g. bike stores, street furniture, play equipment, signs, refuse or other storage units, etc.).**

**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 three years from planting fails to become established, becomes seriously damaged or diseased, dies or for any reason is removed shall be replaced in the next planting season by a tree or shrub of a similar species, size and maturity.**

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

- 8. Prior to commencement of the development, a Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), shall be prepared, detailing how biodiversity will be incorporated within the development scheme. The plan shall include details of native-species planting, and/or fruit/nut tree planting, as well as the location of any habitat boxes/structures to be installed. The plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To ensure that the development contributes to and enhances the natural environment in accordance with Policy CS26 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). These details are required prior to commencement to ensure that an overall on-site net gain for biodiversity can be achieved before construction works begin. The LEMP should include details of when the biodiversity enhancements will be introduced and this may be reliant on the construction process/timings.

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

Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way, in accordance with saved Policies 51 and 54 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (2004), Policy CS8 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraphs 108 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). The details are required prior to commencement to ensure that the construction of the development does not result in any risks to highway safety.

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

**DBC-IW-WEN-00-DR-A-0100 (Revision P2) - Proposed Site Plan**  
**DBC-IW-WEN-XX-DR-A-0200 (Revision P4) - Sitewide Sectional Elevations**  
**DBC-IW-WEN-XX-DR-A-2208 (Revision P2) - Proposed 3B Dwelling Plans & Elevations**  
**DBC-IW-WEN-XX-DR-A-2212 (Revision P2) - Proposed 1B + 2B Dwelling Plans & Elevations**  
**S236-J1-IA-1 - Arboricultural Report by John Cromar's Arboricultural Company Limited (dated 4th September 2020)**  
**S236-J1-P1 Rev 2 - Tree Value Assessment**  
**S236-J1-P2 Rev 3 - Tree Retention & Tree Protection Measures**

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

#### **Informatives:**

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

2. Thames Water

#### **Waste Comments**

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such we have no objection. In the longer term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable surface water strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such we have no objection. In the longer term

Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, 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>.

With regard to SURFACE WATER drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services>

Thames Water would advise that with regard to WASTE WATER NETWORK and SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.

3. In accordance with the Councils adopted criteria, all noisy works associated with site demolition, site preparation and construction works shall be limited to the following hours - 07:30 to 17:30 on Monday to Friday, 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturday and no works are permitted at any time on Sundays or bank holidays.
4. Dust from operations on the site should be minimised by spraying with water or carrying out of other such works that may be necessary to suppress dust. Visual monitoring of dust is to be carried out continuously and Best Practical Means (BPM) should be used at all times. The Applicant is advised to consider the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition Best Practice Guidance, produced in partnership by the Greater London Authority and London Councils.
5. The attention of the Applicant is drawn to the Control of Pollution Act 1974 relating to the control of noise on construction and demolition sites.
6. All wild birds, nests and eggs are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The grant of planning permission does not override the above Act. All applicants and sub-contractors are reminded that site clearance, vegetation removal, demolition works, etc. between March and August (inclusive) may risk committing an offence under the above Act and may be liable to prosecution if birds are known or suspected to be nesting. The Council will pass complaints received about such work to the appropriate authorities for investigation. The Local Authority advises that such work should be scheduled for the period 1 September - 28 February wherever possible. If this is not practicable, a search of the area should be made no more than 2 days in advance of vegetation clearance by a competent Ecologist and if active nests are found, works should stop until the birds have left the nest.
7. If bats, or evidence for them, are discovered during the course of roof works, work must stop immediately and advice sought on how to proceed lawfully from an appropriately qualified and experienced Ecologist or Natural England to avoid an offence being committed.
8. Contamination

The Environmental Health Team has a web-page that aims to provide advice to potential developers, which includes a copy of a Planning Advice Note on "Development on Potentially Contaminated Land and/or for a Sensitive Land Use" in use across Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire. This can be found on [www.dacorum.gov.uk](http://www.dacorum.gov.uk) by searching for contaminated land.

9. It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence.
10. It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway.
11. The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence.
12. As per Agenda Item 14 (Page 3 of 6) of Cabinet dated 16th September 2014 (Update on Garage Disposal Strategy), all of those residents who currently rent a garage in a block earmarked for disposal will be offered an alternative garage. The Garage Management Team will wherever possible, offer a garage to rent in another garage site owned by Dacorum Borough Council in the vicinity of the development site.

## APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Herfordshire Building Control	No comment.
Affinity Water - Three Valleys Water PLC	No comment.
Thames Water	<p>Waste Comments</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such we have no objection. In the longer term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable surface water</p>

	<p>strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. The scale of the proposed development doesn't materially affect the sewer network and as such we have no objection. In the longer term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network</p> <p>There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes. <a href="https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes">https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes</a>.</p> <p>With regard to SURFACE WATER drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website. <a href="https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services">https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewater-services</a></p> <p>Thames Water would advise that with regard to WASTE WATER NETWORK and SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided.</p>
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	<p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <p><b>CONDITIONS</b></p> <p>1. Prior to the first occupation / use of the development hereby permitted the proposed access /on-site car and cycle parking / servicing / loading, unloading / turning /waiting area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.</p> <p>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).</p> <p><b>INFORMATIVES</b></p>

1) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

2) Obstruction of public highway land: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

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

#### COMMENTS

Demolition of 34 residential garages and construction of 2 no dwelling houses and 6 no apartments. The development site occupies two plots, accessed from Wenslydale and connected by Sleddale, which are both unclassified local access roads with a speed limit of 30mph and highway maintainable at public expense.

#### ACCESS

Current vehicle accesses to the site are from Sleddale, and

	<p>Wensleydale. These accesses will remain unchanged. A pedestrian way through the site will be maintained.</p> <p><b>PARKING</b></p> <p>Allocated car parking provides 12 spaces plus 7 visitor parking spaces; 19 in total). Secure cycle parking will be provided for each property.</p> <p><b>EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS</b></p> <p>The proposed dwellings are within the recommended 45m distance from emergency vehicle access.</p> <p><b>REFUSE / WASTE COLLECTION</b></p> <p>Arrangements have been made for the storage and collection of waste.</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION</b></p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority considers the proposal would not have a severe residual impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highway, subject to the conditions and informative notes above.</p>
Hertfordshire Ecology	<p>Thank you for consulting Hertfordshire Ecology on the above. I apologise for the delay with this reply. Roosting bats are known to be in close proximity.</p> <p>I am pleased to see an ecological report has been submitted in support of this application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment (Bernwood Ecology, 1 September 2020);</li> </ul> <p>The site was visited on 13 August 2020 and comprises two blocks of terraced garages on hardstanding with some amenity grassland. There are two mature trees on site, which are being retained and should be protected from damage (including roots and overhanging branches) during construction. The report provides an adequate assessment of the impact of the proposals and is based on appropriate survey methods and effort. The likelihood of an adverse ecological impact is negligible-low; however as bats and nesting birds are likely to be in the area, I advise the following precautionary approach Informatives are added to any consent given:</p>

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

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

The planning system should aim to deliver overall net gains for biodiversity where possible as laid out in the National Planning Policy Framework and other planning policy documents. It would be appropriate for this development to enhance the site for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. Simple measures to achieve this could include the planting of native trees, fruit/nut trees, hedgerows; sowing of wildflower areas for pollinators and species diversity; provision of roosting opportunities through the integration of bat bricks/units within the design of the buildings; the inclusion of bird boxes for common garden bird species and/or nest box terraces on buildings for swifts and house sparrows; hedgehog homes and gaps in fencing to allow free passage of small animals.

Consequently, I would like to see details of how biodiversity will be included in the development scheme to address the expectations of NPPF in achieving biodiversity net gain. This should be provided in a Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) or Biodiversity Gain Plan (or similar) secured by Condition and I can suggest the following wording:

"Prior to commencement of the development, a Landscape Ecological Management Plan, shall be prepared, detailing how biodiversity will be incorporated within the development scheme. The plan shall include details of native-species planting, and/or fruit/nut tree planting, as well as the location of any habitat boxes/ structures to be installed. The plan shall be submitted to the LPA for written approval and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA."

Reason: to demonstrate the expectations of NPPF in achieving overall net gain for biodiversity have been met in accordance with national and local policies."

I trust these comments are of assistance.

<p>Lead Local Flood Authority (HCC)</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the above application for the demolition of 34 residential garages and construction of 2 no dwelling houses and 6 no apartments.</p> <p>As it is a minor application the Lead Local Flood Authority is not a statutory consultee. However, we can offer advice to the Local Planning Authority to place them in a position to make their own decision regarding surface water and drainage. We have reviewed the following documents submitted in support of the above application;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Flood Risk Assessment reference M03001-04_FR04 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting</li><li>- Drainage Strategy reference M03001-04_DG04 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting</li></ul> <p>Following the review of the Environment Agency maps for surface water flood risk, the proposed development itself is at a predicted low risk of flooding from surface water however the road adjacent to the site is shown to be at risk. We do not have any records of flooding in this location.</p> <p>The drainage strategy states that the ground conditions may not be suitable for infiltration. We note that there are no watercourses within the vicinity of the site however there is Thames Water surface water sewer located in Dione Road. A pre-development enquiry has been submitted to Thames Water and have agreed a discharge rate of 2l/s into their network.</p> <p>The drainage strategy for new development comprises of unlined permeable paving for car parking areas with an outflow into the proposed network. The site will drain to below ground attenuation tank with discharge at 2l/s into the Thames sewer. We note surface water drainage calculations have been provided to support to scheme and ensure sufficient storage has been provided for the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event. Based on the information provided we can confirm that the site can be adequately drained and recommend the following condition to the LPA.</p> <p>Condition 1</p> <p>No development shall take place until the final design of the drainage scheme is completed and sent to the LPA for approval. The surface water drainage system will be based on the submitted the Flood Risk Assessment reference M03001-04_FR04 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting and Drainage Strategy reference M03001-04_DG04 dated December 2020 prepared by McCloy Consulting. The scheme shall also include:</p>
---	---

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Limiting the surface water run-off rates to a maximum of 2l/s for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event with discharge into the Thames surface Water sewer.</li> <li>2. Provide attenuation to ensure no increase in surface water run-off volumes for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.</li> <li>3. Implement drainage strategy to include permeable paving and attenuation tank.</li> <li>4. Detailed engineered drawings of the proposed SuDS features including their location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features including any connecting pipe runs and all corresponding calculations/modelling to ensure the scheme caters for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + 40% allowance for climate change event, with a supporting contributing area plan.</li> <li>5. Demonstrate appropriate SuDS management and treatment for the entire site including the access road. To include exploration of source control measures and to include above ground features such as permeable paving.</li> <li>6. Maintenance and management plan for the SuDS features</li> </ol> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of and disposal of surface water from the site.</p> <p>Informative to the LPA</p> <p>Please note if the LPA decide to grant planning permission, we wished to be notified for our records should there be any subsequent surface water flooding that we may be required to investigate as a result of the new development.</p>
<p>Crime Prevention Design Advisor</p>	<p>Dear Martin,</p> <p>Thank you for sight of planning application : 20/03821/FUL, Demolition of 34 residential garages and construction of 2 no dwelling houses and 6 no apartments, Address: Garage Court Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire .</p> <p>In relation to security and crime prevention I have no concerns regarding this proposed development however I would ask that it is built to the Secured by Design standard.</p> <p>Physical Security (SBD)</p> <p>Communal door sets:  Certificated to BS PAS 24: 2016, or LPS.1175 SR2  Access Control to block of flats:</p>

	<p>Audio Visual. Tradespersons release buttons are not permitted.</p> <p>Postal delivery for communal dwellings (flats)</p> <p>Communal post boxes within the communal entrances or through front doors</p> <p>Individual front entrance doors ( flats and houses )</p> <p>Certificated to BS PAS 24:2016</p> <p>Windows: (flats and Houses)</p> <p>Ground floor windows and those easily accessible certificated to BS PAS 24:2016 or LPS 1175 French doors for balconies:</p> <p>Dwelling security lighting :</p> <p>Communal entrance hall, lobby, landings, corridors and stairwells, and all entrance/exit points. (Dusk to dawn lighting).</p> <p>Car Parking:</p> <p>Adequate parking allocated , good surveillance</p>
<p>Conservation &amp; Design (DBC)</p>	<p>Architectural Character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposal is out of character with the local context (Highfield new town district) which comprises of 2-3 storey flat roof terraces of modernist design.</li> <li>- The proposal's pitched gable roof is out of character and inappropriate for this context - a flat roof would be more</li> </ul> <p>Further comments received 08.03.21</p> <p>Comments on revised drawings as below:</p> <p>Houses:</p> <p>Top of roof parapet and façades should be on a level datum so the houses read as a pair. This is the character of the typical houses of the street, generally set out in groups of 2/3 and are not stepped</p> <p>3B Apartment Block:</p> <p>Can defensible space be added to the ground floor units (planting, front garden, fencing etc) this is particular important in front of bedrooms on the ground floor to provide privacy - attached a sketch with marked areas the red is requiring the most privacy and would be suitable location for a front garden.</p> <p>The two ground floor units also should have private amenity space which isn't currently marked on the site plan and should help with the privacy issues</p> <p>Proposed plant seems to be much higher than previous design, could this be reduced or incorporated behind a parapet?</p>

	<p>Other than that no further comments.</p> <p>Further comments 09.03.21</p> <p>Houses: noted feedback on level change - can the parapet be levelled so the two units read as one block?</p> <p>Apartment: A small parapet could help in screening the plant, would this be achievable without interfering with the sight lines for 25-31?</p> <p>Further comments 17.03.21</p> <p>Good to see updates on parapet and defensible space - no objection in principal on design. Presuming the 0200 site elevations will be updated to show revised parapet line?</p> <p>Would also recommend some kind of planter / footing detail to be added to the newly proposed hedge boundaries in particular the apartment block (could be conditioned?)</p> <p>Think is important to ensure set boundary condition particularly along primary frontage and for the apartment blocks where this will be defining their main amenity space.</p> <p>Will also help tie into the design of the building to provide an overall high quality of design and should raise the hedge more than 450mm off the ground (as specified) to provide increased privacy for the main amenity space.</p>
Waste Services (DBC)	No comment.
Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)	<p>No objections on noise or air quality grounds.</p> <p>Having reviewed the planning application I am able to confirm that there is no objection to the proposed development, but that it will be necessary for the developer to demonstrate that the potential for land contamination to affect the proposed development has been considered and where it is present will be remediated.</p> <p>This is considered necessary because the application site is on land which has been previously developed and as such the possibility of ground contamination cannot be ruled out at this stage. This combined with the vulnerability of the proposed end use to the presence of any contamination means that the following planning conditions should be included if permission is granted. Please note condition 1 acknowledges existence of an adequate phase 1 report.</p>

Contaminated Land Conditions:

Condition 1:

(a) The Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the Preliminary Investigation Report submitted at the planning application stage (Document Reference: RSK Preliminary Risk Assessment 1921152-06(00) March 2020) indicates a reasonable likelihood of harmful contamination and so no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Site Investigation (Phase II environmental risk assessment) report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which includes:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Informative:</p> <p>The above conditions are considered to be in line with paragraphs 170 (e) &amp; (f) and 178 and 179 of the NPPF 2019.</p> <p>The Environmental Health Team has a web-page that aims to provide advice to potential developers, which includes a copy of a Planning Advice Note on "Development on Potentially Contaminated Land and/or for a Sensitive Land Use" in use across Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire. This can be found on <a href="http://www.dacorum.gov.uk">www.dacorum.gov.uk</a> by searching for contaminated land and I would be grateful if this fact could be passed on to the developers.</p>
Conservation & Design (DBC)	
Strategic Planning & Regeneration (DBC)	No comment.

## APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

### Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
21	28	1	30	0

### Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
4 Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TN	I strongly object to this project. Currently the parking around this area is completely inadequate for the amount of properties and to take away some of the very few spaces along kerbside etc would be ridiculous. The fact the new spaces would only be available to the new tenants would leave the existing tenants in a very difficult situation. I find that the current parking along the kerbside of Wensleydale/Sleddale is already at the point of being dangerous. Barely 1 car can get through this area of the street due to sheer amount of cars parked on both sides of the street. All you have to do is come to our area at 5:30-6pm on a normal working day and you can see many people struggling to find an

	<p>area to park near their home. Some with disabilities or other health issues. Please reconsider the planning of this project to make it beneficial to all its effects.</p>
<p>10 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>We have a car garaged at 24 Wensleydale. As yet we have not been offered a garage on an alternative local site.</p>
<p>8 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>Parking in Ribblesdale is already impossible to find a space near your house even though more spaces were made available previously but the result from that is even more people who do not live in Ribblesdale come to park their vehicles because there is not enough parking in all surrounding roads.</p> <p>My objection against the build is I don't not wish to look out at a block of flats and nor do I wish to lose even more ability to be able to park my vehicle in my street. As a resident who pays council tax and road tax I should be able to park near my dwelling and this new build will make a bad situation even worse.</p> <p>As previously stated the revised plans still do not state provisions for the new developments parking and as a long standing resident of Ribblesdale who is frustrated daily that she cannot always park in her street due to non-residents parking in the facility, I do not wish this problem to become an even larger problem that it already is by more non residents of Ribblesdale using it as their means to park. Ribblesdale's parking already supports enough surrounding roads of residents. With street lights turned off at midnight it is more important than ever to be able to park in your own cul-d-sac and not streets away.</p> <p>When I purchased my resident over 30 yrs ago I didn't buy it to look out to a tall building opposite.</p> <p>I would like to see plans for parking that do not include the use of Ribblesdale before any plans are put forward to be granted.</p>
<p>35 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>The proposed block of flats is 3-storeys high with a pitched roof (effectively making it a 4-storey building). This makes the building very out of character with the rest of the community which is made up of 2-storey buildings with flat roofs.</p> <p>As the 4-storey building will only be 25m from the back of our homes, the residents nearby will be majorly overlooked, with a lack of security from residents being able to see into our homes &amp; gardens.</p> <p>The excessive height of the proposed building will mean there will be loss of natural light. However there is likely to be an increase in light pollution from the flats and communal areas of the proposed building.</p> <p>Reducing the parking options in the neighbourhood, along with the additional car owners in the flats, is likely to result in inadequate parking provisions.</p> <p><i>Further comments following amendments</i></p> <p>Even though the pitched roof has been removed the height of the block of flats is still really concerning considering the close proximity to</p>

multiple 2 storey houses. This would cause a considerable loss of privacy and sunlight for the surrounding houses. In particular for the local residents in Ribblesdale for which the new development backs on to, the loss of privacy and sunlight would be significant and any new residents would have clear sight into our gardens and into the backs of our houses.

Another major issue as mentioned by other local residents is the parking. To be told that the proposed development would have allocated parking that could not be used by the current local residents, but any residents of the new development would have free reign to park anywhere in the surrounding areas is unacceptable. The current parking in the local area is already not good enough and is becoming more of a problem. The council have a duty to improve the current parking standards for the current residents before allowing more residents and cars into the already congested area.

Based on these 2 major issues I completely object to the current proposal. These issues were raised previously but were not considered in the revised proposal. If the council do not seriously consider the issues raised, this would be disheartening for the local residents.

We very much object with this planning proposal.

Although the pitched roof has been removed from the proposal, the bock of flats will still be 25% higher than the next-door townhouse on Wensleydale and twice the size of the new houses! This will result in a complete lack of privacy for the surrounding residents along with a loss of sunlight, especially for those along Sleddale where the flats are being 'built up'. The CGI photo uploaded to the website is also very misleading as it does not show this difference in height very clearly.

I have been informed that the initial plan was to have a block made up of 4 flats instead of 6. Why can this not be done? We believe local residents would be more accepting of this as this would in keeping with the surrounding properties and much less of an eyesore.

Another issue we have with the proposed development is the parking. The proposal currently includes several parking spaces allocated to the new homes. We have been told existing residents will not be able to use the new parking spaces as they will be strictly be for the residents of the new development only. This is ridiculously unfair on existing residents and it is shocking to hear the council is happy with this. Parking is already inadequate with many residents parking on pavements far from their home. This development will just make the situation worse for existing residents. How is this fair?

It's very disappointing to hear the council is considering digging up the green area in Ribblesdale to turn into parking spaces. This would only result in a loss of amenity area, loss of green and only a few additional parking spaces. There is little benefit in this. If additional parking is to be provided, please can the large garage site on Wensleydale (opposite the development site) be used? The council were previously planning to demolish the majority of these to build three houses. If it

	<p>cannot be used for housing, could it not be used for parking? This would generate more parking for local residents, reduce congestion caused by the school run, and reduce the loss of biodiversity. Please consider this.</p> <p>We have also been extremely disappointed by the council's communication of this project. Its sad to hear many local residents haven't been made aware of the project by the council because they are not classed as 'neighbouring'. These residents will still be highly impacted by this project and deserve to be informed and given the opportunity to comment.</p>
<p>36 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>I own 36 Ribblesdale and I have looked at the planning application for Garage Court Sleddale and I am not too happy with what has been proposed.</p> <p>Mainly Due to the height of the proposed dwelling. My Garden would almost certainly be over looked by upper floor of the dwelling. It would also impact my view from the back bedroom.</p> <p>I would also potentially loose an hour or two of direct sunlight each day during certain months. Especially with the proposed Apex roof.</p> <p>I'm not against the development of the garages, It makes sense for the land to be put to good use and would tidy the area up. I just feel a 2 story apartment block with a flat roof would be more suited to the estate.</p>
<p>33 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>Although we empathise with the need for new homes within the council due to growing population, we object to the proposal and have a number of concerns in regards to the development.</p> <p>The most apparent concern is the location. The existing garage function of the site serves as a buffer zone between the neighbouring houses, road and our gardens on Ribblesdale, therefore protecting our amenity spaces. A three-storey block of flats will undoubtedly cause overlooking into our gardens contributing to loss of privacy and light. Interior and exterior spaces that are overlooked lack privacy, which will affect the quality of life for all the occupants on Ribblesdale. The visual amenity currently enjoyed by the residents of Ribblesdale will also be lost. The proposed three storey block of flats will appear dominant and overbearing ruining the enjoyment of our properties and creating overcasts during the morning where we currently enjoy a beautiful eastern rising sun from the morning to midday. The local plan aims to protect human health and amenities, this begs to differ from that aim. There is no report in the documents demonstrating that the amount of daylight and sunlight currently experienced is being protected. There is also a legal right to light requirement that our properties acquire which does not appear to have been considered.</p> <p>The proposal will also cause loss of parking spaces which we already struggle with in the area. The plans suggest the proposed parking spaces are private. This takes away from the already restrictive number of spaces available to the local residents that do not have private</p>

	<p>parking. This is counter intuitive to the needs of existing residents.</p> <p>There is no evidence of a construction management plan in the documents which raises concerns about noise/air pollution and highway safety and management during the construction phase. The area is generally quiet and safe and residents are respectful towards one another ensuring an existing environment that is peaceful and pleasant. The construction of the flats and houses will impede on this current state. We are also pregnant and due to have a baby in the near future and the construction will be adjacent to the room where our child will sleep. This will mean we cannot open windows due potential air and noise pollution coming from the site. The council has a legal duty to protect residents from the effects of noise and other environmental issues affecting amenity, which could result from construction activity.</p> <p>In conclusion we do not feel that this proposal is sympathetic to its surroundings and the local residents that live in the area. Considering Dacorum's local plan aims to protect and enhance its environments a less invasive proposal might be welcomed. Such as upgrading the existing garages or providing more parking rather than squeezing in homes/flats into sites which as a result take away from its residents and environment.</p>
<p>37 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>I object to this development.</p> <p>The Council has confirmed the flats will be 50% taller than the adjacent three storey town houses (12m vs 8m) so how much higher will they stand in relation to the houses facing the site in Ribblesdale and Wensleydale? Where are the architect site elevation plans for this? They are missing from the uploaded documents.</p> <p>Three storey flats built 13.3m from the rear gardens of 33-37 Ribblesdale will result in them being completely overlooked and having no privacy whatsoever. It will also have a marked affect on the amount of sunlight that will reach these properties at certain times of the day.</p> <p>The Council have confirmed that all the parking bays on the plan (21?) are for the sole use of the residents and visitors of the 8 new dwellings. These bays are being built where existing residents currently park. Where are they supposed to go? There is already an acute shortage of parking in the area. This development will just exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>The planning documents all state that the larger of the two trees in Wensleydale should, and can, be kept however conversations with Council Officers indicate that it will be cut down. Why is this? Can residents ask for a TPO for it?</p> <p>Night lighting for a three storey block of flats and the adjacent car park is likely to be very intrusive for rear of 33-37 Ribblesdale.</p> <p>The elevation of the flats will dominate the skyline of the estate and they are not in keeping with the properties around it. Houses are</p>

needed but why can't it be a less intrusive two story development? Why does the pitch of the proposed roof need to be so steep?

Light:

Residents in Nidderdale will be overlooked and will lose sunlight. Yesterday I took interval photos of the shadow cast by the existing town houses. The flats, 50% taller, would have completely removed direct afternoon sunlight for most of the town houses on the opposite side of the road plus the houses in Nidderdale - including those bordering Cambrian Way. Residents in Ribblesdale will lose hours of direct morning sunlight. All of these houses have had uninterrupted sunlight since they were built in 1970's.

Parking:

I object to the location of the parking for the two new houses in Wensleydale. I spoke to the Council's Senior Project Manager and was told that the current shortage of parking would be partially alleviated if houses in Wensleydale converted their front gardens to parking (many of them have already done so); each conversion could take two cars off the road. This is true. So why isn't the Council following its own advice and putting driveways outside the front of the new houses?

This change to the plans would free up 4 spaces in Sleddale for existing residents/tenants. In addition, new tenants' cars would be more secure on a driveway and much closer if tenants had mobility issues.

I understand that investigations are underway to dig up the green in Ribblesdale, fell the mature trees and make it into car parking. Why destroy a beautiful amenity area that is well used when there is a large eyesore of garages and hard standing opposite the proposed development site? The garages clearly aren't all needed because the Council were recently planning to put houses on the site.

A minimum of 20 new parking spaces could be easily created if just some, not all, of the garages were demolished and the small patch of grass located to the side of no.23 (which isn't overlooked by anyone and is regularly used for dog fouling/discarded drinks containers) were used to create a car park.

There is already lighting installed in this area to serve the garages. Drains already exist but could be aided if Grasscrete were used as a surface. A sizeable parking area in this location would satisfy local demand and would also provide a safe, and much needed, area for parents at the start and end of the school day. The current congestion and chaotic parking by Hammond Academy traffic is an accident waiting to happen. There would still be garages available on the site for people to rent from the Council and it would mean that the Ribblesdale green and trees could be preserved. I am sure local residents would support this idea.

Bins:

Documents describe a communal bin storage structure for the flats being near to a road. However, it is not shown on the plans. If it is similar to the one built in 2020 at Howe Grove it is quite large. Does the Council propose to build it close to the back gardens of 33/34 Ribblesdale (on the spot where there is currently a new tree illustrated

on the plan)? The store is likely to attract vermin and wasps if left open.

**Deadlines:**

Why did residents in Nidderdale get the first letter from the Council notifying them of a forthcoming planning application but not the second one which gave details of the development and how to object to it? The first letter told residents the Council would commence the formal consultation process "directly after submission of the planning application" but it gave no date nor reference number. The deadline for objections is tomorrow. Nidderdale residents should have had at least 14 days opportunity to comment on the proposal since they will be directly affected by the new buildings.

*Further comments following amendments*

Height of buildings - a possible compromise: I was informed by a Council Officer that the original proposal was for a block of four flats but it was amended to six flats at the request of an elected Member? I appreciate the need for social housing, and do not object to dwellings being built at the end of my garden, however, the height of six flats is out of keeping with ALL surrounding buildings, it will be intrusive, dominating and will lower the quality of life for every resident who borders the site. I believe a two storey block of flats is a sensible compromise for both residents and the Council. Two storey flats will be very close to the height of the existing three storey town houses, so would not impact the skyline or streetscape as much.

I dispute DBC's assertions that the proposed development will "integrate well" with its immediate surroundings; it will tower over its surroundings! "The flats will be 10.6m tall and stand 12m above the road junction of Sleddale/Wensleydale. This will be double the height of the new two-storey houses and 50% taller than the nearest town houses in the lower part of Wensleydale (which are 8m tall). The flats will also be 25% taller than the adjacent townhouse (no.24).

The plans state that the flats continue "the 3-storey nature of the adjacent properties" and that they have "been developed to respond to the specific context in terms of scale". What it doesn't mention is that a 'storey' in a town house is far shorter than a 'storey' in a block of flats; they will not look similar. In short, the flats will dominate the skyline and will destroy, not integrate with, the character of the area.

**Privacy:**

In my previous comment I mentioned that a three-storey block of flats will remove all privacy from the rear gardens of 33-37 Ribblesdale. The rear gardens of 24&26 Wensleydale will also be overlooked. I am disappointed that great attention is being given to protect the privacy of new tenants (a surrounding hedge, new trees, opaque glass), and yet the removal of ALL privacy from some existing residents' outside space is being ignored. Why is this? What are the DBC regulations for loss of privacy caused by new buildings? There aren't even plans to plant a row of trees between our boundaries and the flats which would at least give us some privacy (although I see that trees have been included on the artist's impression of the development!).

I note comments made by residents in Wensleydale that the balconies and full length window of the flats opposite them will mean that new tenants will be able to look DOWN into their bedrooms! Surely this is unacceptable! A building with four flats rather than six would alleviate some of this gross intrusion and invasion of privacy.

#### Parking

I note and agree with the comments made by 23 Nidderdale regarding parking and road usage. I would like to add this question to their list: Why have residents have been told that they will not be able to use any of the parking spaces created by the development? The plans confirm that the 18 spaces are "in excess of the 13-space policy requirement, in order to provide space for existing casual parking observed at the proposal sites." So are the new spaces available for existing residents or not?

I believe DBC must bear some responsibility for creating the existing parking problems; you have granted planning permission for so many town houses to be converted to two flats or HMOs. Where did you think all the vehicles would park when you approved the creation of so many additional dwellings on this estate?

You have an opportunity to ease parking problems by creating two parking spaces in front of each of the two new houses. This would be in keeping with the planning aim of "integrating well" with the surrounding properties since most other houses in the road have converted their frontage to parking. You could also demolish some of the garages on the large site opposite (that has been deemed inappropriate for dwelling development) and create a sizeable car park.

**Biodiversity of the Development:**  
The Ecology Report specifies the development must add to biodiversity on site. However, the plans will necessitate the provision of additional parking for local residents. If your argument for not putting parking in front of the two houses is to protect an existing tree and create a lawn area, then I object strongly to this on the grounds that you are currently investigating the removal of several mature trees and the grass amenity area in Ribblesdale to create a car park.

The Planning Application states that the development will "improve the local environment". Therefore, additional parking sites must be considered as part of this application; to destroy an amenity area in the heart of the community, while claiming that the development has led to a 'net gain' of biodiversity, would be very wrong. It would also go against specific environmental protection targets in the Dacorum Borough Council Core Strategy (2006 - 2031).

Planting low hedges and wildflower areas, rather than grass, is great for biodiversity but it does nothing to help "integrate the development" with its surroundings. There is nothing like that in the roads near the site so it will stand out, rather than blend in.

#### Lighting:

I am concerned that lighting for the flats and the car park will illuminate

	<p>the back gardens and windows of adjacent properties in Ribblesdale throughout the night; the Police have recommended dawn to dusk lighting in their comments. The car park will be 1.5m from our rear fences. I think that constant lighting will make our properties more vulnerable and will also disturb those who sleep in their back bedrooms.</p> <p>The Ecology Report states that there "must be no additional lighting on site that will spill artificial light onto any habitats of ecological value (e.g. trees)". How is this possible with a large sycamore tree immediately outside the flats?</p> <p>Information about the Development: I am disappointed that residents' requests for information made in January (including elevation plans and revised cgi's) had still not been acted on when the new plans were uploaded on 8th March. I only received answers to some questions on the last working day before the objection deadline (e.g. the full height of the flats, 10.6m not just the 9.9m as shown on the plans).</p> <p>The revised elevation plans are STILL not on the Portal for residents to view and residents haven't been notified that there have been changes to the original documents. When revised versions of documents have been uploaded, I've noticed that the date has not been changed. This is very misleading - it doesn't indicate that there is anything new to look at.</p> <p>I appreciate that the Planning Officer doesn't think the new information is worth re-consulting about, however, the information should have been available online to those affected (33-37 Ribblesdale) BEFORE the end of the 14 day consultation period. Some residents have not seen it and don't know it exists.</p>
<p>24 Nidderdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TE</p>	<p>Good evening.</p> <p>We have been living here for more than 3 years and have seen an increase in traffic, poor parking and accidents due to this problem. As the end of Terrace house in Nidderdale we would suffer greatly the loss of sunlight in our back garden. We already don't have much sunlight coming through the front due to the apartments on Wensleydale, we certainly do not wish to not enjoy the sun in our back garden.</p> <p>I am and I work as a Herbalist/ Holistic Therapists and rely very much on the sun to nourish the herbs and plants that I keep and use in my practice. This change would affect my business especially in these difficult times we are in.</p> <p>I also value my privacy as I am a mother to a 9 year old and I certainly do not appreciate the lack of privacy this would mean if the buildings look into our back garden, especially if as a family we are enjoying our afternoons outside.</p> <p>Also I don't think that it's fair that those who have lived here are penalised with the parking adjustments after being residents for many years, in favour for the new builds, specially if we consider when schools are open and the roads are full of cars obstructing vision and space. I have witnessed not long ago a child being run over by a speeding car during school run on Wensleydale. It doesn't make the</p>

	<p>neighbourhood feel safe.</p> <p>These are our concerns and hope you would also consider our opinions in this regard.</p> <p><i>Further comments</i></p> <p>I am not happy at all by the proposal, there still is the lack of privacy and the fact that the parking will be reduced. Lack of sunlight is nefarious in a place that already we suffer the lack of , especially under mental wellbeing and plants and trees. Also we bought this house as it was perfect to support my Herbalist practice ( very new) where I grow my own herbs. It would be a significant loss to me as I wouldn't be able to use my herbs due to pollution and fine particles. This is simply put,pure greed as we are slowly losing such a big amount of green belt land and now you are building more apartments which affects the environment. I ask you to reconsider and adjust the project, creating more parking for us residents that have lived here longer and have the same right to parking and not to be subjected to traffic and increased air pollution which would mean also an increase in respiratory problems, stress on both humans and ecology. Thank you.</p>
<p>22 Nidderdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TE</p>	<p>As a resident of nidderdale I am very concerned about the planning application, we have no parking apart from cambrian way or down by the proposed site , it is already a huge struggle to park as it is on a normal day and impossible to get parked during school drop off and pick up times , some of the 3 story houses have multiple residents and sometimes have 8 vehicles parked down there , I witnessed a school boy getting hit by a car recently , as the road was so busy with cars double parked . Also a lot of people use their garages for storage due to the fact we do not have lofts. I think this is going to be a big mistake if it goes ahead</p>
<p>23 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>New build will be out of character with the surrounding estate and will dominate the skyline.</p> <p>Parking is already limited and residents are already parking elsewhere. This will only increase the pressure with parking.</p>
<p>28 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>Thank you for your recent communication which we received on the 5th January 2021.</p> <p>This is the first communication we have had from you although you state in your letter you had connected us in December 2020 ~ nothing received and talking to neighbours, no one have received any letters from you?</p> <p>We strongly object to this development which we will be able to see over the roof tops of 35/36/37 Ribblesdale. With the big development taking place in Grove Hill West from the Link Road, we do not see that trying to fit in a small group of houses / apartments and</p>

	<p>over-crowding the area will help the community at all. All of Highfield 14 have flat roofs, so adding buildings with pitched roofs will stand out and make the area look over crowded and very untidy. We are encouraged to take pride in our community, but how can we do that when you are insisting in overcrowding small areas.</p> <p>Also parking, which I know is not your priority, but is such a big problem and an issue which should be taken into account, you only have to walk around in the early evening to see that cars are parked on the grass verges, on the corners, parked on pavements all around this area. In Ribblesdale we have 37 houses (with flats) and mosthouseholds have at least two cars, and there is certainly not enough parking. In Ribblesdale we have many cars parked who live in Sleddale, Lonsdale and the other blocks and many a time we cannot park in our parking areas. Adding more houses will make this big problem even more unbearable even though they will have parking allocated which is never enough, and should be taken into account as this does effect the residents and their daily life and commitments which are all part of the Dacorum community and their life styles.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing back from you and hope that the responses for this development prompts you to arrange a meeting where this proposed new development can be discussed as it does affect our area and home life.</p> <p>thank you</p> <p><i>Further comments following amendments</i></p> <p>The houses/flats are far taller than the existing town houses i live at no 28 ribblesdale and will look out to see these buildings in the sky line instead of trees and woods that i can see now. If 2 storey houses were built we would not have this problem.Then we come to the major problem of parking for the vehicles that park where these buildings will be.Ribblesdale allready has cars vans etc used for parking by people from other estates where are all these vehicles going to park.We have heard the green space in front of our house is going to be considered for extra parking this cannot happen felling mature trees and digging up green space where children play i strongly object to this happening WHERE ARE THE CHILDREN GOING TO PLAY there is ample parking space in the area opposite in Wensleydale where the garages are.I object to these plans because these houses/flats will be totally out of character with the rest of the area they will be an eyesore and dominate the skyline.</p>
<p>31 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>We have lived in Ribblesdale for 25 years and have always had a parking problem which has got significantly worse over the years due to the lack of spaces for residents of Ribblesdale and the constant parking of residents from adjoining roads here too. I personally leave for work in the middle of the night and my vehicle has been blocked in on numerous occasions by vehicles due to the overpacked car park and under marked parking bays, which has forced me to pay for a taxi to Hatfield and back at my expense. I also return from work mid afternoon usually around the time the local school finishes and all the parents have parked on this estate to pick their children up which is already an</p>

	<p>accident waiting to happen and will become more dangerous for those children when the garaged and kerbside spaces are taken away to build these new properties and the parking becomes more congested around school drop off/pick up times. we feel the parking of the existing residents was not taken into consideration and should be looked into before planning is agreed.</p>
<p>19 Nidderdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TE</p>	<p>This area already has a significant parking issue and whilst there may be parking provided for the new properties, this new development will take away a number of spaces used by other residents - especially at school times.</p> <p>In addition to the loss of parking, these new properties will be able to look directly into my back garden.</p>
<p>10 Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TN</p>	<p>I am writing to you about the planned proposal to develop the garages on Sleddale into 2 houses and 6 apartments.</p> <p>Although I can appreciate the need to develop more houses in the local area I feel that the development of the local garages is not the way to do it.</p> <p>Our local roads are already congested by people trying to park near their homes and by developing on ground such as the garages will only exacerbated the problem further.</p> <p>As it stands it is very unlikely that a fire engine or ambulance would be able to get to the top of the road as the bin truck struggles weekly.</p> <p>The area would be better suited for demolition and redevelopment as a car park. This planning application has also given me the ability to raise the concern that with the current parking situation the footpaths in the local area are impassable, this is highly concerning as the route is used by school children daily that need to walk down the middle of the road, you also WOULD NOT be able to use wheelchair in the area due to impassable paths and no drop curbs.</p> <p>I would greatly appreciate the opportunity to raise these concerns if a planning meeting is possible.</p>
<p>12 Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TN</p>	<p>I hope you are well in these times and your Christmas and new year were as good as they could be.</p> <p>I live at 12 Sleddale with my wife, and two young sons.</p> <p>As we spoke about in December when I emailed you and you replied you will remember that I support the development of the garage sites as they are an eyesore and a fly tipping hot spot.</p> <p>However, in the correspondence we had you assured me the parking for Sleddale would not be affected by the build and the new build had their parking included.</p> <p>Now that people have been able to see the plans and study them a</p>

document has been produced and given out highlighting the bad points.

My objections are:

1) The proposed parking for the new development

2) The height of the new builds on a privacy point of view for residents of Sleddale.

3) The pitched or sloped roofs that will be used

Objection 1 - I worked out initially and said to you I think there could be potential for 23 cars from the new builds if families move in with children who drive etc. 19 spaces aren't far off but these other cars where will they go? the plans specifically say Sleddale residents cannot use the new developments parking. Is the same respect going to be shown the other way? ( the new builds cannot use Sleddale parking?) how will this be policed? Are the 4-6 spaces that Sleddale will lose going to be made up somewhere else? like opening the green up in Ribblesdale or similar?

Objection 2- The height of the proposals is quite unreasonable. The residents of Sleddale will have people with a birds eye view into their back gardens (and the rest of the area). A complete invasion of privacy. I think this should be reconsidered.

Objection 3- As we spoke back in December and I mentioned this to you, and you quite rightly said that all new build will have the pitched roofs as they are more efficient in every way (cost and thermal). But having the whole estate in flat roof but a number in pitched roof will look very odd and not in keeping.

Could you please tell me why when the new build (of the old garage site) in Westerdale in 2019/2020 have flat roofs? when by your own admission pitched roofs are a better choice? ( they may have been built by a third party? and not Dacorum, but surely the council would have had to sign the plans off?)

Now I realise the garage site is the property of the council and they shall do what they feel, as I have stated I support the development but a compromise has to be reached on the objections please.

We, the residents, didn't ask for the new development so I do not see why we have to be penalised for it. Instead of making Sleddale fit to the new development, surely the new development should fit to Sleddale.

The great thing about life is change but change for the better. Once all the work has been done and the new builds are a few years old and blend in I'm sure it will have a positive impact on Sleddale but only if you listen now to the people that live here.

I do not wish to make your life hard Mr Stickley and I'm guessing you have had lots of questions regarding this but please take on board what

	<p>the residents say about the whole plans.</p> <p><i>Further comments following amendments</i></p> <p>I'm sorry I am a touch late on my response I have been busy.</p> <p>Unfortunately again I will have to object to the proposed development of the garage sites for Sleddale for the issue of parking again</p> <p>As stated before I fully support the sites being developed but Sleddale shouldn't lose out on the kerbside parking for the sake of the new development. The parking, by my reckoning about 4-5 spaces, for Sleddale will be lost.</p> <p>These need to be made up and I find the councils attitude of it isn't up to us to offer parking solutions laughable, maybe if this situation was on the powers that be door step(s) they may not be so flippant!?</p> <p>As stated before the new development should fit Sleddale. Not Sleddale fit the new development.</p> <p>I'm sorry to be a pain in backside by objecting again and thank-you for the compromises made with the pitched roofs and the 1 less parking space but more needs to be done please.</p> <p>I hear that part of Ribblesdale grassed area be made into parking has been tabled? Hopefully not all of it as i play on it with my children but this is a step in the right direction.</p> <p>If the parking issue isn't sorted out and the council go ahead you (the council) will make for a very miserable place to live because of the fighting for parking spaces that will be caused and this could lead to neighbour situations and resentment on both sides and development will have the reverse effect what it is intended.</p> <p>Please do not look at this as a quick buck to be made and 'you can get on with it'. Please consider these objections seriously.</p> <p>The new developments parking can not be used by current Sleddale residents? Will the same be said for the new development residents about Sleddale parking? How will this be policed?</p> <p>The height of the buildings and privacy are not of a major concern to me but it is the parking.</p>
<p>5 Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TN</p>	<p>I am writing this letter to you to object against the development, I feel that Sleddale and the area around it isnt looked after atall the flat block i live in has a number of things wrong with it, these problems are pulled up by me and im sure other people that live here and there is no change.</p> <p>The parking here is minimal, i have lived here for two years and rarely have places to park which sometimes forces me to park in the garages.</p> <p>For the amount of houses/flats there are around here and i personally</p>

	<p>think its disgusting that you wouldn't then allow residents to use the new parking spaces if available. As you can tell i dont agree with this development and would be gutted to see more of the space taken up and money being spent on these properties instead of making ones in the area better places to live.</p>
<p>23 Nidderdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TE</p>	<p><b>OBJECTIONS</b> The proposed pitched roofs are out of character with all the surrounding buildings that have flat roofs.</p> <p>The pitched roofs increase the height of the proposed buildings significantly and disproportionately to adjacent buildings.</p> <p>The ridge height of the apartment block in particular would overwhelm the existing street character, and would significantly obscure the view to the western skyline and sunsets that have been enjoyed for many years by residents to the east of Wensleydale.</p> <p>Any new dwellings should ideally be either 2 or 3 storey with flat roofs, and have floor levels that step down to follow the slope of the street.</p> <p><b>PARKING OBSERVATIONS</b> The Sleddale garage areas were originally designated as parking areas serving the dwellings to Sleddale and Ribblesdale. A factor in the garages falling into disuse may be that they are too small to accommodate many modern cars, and this will have increased the on street parking pressures to the area.</p> <p>Currently the formal and informal parking for Ribblesdale and Sleddale is around 60 spaces for approximately 47 dwellings, and falls below the Zone 3 standard. This and the greatly increased number of commercial vehicles in the locality has added much pressure to on street parking in Wensleydale. In addition, the conversion of many of the houses in Wensleydale to flats will have added to this pressure.</p> <p>On most days the on street parking in Wensleydale is chaotic and often hazardous with footpaths on both sides continuously blocked by vehicles. Pedestrians are forced into the road, and I have witnessed a wheelchair user having to hurriedly struggle uphill in the roadway with the fear of speeding vehicles.</p> <p>I would ask please if consideration is given to any existing formal or informal parking that may be displaced by these proposals, and if there are any nearby alternative areas that could become car parking to help mitigate this increasing and hazardous problem.</p> <p><b>GENERAL COMMENT</b> I received a letter from DBC dated 20/11/20 outlining these proposals and advising a formal application would follow where comments from local residents would be invited. I assumed a further letter would follow?  I heard nothing further and only found out recently by a letter from</p>

Councillor Brenda Link that a formal application had been submitted on 8/12/20.

Thank You

#### GARAGES

The Design & Access Statement acknowledges the garage court was originally provided to provide parking spaces for residents of Sleddale & Ribblesdale. However, it describes the garages as becoming disused and underused over time. This may give a false impression of the garages being unwanted and not required. The following questions arise:-

1. Does the Council acknowledge the garages are too small for many modern cars, and are therefore not fit for purpose, and given the increase in car ownership this loss of parking provision has led to an increase in on-street parking stress.
2. Has the Council had a policy of not carrying out routine maintenance & repairs that has led to the garage court looking run down or derelict.
3. Has the Council had a policy of withholding re-letting of garages when they have been vacated
4. Other Councils have options that include leveling garages that are not fit for purpose and providing open parking for rent. Has DBC assessed this option.

#### DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

The Design & Access Statement describes the apartment block as continuing the nature of the adjacent 3 storey properties and integrating well with existing surroundings, which appears incorrect.

The height of the apartment block would be equivalent to a comparable 4 storey version of the adjacent property, and even though the ground floor level is lower on the downhill slope the roof will be significantly higher than the adjacent uphill property.

The apartment block is significantly out of character with the Wensleydale street scene where existing 3 storey dwellings generally sit 7 to 8 metres above street level. The height and length of the block will dominate the street scene, and the downhill flank will tower some 12 metres above street level at the junction of Sleddale and Wensleydale, and will also tower some 6 metres above the adjacent new dwelling. The block will significantly obscure direct sunlight from surrounding properties at varying times.

This proposal is not in keeping with Dacorums Area Based Policy for HCA20 Highfield.

#### PARKING

The displacement of vehicles from garages has led to on street parking in the surrounding streets being highly stressed. There are approximately 45 dwellings served by Sleddale and Ribblesdale. Acceptable formal and on street parking available is approximately 45 spaces and is well below Zone 3 parking standards that would provide 68 spaces in new development. It can be observed that well in excess

	<p>of a further 20 vehicles are often chaotically parking in these streets with many parked on pavements causing obstruction. The eviction of any existing garage users to on street would exacerbate the problem, and the proposal will displace a minimum of 14 vehicles from on street in Sleddale &amp; Wensleydale.</p> <p>Area Based Policy for HCA20 states 'the redevelopment of garage blocks will only be permitted if alternative provision is made for displaced vehicle parking'</p> <p><b>EXISTING ON STREET PARKING STRESS</b>  This proposal will increase the existing high on street parking stress in Ribblesdale and Wensleydale. (comments made in previous consultation on parking stress in Wensleydale)</p> <p>Has the Council carried out an on street parking stress survey in accordance with appendix C of Dacorum's parking standards SPG adopted in Nov 20, and will the results be published prior to committee date. The residents may consider a private independent survey using the Council's methodology in appendix C.</p> <p>Pavement parking is a severe and hazardous problem in Wensleydale, which will increase due to this proposal if no alternative provision is made. How would this fit with any duties the Council may have under network management and The Traffic Management Act, and the House of Commons traffic committee review on the problem of pavement parking.</p> <p><b>SUMMARY</b>  Whilst these proposals may be presented as in keeping with the provisions of the NPPF, and the Council's adopted Core Strategy, can they be justified in overriding previously well thought out Area Based Policies, and particularly where unmitigated increased parking stress will further degrade the quality of living in the area for existing residents.</p>
<p>26 Wensleydale  Hemel Hempstead  Hertfordshire  HP2 5TF</p>	<p>I live (and own) the property at 26 Wensleydale. I own (and rent out) the property at 28 Wensleydale: both properties are very close to the proposed development. We also rent two garages in Sleddale, one used as storage area (no loft in the house!), and another one to store our second car.</p> <p>I am 65 years old and Antony is 78 years old.  We are both strongly against the new development, because of the traffic in Wensleydale and the number of cars already parked here. Removing garages and adding people will make the situation much worse.</p> <p>The increased traffic will make more difficult for an emergency vehicle to reach us. In the last few years, my husband had to be taken to the hospital by ambulance several times. In one occasion, he collapsed outside our home and he had to be resuscitated by the paramedic. I don't even want to think what could have happened if the ambulance was delayed by the traffic between Wensleydale and Cambrian way.</p> <p>Even without the new development, Wensleydale is already</p>

overcrowded with parked cars and because of the nearby school, the traffic in the morning is horrendous.

We avoid leaving/returning home at rush hours, because of the traffic at the junction with Cambrian way.

At night (and day), the pavement at the top of Wensleydale (before the junction with Cambrian way) is full with parked cars : I used to catch the 6:10 am coach to London and most of the time I had to walk in the middle of the road, because it was not possible to use the pavement.

The 'square' at the back on my house is completely full with parked cars, and there is no spared capacity for parking.

Several people in the neighbourhood keep their cars in one of the garage: the development will remove the garages (more cars to be parked in the street), and it will remove the a lot of kerbside, and the garage access, at the moment used for parking cars. In the morning, there are usually 4-5 cars parked just in the access road to the garage. They are often gone during the day when the owners drives to work.

Visitors are unable to park their car, and often leave their car in the middle of the road!

The lower part of Wensleydale is already overcrowded compared to the original design of the street. Almost every town house from number 1 to 20 has been converted to two dwellings, increasing the occupancy, the number of cars, and traffic resulting from delivery vans.

The new development, with the increased populations and traffic, will considerable decrease our quality of life.

*Further comments following amendments*

I live at 26 Wensleydale. We moved here over 35 years ago, and the area was spacious and pleasant. Since then, we traffic and the number of cars parked have grown exponentially, partly caused most of the town houses at the bottom of Wensleydale have been converted to flat/maisonette, increasing the number of cars, without providing extra space. At the moment, Wensleydale is already overcrowded with traffic and parked cars. If the garages are demolished, all the cars parked in the garages and the access road will move to Wensleydale/Ribblesdale, already full.

For instance, I rent two garages in the area that will be rebuild, we use one as extra storage, and the second for my car. I will have to keep my car in front of the house, and this will cause access problem to my disabled husband, as he will not have enough room to access his car. We need two cars, because we are out at the same time during the day (pre-pandemic!) and my husband is unable to use public transport. If we have visitors they have problems in parking their car because of overcrowding.

	<p>The parking spaces provided to the new dwellings are not enough, for the number of properties, so more cars will be fighting for the non existing parking space.</p> <p>The traffic is currently very heavy, causing congestion at the top of the road. I am really worried that extra dwellings will increase the traffic, and making difficult for emergency vehicle to enter Wensleydale. My husband has an hearth condition, and just in the last year I had to call an emergency ambulance three times. So this is a real concern for me.</p> <p>Already, we try to avoid going out at rush hours, because the traffic make difficult and risky accessing Wensleydale.</p> <p>During school time, the traffic is very heavy, with car parked in the middle of the street, stopping the children from being able to cross the road safely.</p> <p>Cars are parked on the pavements: when commuting to London in the early hours of the morning, I have to walk in the middle of the road to get to the bus stop, because the pavement is occupied by cars.</p> <p>The proposed block of flat is too tall, and its design is not in keep with the rest of the estate architecture. The submitted designs are very pretty, but they don't show how the street will be affected by cars piled everywhere.</p> <p>I am already suffering and taking medication for clinical depression (partly due to the worrying for my husband health). This new proposed development is making my condition much worse, especially because of the future problems with traffic, and the fear and anxiety of not been able to get an ambulance in case of need.</p> <p>We have not been given any alternative arrangement for the garages we rent.</p> <p>I fully understand the need for new dwelling, but the proposed one will make everyone one life more complicated and difficult.</p>
<p>35 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>The height of the proposed block of apartments is really concerning considering the close proximity to multiple 2 storey flat roofed houses. I feel that if the design of the apartment block is not reconsidered, this shows a clear lack of care and understanding for the local residents.</p>
<p>7 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>I object to this plan. There isn't enough parking for what is already here as it is and it will decrease daylight into our homes. It will also increase traffic and congestion on the area.</p> <p>I object to this proposal. Due to there being an impact on privacy, they will be higher than the current homes here. It will have a massive impact on parking. Which is already full as it is. Local facilities will be impacted with more residents in the area.</p>
<p>4 Wensleydale Hemel Hempstead</p>	<p>I am extremely disappointed to receive notification of a development of the Sleddale Garage Sites.</p>

<p>Hertfordshire HP2 5TF</p>	<p>This is the first notification I have seen about the development and note that it has been prepared by local residents!</p> <p>Although I am not affected by loss of sunlight or loss of privacy like the residents nearer the proposed development, just the fact that there is not enough parking for the current residents is enough for me to raise an objection as this will make matters even worse.</p> <p>There is already inadequate parking available for the residents and this is further compounded by parents dropping their children off and collecting from school who block driveways and park on the pavements!</p> <p>An area of green land in Wharfdale was already turned into more parking spaces about 3-4 years ago and mature trees were felled to provide more parking for the current residents and there is still a huge problem.</p> <p>There have been far too many townhouses converted into flats already, which has caused significant problems with parking. We purchased our property in 2015 and unbeknown to us the property next door had been bought by a landlord. We were unaware that planning had been submitted to turn the property into two flats and would have objected strongly if we had known. Since living here, I have seen more townhouses converted into flats, but have never seen any notification of the proposed development and so have never had the opportunity to object!</p> <p>Rather than building more houses, if the Sleddale garages are not being used by any of the current residents which I assume is the case as you are planning to put more houses on the site, then convert the area into more parking for the current residents, please do not add to what is already a huge problem for those who live in the area!</p>
<p>25 Nitterdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TE</p>	<p>I object with the planning permission.</p>
<p>23 Nitterdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TE</p>	<p><b>GARAGES</b></p> <p>The Design &amp; Access Statement acknowledges the garage court was originally provided to provide parking spaces for residents of Sleddale &amp; Ribblesdale. However, it describes the garages as becoming disused and underused over time. This may give a false impression of the garages being unwanted and not required. The following questions arise:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the Council acknowledge the garages are too small for many modern cars, and are therefore not fit for purpose, and given the increase in car ownership this loss of parking provision has led to an increase in on-street parking stress.</li> <li>2. Has the Council had a policy of not carrying out routine maintenance &amp; repairs that has led to the garage court looking run down or derelict.</li> <li>3. Has the Council had a policy of withholding re-letting of garages</li> </ol>

when they have been vacated  
4. Other Councils have options that include leveling garages that are not fit for purpose and providing open parking for rent. Has DBC assessed this option.

#### DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

The Design & Access Statement describes the apartment block as continuing the nature of the adjacent 3 storey properties and integrating well with existing surroundings, which appears incorrect.

The height of the apartment block would be equivalent to a comparable 4 storey version of the adjacent property, and even though the ground floor level is lower on the downhill slope the roof will be significantly higher than the adjacent uphill property.

The apartment block is significantly out of character with the Wensleydale street scene where existing 3 storey dwellings generally sit 7 to 8 metres above street level. The height and length of the block will dominate the street scene, and the downhill flank will tower some 12 metres above street level at the junction of Sleddale and Wensleydale, and will also tower some 6 metres above the adjacent new dwelling. The block will significantly obscure direct sunlight from surrounding properties at varying times.

This proposal is not in keeping with Dacorums Area Based Policy for HCA20 Highfield.

#### PARKING

The displacement of vehicles from garages has led to on street parking in the surrounding streets being highly stressed. There are approximately 45 dwellings served by Sleddale and Ribblesdale. Acceptable formal and on street parking available is approximately 45 spaces and is well below Zone 3 parking standards that would provide 68 spaces in new development. It can be observed that well in excess of a further 20 vehicles are often chaotically parking in these streets with many parked on pavements causing obstruction. The eviction of any existing garage users to on street would exacerbate the problem, and the proposal will displace a minimum of 14 vehicles from on street in Sleddale & Wensleydale.

Area Based Policy for HCA20 states 'the redevelopment of garage blocks will only be permitted if alternative provision is made for displaced vehicle parking'

#### EXISTING ON STREET PARKING STRESS

This proposal will increase the existing high on street parking stress in Ribblesdale and Wensleydale. (comments made in previous consultation on parking stress in Wensleydale)

Has the Council carried out an on street parking stress survey in accordance with appendix C of Dacorums parking standards SPG adopted in Nov 20, and will the results be published prior to committee date. The residents may consider a private independent survey using the Council's methodology in appendix C.

	<p>Pavement parking is a severe and hazardous problem in Wensleydale, which will increase due to this proposal if no alternative provision is made. How would this fit with any duties the Council may have under network management and The Traffic Management Act, and the House of Commons traffic committee review on the problem of pavement parking.</p> <p><b>SUMMARY</b>          Whilst these proposals may be presented as in keeping with the provisions of the NPPF, and the Council's adopted Core Strategy, can they be justified in overriding previously well thought out Area Based Policies, and particularly where unmitigated increased parking stress will further degrade the quality of living in the area for existing residents.</p>
<p>2 Ribblesdale          Hemel Hempstead          Hertfordshire          HP2 5TS</p>	<p>Due to the height of the development it is not in keeping with the area, as well as the height of the building it will in fringe on the privacy of nearby properties. At the moment the area is used for parking, and any parking taken away will involve them parking in other areas or on the wensleydale, which will be dangerous, many of the local school parents park down there, and I have often seen near misses with parents and children trying to cross here, the garages opposite the development would make ideal additional parking for residents and school parents alike, and would be a safe option.</p>
<p>20 Nitterdale          Hemel Hempstead          Hertfordshire          HP2 5TE</p>	<p>This height of this development is too high, and will block sunlight in my garden. The height of the flats are not in keeping with the rest of the area. I will lose privacy in my garden as a result of this. It would be more ideal to make this development 2 stories high only. This will also reduce parking and cause parking issues in an already difficult area to park, and will result in inadequate parking for all surrounding roads.</p>
<p>28 Ribblesdale          Hemel Hempstead          Hertfordshire          HP2 5TS</p>	<p>Highfield 14 is already an overdeveloped area, but the Council seems to persist in building on every available small piece of land and digging up trees and concreting over grass areas. The height of the proposed dwellings are too high and will overshadow all nearby houses. Our house at no. 28 will be overlooked and you would have cut off any views we have. You are taking away households privacy from all the houses near by. How can we have pride in our area when it is becoming an overdeveloped site? You want all Dacorum residents to have pride and well being by you are not prepared to let us enjoy our home living. In a national survey HH came 4th in the worst place to live in Hertfordshire, the survey states that HH is a grubby concrete place to live. By overdeveloping each area, I think Dacorum want to knock Stevenage off number 1 on the list and take its place!! Also it is suggested that the glass square in Ribblesdale has the trees cut down and concreted over to make another SIX parking places ~ you have already cut all the corners of the parking areas off to make a square parking area, digging up the grass and cutting down the trees to make more parking, also two large areas of bushes were cut down and concreted over for more parking. I cannot believe that you want to concrete this over for more parking and are prepared to cut down MORE TREES. Children use this grass area to play and ride their bikes and scooters round, when it snowed there were five snowmen built out</p>

	<p>there, but you now want to take this all away from the residents and their children/grandchildren. There is ample parking in Ribblesdale for the residents, but half of Sleddale also walk up and park here, so if you want to concrete any green over, use the big green in Sleddale so they have their own parking. I think you should look for a bigger site for new dwellings and parking and stop trying to jam so many new houses into all ready over developed areas.</p>
<p>27 Wensleydale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TF</p>	<p>Parking is already extremely limited on Wensleydale and Sleddale, building 18 new properties is going to cause even more parking issues.</p> <p>Loss of sunlight as the flats will be blocking the sunlight coming into view of my house.</p> <p>Loss of privacy</p>
<p>5 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>I am currently renting 2 garages to store a car and a motorcycle, If I do not keep my motorcycle in a locked building it will increase my insurance premiums and the possibility of its theft.</p> <p>These garages are in the block above Sleddale, I know of many residents that rent garages in this block.</p> <p>What I would like to know is, will there be alternative garages made available to enable myself and other residents to park the vehicles.</p> <p><i>Further comments</i></p> <p>I currently rent 2 garages in the top block, where am I going to put my project car and my motorcycle and trailer in separate garage as I have no space on my property?</p>
<p>25 Wensleydale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TF</p>	<p>We are writing to complain about the future development opposite our house (25 Wensleydale) as the height of the building will affect our privacy and stop the sunlight. They will be able to look straight in to our bedroom windows.</p> <p>The flats will totally dominate the view that we have at the moment. We have had our house since new and it will affect our way of life. We wont get any sun at the front of our house during the months when the sun is lower. Can you not lower this building to a two storey instead of a three so we're not as overlooked as we will be, and we will get more sunlight.</p> <p>Would it be possible to have very light brick and not the dark ones that my house is made of?</p>
<p>24 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>The proposed height of the flats will ruin the skyline and cause neighbouring buildings to be over-shadowed. People need natural sunlight and to have this taken away because someone wants to make more money is criminal. To stop the building "sticking out like a sore thumb", it needs to be aesthetically pleasing and to be built with the lighter bricks of the 2 options.</p>

	<p>The parking in the surrounding area is already inadequate and so if the large garage area in Wensleydale , opposite the development site, could be made into additional parking this would ease the pressure.</p>
<p>6 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>When taking my children to and from school every day the road is so dangerous, there are so many parked cars on top of all the junctions, there are no safe places to cross, parents from hammond school drive in and park, on top of all the residents that are already parked here makes it a terribly dangerous for the children. Besides that there are not enough spaces for parking the people who live here already without adding another 20 or so families into the mix. The residents here have to park on kerbs and in other streets as it is, adding to this would make it even worse and then if emergency services need to get into the road this may prove very hard. I'm not totally against the space being used for homes as i understand people need somewhere to live but maybe the development could be smaller and with adequate parking.</p>
<p>34 Ribblesdale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TS</p>	<p>I would like to take this opportunity to voice my objections to the proposed planning application submitted by Mr Ian Jackson for the demolition of 34 residential garages and construction of 2 no dwelling houses 6 no apartments at Garage Court Sleddale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire, the Planning Reference number is 20/03821/FUL. The proposed development would result in a building site being basically at the bottom of my garden with all the dust and noise that entails for 12/18 months or longer meaning we would not be able to have doors/windows open in the hot weather or let our Granddaughters play out in the back garden. Once the development is completed the properties would be higher than ours and would not only block any sunlight from my garden/house but would mean the residents of the new dwellings would be able to look down into our house, or my Daughters bedroom which would be a massive invasion of privacy. If the development went ahead it would also add to the massive parking problem that already exists in the area and could surely only be addressed by removing the trees and amenity area ( green ) that the children play on that presently exists in Ribblesdale. If this development goes ahead I think it ill have a massive negative effect on the quality of life for the local residents and a negative effect on the biodiversity of the area, we would also lose valuable green areas which is not for the ecology of the area in general and Ribblesdale in particular. I really do hope that the concerns of the residents are taken into consideration when the decisions are made and are not just brushed aside as Ribblesdale is a nice place to raise a family and it should be allowed to stay that way.</p>
<p>31 Wensleydale Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP2 5TF</p>	<p>I do not have access to email or internet. I am writing to object to planning of proposed building of 2 bedroom flats + 1 bedroom flats and two houses at the site I Sleddale as it will interfere with privacy and parking of my property.</p>